

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Nevada Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: 700 East Fifth Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Marcia Calloway</p> <p>Position and Office: State Title I Director Nevada Department of Education</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Nevada Department of Education 700 East Fifth Street Suite 113 Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096</p> <p>Telephone: 775-687-9161</p> <p>Fax: 775-687-9120</p> <p>Email address: mcalloway@doe.nv.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Keith Rheault</p>	<p>Telephone: 775-687-9217</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X </p>	<p>Date: December 3, 2010</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Nevada



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



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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

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

FY 2010 Application Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant:</p> <p>Nevada Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p> <p>700 East Fifth Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Marcia Calloway</p> <p>Position and Office: State Title I Director Nevada Department of Education</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Nevada Department of Education 700 East Fifth Street Suite 113 Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096</p> <p>Telephone: 775-687-9161</p> <p>Fax: 775-687-9120</p> <p>Email address: mcalloway@doe.nv.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Keith Rheault</p>	<p>Telephone: 775-687-9217</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X The Superintendent signature can be found in Appendix A, as well as it was overnighted via FedEx on December 3, 2010.</p>	<p>Date: December 3, 2010</p> <p>Resubmission date: January 14, 2011</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>

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

Nevada Department of Education

2010-11 SIG Identification Definitions and Procedures Document

This document describes the process that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) used to develop its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” and how schools are included in the SIG Tier I, II, or III lists for 2010-11. This definition is essentially the same definition and process as was used in the 2009 SIG application with a few minor

adjustments. Therefore, the following Tier descriptions apply to this grant:

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

Measure of Percent Proficient

The proficiency criterion was based upon the percent proficient, or the percent of the student body that scored in the proficient range in math and English/Language Arts (ELA, Reading and Writing), respectively, in 2009-10 adequate yearly progress (AYP) results. For K-8 schools, this included students enrolled in grades 3 to 8, who were continuously enrolled at their respective school from count day to the date of testing. For high schools, the proficiency criterion was based on each student's best score on the High School Proficiency Examination through the spring of their 11th grade year. The proficiency metric was calculated for math and ELA, respectively, for each school and each school was assigned a rank based on Math Proficiency and a rank based on ELA Proficiency.

Measure of Progress¹

The Progress measure was based upon whether schools had made progress or increased the proficiency rate on the state accountability assessments. Progress is defined here as the change in a school's percent proficient in math and ELA across as many years as the school was in existence over the four-year period. For example, each school's math and ELA changes in percent proficient from 2006-07 to 2007-08, 2007-08 to 2008-09, and 2008-09 to 2009-10 were computed. The annual changes

¹ The term "progress," called "growth" in 2009, is used to refer to the change in proficiency rates over the period of time analyzed for SIG identification. This measure has been renamed "progress" to distinguish it from growth or value-added measurements.

were summed to determine each school’s total change (i.e., Progress) over the time period. Each school was assigned a separate rank for math change (i.e., Progress) and a rank for ELA change (Progress).

Combination of Criteria for Identification

The total of four ranks (i.e., sum of the rank scores for Math Proficiency, ELA Proficiency, Math Progress, and ELA Progress) was computed for each school to derive a total rank value. Note that each of the four ranks was weighted equally. Once established, the overall total rank value remains unchanged throughout the remainder of the SIG identification process. In other words, no re-ordering is undertaken.

***A companion document with detailed technical information that further articulates the implementation of this definition can be found in Appendix B.**

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 ²

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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.

Please find the attached tables/List of Schools under Appendix C.

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:

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Part 1

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

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

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

regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices.

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

sufficient number of personnel at the district level to support the number of schools targeted in the LEA's application. District staff members' roles must be clearly defined relative to the ways in which they will offer support to targeted schools. There is a plan to assess the ways in which targeted district support is assisting schools to improve, and to use those data accordingly (e.g., to leverage supports and/or apply consequences in response to such analyses; to change the way(s) in which support is provided, if necessary).

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

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

- 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.
- 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, which may include pre-implementation activities.

- The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of each school intervention model in all Tier I and Tier II schools, which may also include pre-implementation activities.
- 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.
- 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).

Part 2

Requirement 1: The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. In order to meet this requirement, an approvable LEA application must make a strong case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model for a particular school and how it will implement all the requirements of that intervention model; each requirement of the chosen model must be included in the LEA's description of how it will implement that model. For instance, if an LEA chooses to implement the **Turnaround model**, it must demonstrate that it has addressed the following aspects of the model: a) a detailed process whereby the principal will be replaced and the new principal will be given sufficient operating flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement; b) a detailed description of the measure used to determine the effectiveness of staff, and a description of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent of existing staff; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will use such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions in order to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school; d) a compelling description of how it will provide staff with on-going, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program; e) a detailed description of how the LEA will implement a new governance structure for the school; f) a clearly delineated description of how the LEA will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards; g) a full description of how the LEA will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction; h) a well-defined plan for how the turnaround school will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and i) provide strong evidence of the LEA's commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

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

If an LEA chooses the **School Closure Model**, it must describe in detail how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

For LEAs that choose the **Transformation Model**, all the following components of the Transformation Model must be addressed in the LEA application including an in-depth consideration of how the LEA will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, which must provide detail about all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation Model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a fully developed description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and is designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and e) the LEA provides an in-depth description of how it will implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation School. Additionally, the LEA must provide detailed evidence of how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. The LEA must also demonstrate how it will increase learning time and create community-oriented schools.

Requirement 2: The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. If an LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the

LEA must present strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality. A fundable application must include the following strong evidence:

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

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

- A workable plan for aligning resources to implement the components of a given intervention model;
- Budget estimates of potential funding over the life of the grant. For example, the application discusses how the LEA will combine existing funding resources, such as Title I, Part A Basic funds, Title I (1003a), Title II, Title III, 21st CCLC (if applicable), Early Childhood Education state funding (if applicable), state general funding, etc., with the SIG funding.

Requirement 4: The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively. In an approvable application, the LEA must provide a specific and detailed discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. This discussion should include consideration of such issues as modifying typical district hiring practices, allowing for additional flexibility in the use of funding, and for implementing an instructional program that is custom tailored for the students who attend the school.

Requirement 5: The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. The LEA must provide a convincing and detailed discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. For instance, the LEA should specify how activities or personnel that will no longer be funded through the grant monies will continue to be implemented through other sources of funds after the grant period is

over. A fundable application must include the following in terms of sustainability:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B-1. – ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Requirement 1: How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year? The NDE will require all LEAs that plan to apply for funds to carry out pre-implementation activities to submit a budget that covers a three-year period with the identified pre-implementation activities listed in a separate column located in the Year 1 column of the budget. In addition, pre-implementation expenses must be directly linked to the requirements of the chosen intervention model in order to enable the school to reach full implementation in the following school year. **NOTE:** Pre-implementation activities must be included in the first year budget total. See Appendix A under Budget Guidance.

Requirement 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?

NOTE: All of the SIG funds an LEA uses in a Tier I or Tier II school must be used to support the LEA’s implementation of one of the four school intervention models, each of which represents a comprehensive approach to addressing the particular needs of the students in a

school as identified through the LEA's needs assessment. Accordingly, in determining whether a particular proposed use of SIG funds is allowable, the SEA will consider whether the proposed use is directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, whether it addresses the needs identified by the LEA, and whether it will advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

New to the 2011 SIG grant is the addition of opportunities to assist an LEA in carrying out SIG-related activities prior to full implementation. Pre-implementation activities are not a requirement in order to obtain an approved grant, rather, carrying out SIG-related activities during a "pre-implementation" period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year. The determining factors listed above will be applied to all pre-implementation activities as well.

Examples of possible pre-implementation activities are listed below. However, this list IS NOT to be considered required or exhaustive; they are just examples: 1) Family and Community Engagement, 2) Rigorous Review of External Providers, 3) Staffing, 4) Instructional Programs, 5) Professional Development and Support, or 6) Preparation for Accountability Measures.

As part of the application process, the NDE will provide the LEA's with a list of allowable activities that may be implemented prior to the start of the 2011-12 school year. Should an LEA decide to carry out any pre-implementation activities, they will be required to submit a detailed description of all activities, along with a timeline with benchmarks included. The NDE will then review the identified activities against the list of allowable activities with the expectation that the activities will support and assist the Tier I and Tier II schools get a jump start on the chosen intervention model and that the model will be up and running 100% at the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.

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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

D (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:

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

DATE	ACTIVITY
February 15, 2011 *	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• NDE opens up LEA SIG application process once USDOE approval is received;• USDOE awards SIG funds to NDE once NDE’s SIG application has been approved.
February - March, 2011	NDE provides technical assistance to eligible LEAs through development and dissemination of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), videoconferencing, conference calls, and on an individual basis as needed.
March 18, 2011 *	LEA SIG applications due to NDE.

<p>March 23 – 26, 2011 *</p> <p>March 31 – April 1, 2011*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDE’s initial “paper” review of LEA SIG applications; • LEA SIG interviews to take place.
<p>April 4 – 8, 2011 *</p>	<p>NDE provides LEAs opportunity to provide further clarification or to discuss potential revisions to its application through its structured interview process, including potential budget adjustments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDE awards funds to LEAs with approved applications. • Awarded grant applications will be posted on the NDE website.
<p>April, 2011 through August, 2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDE provides eNOTE (electronic online monitoring system) training to all LEAs with approved applications. • LEAs with approved pre-implementation activities for the intervention(s) chosen for its Tier I and Tier II schools may begin activities in order to reach full implementation of the intervention(s) at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year; • LEAs with approved LEA-level SIG activities must begin or continue implementation of these activities to enable implementation of the intervention(s) at its Tier I and Tier II schools at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year.
<p>September, 2011</p>	<p>NDE begins its bimonthly onsite monitoring visits to the LEAs and their respective Tier I and/or Tier II schools.</p>

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:

Requirement 2: 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 SIG with respect to one or more schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements.

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

the final requirements, including progress toward meeting the AYP benchmarks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEAs serving Tier I and/or Tier II schools will be monitored by the following processes to

ensure that the selected intervention model is being implemented fully and effectively in each Tier I and/or Tier II school identified within the LEA's application:

- Monthly monitoring of the electronic Nevada Online Tracking and Evaluation (eNOTE) system to oversee the continuous progress the LEA and SIG schools are making toward the implementation of their plan;
- Bi-monthly onsite visits beginning in September 2011 to each Tier I and Tier II school within the LEA identified in its application, as well as to the LEA office(s), which has management oversight for the LEA's SIG-served school(s). Such visits will utilize pre-established interview and observation protocols;
- Submission of required SIG Quarterly Implementation Reports from an external evaluator to the NDE that will document:
 - the LEA's progress on completion of the action steps delineated in its implementation timeline developed for each Tier I and Tier II school identified in its application, and
 - the progress of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school toward meeting its LEA-established goals.

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

Priority will be given to the LEAs with the lowest achieving schools that demonstrate the greatest need and the strongest commitment to improve the academic achievement of students. If there are insufficient SEA SIG funds to award, for up to three years, a grant to each LEA that submits an approvable application, NDE will give first priority to LEAs that apply to serve either Tier I and/or Tier II schools. The NDE will also take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among the eligible LEAs to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the state can be served.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. ASSURANCES

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

F. SEA RESERVATION:

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

Administration:

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

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

Evaluation:

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

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

Technical Assistance:

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

- Develop and implement policy and procedures to provide adequate technical assistance to eligible LEAs that will include but not be limited to:
 - In-person meetings and telephone conferencing with LEAs throughout development of their SIG applications on an as-needed basis;
 - Video conferencing with eligible LEAs as mutual issues arise;
 - On-site monitoring of SIG implementation to identify additional technical assistance needs.
- NDE anticipates that, in order to implement the selected intervention models effectively, LEAs will likely need assistance in one or more of the following areas:
 - Adoption and implementation of high quality standards and assessments;
 - Development and implementation data systems to support instruction;
 - Development of and support for effective teachers and leaders by contracting with a program, such as the one offered at the University of Virginia;
 - Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools.
- To facilitate such assistance, LEAs may, if applicable, contract with an outside expert with expertise in one or more of the following areas:
 - Implementation of the selected intervention model at a school or schools;
 - Evaluation of current policies and practices that support or impede reform;
 - Scaling up evidence-based practices.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: 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.

[A copy of the email that went out to the Committee of Practitioners can be found in Appendix D.](#)

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 NEVADA 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.A1(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]** 20.

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 NEVADA 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 NEVADA 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.

[A copy of the SIG waiver letter can be found in Appendix E.](#)

LISTING OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE
APPENDIX B	COMPANION DOCUMENT FOR NEW DEFINITION
APPENDIX C	LIST OF SCHOOLS
APPENDIX D	EMAIL TO THE COMMITTEE OF PRACTITIONERS
APPENDIX E	COPY OF SIG WAIVER LETTER

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

								NEWL
LEA							GRA	Y
LEA NAME	NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	D RATE	ELIG-IBLE
Nye	3200360	Amargosa Valley E.S.	320036000185	X				
Clark	3200060	Bruner E.S.	320006000417	X				
Clark	3200060	Canyon Springs H.S.	320006000567	X			X	
Clark	3200060	Chaparral H.S.	320006000018	X			X	
Clark	3200060	Del Sol H.S.	320006000571	X			X	
Clark	3200060	Desert Pines H.S.	320006000495	X			X	
Clark	3200060	Elizondo E.S.	320006000470	X				
Clark	3200060	Hancock E.S.	320006000027	X				
Clark	3200060	Mojave H.S.	320006000445	X			X	
Clark	3200060	Mountain View E.S.	320006000079	X				
Clark	3200060	Owen Roundy E.S.	320006000743	X				
Clark	3200060	Paradise E.S.	320006000085	X				
Clark	3200060	Western H.S.	320006000114	X			X	
Clark	3200060	Burk Horizon H.S.	320006000313		X		X	
Clark	3200060	Cheyenne H.S.	320006000405		X			
Churchill	3200030	Churchill Co. J.H.S.	320003000003		X			
Clark	3200060	Cimarron H.S.	320006000406		X			
Lyon	3200300	Fernley Intermediate	320030000311		X			
Washoe	3200480	Washoe H.S.	320048000252		X			
Clark	3200060	100 Academy of Excellence - E.S.	320006000670			X		
Clark	3200060	Bailey M.S.	320006000663			X		
Clark	3200060	Beckley E.S.	320006000116			X		
Washoe	3200480	Bennett E.S.	320048000481			X		
Washoe	3200480	Booth E.S.	320048000230			X		
Clark	3200060	Brinley M.S.	320006000053			X		
Clark	3200060	Brown J.H.S.	320006000301			X		
Clark	3200060	Bunker E.S.	320006000469			X		
Clark	3200060	C. Cox E.S.	320006000337			X		
Clark	3200060	C. Perkins E.S.	320006000733			X		
Clark	3200060	Cambeiro E.S.	320006000441			X		
Washoe	3200480	Cannan E.S.	320048000240			X		
Clark	3200060	Cashman M.S.	320006000056			X		
Nye	3200360	Clarke M.S.	320036000412			X		
Washoe	3200480	Corbett E.S.	320048000242			X		
Clark	3200060	Cortez E.S.	320006000471			X		
Clark	3200060	Cortney M.S.	320006000476			X		
Clark	3200060	Cozine E.S.	320006000549			X		
Clark	3200060	Craig E.S.	320006000069			X		
Clark	3200060	Cunningham E.S.	320006000381			X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

Clark	3200060	Dearing E.S.	320006000066			X		
Clark	3200060	Decker E.S.	320006000022			X		
Clark	3200060	Detwiler E.S.	320006000489			X		
Clark	3200060	Diaz E.S.	320006000747			X		
Clark	3200060	Dickens E.S.	320006000741			X		
Churchill	3200030	E.C. Best E.S.	320003000004			X		
Clark	3200060	Edwards E.S.	320006000031			X		
Washoe	3200480	Elmcrest E.S.	320048000212			X		
Carson	3200390	Empire E.S.	320039000364			X		
Clark	3200060	Ferron E.S.	320006000118			X		
Clark	3200060	Findlay M.S.	320006000570			X		
Clark	3200060	Fitzgerald E.S.	320006000269			X		
Clark	3200060	Fong E.S.	320006000375			x		
Carson	3200390	Fremont E.S.	320039000285			X		
Clark	3200060	Fremont M.S.	320006000059			X		
Clark	3200060	Garside J.H.S.	320006000034			X		
Clark	3200060	Gibson M.S.	320006000094			X		
Clark	3200060	Goldfarb E.S.	320006000439			X		
Clark	3200060	Gragson E.S.	320006000292			X		
Clark	3200060	Guinn M.S.	320006000289			X		
Clark	3200060	Hal Smith E.S.	320006000510			X		
Clark	3200060	Harney M.S.	320006000553			X		
Mineral	3200330	Hawthorne E.S.	320033000479			X		
Clark	3200060	Herr E.S.	320006000397			X		
Clark	3200060	Herron E.S.	320006000033			X		
Clark	3200060	Hickey E.S.	320006000656			X		
Clark	3200060	Hollingsworth E.S.	320006000587			X		
Clark	3200060	Hughes M.S.	320006000592			X		
Clark	3200060	I. Earl E.S.	320006000050			X		
Clark	3200060	100 Academy of Excellence - Secondary	320006000756			X		
Clark	3200060	Iverson E.S.	320006000551			X		
Clark	3200060	J. Bowler E.S.	320006000456			X		
Clark	3200060	J.D. Smith M.S.	320006000051			X		
Clark	3200060	J.T. McWilliams E.S.	320006000055			X		
Clark	3200060	Jeffers E.S.	320006000657			X		
Nye	3200360	Johnson E.S.	320036000351			X		
Clark	3200060	Johnston M.S.	320006000672			X		
Clark	3200060	Jydstrup E.S.	320006000398			X		
Clark	3200060	Keller M.S.	320006000462			X		
Clark	3200060	Kelly E.S.	320006000075			X		
Clark	3200060	Knudson J.H.S.	320006000062			X		
Clark	3200060	Lake E.S.	320006000092			X		
Washoe	3200480	Lincoln Park E.S.	320048000231			X		
Clark	3200060	Long E.S.	320006000113			X		
Clark	3200060	Lunt E.S.	320006000373			X		
Clark	3200060	Mack M.S.	320006000659			X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

Nye	3200360	Manse E.S.	320036000191			X		
Washoe	3200480	Mariposa Academy Charter	320048000560			X		
Carson	3200390	Mark Twain E.S.	320039000160			X		
Clark	3200060	Martin M.S.	320006000096			X		
Clark	3200060	Martinez E.S.	320006000507			X		
Clark	3200060	McCall E.S.	320006000088			X		
Clark	3200060	McCaw E.S.	320006000038			X		
Clark	3200060	Mendoza E.S.	320006000357			X		
Washoe	3200480	Mitchell E.S.	320048000241			X		
Clark	3200060	Monaco M.S.	320006000536			X		
Clark	3200060	Moore E.S.	320006000508			X		
Nye	3200360	Mt. Charleston E.S.	320036000425			X		
Pine	3200510	Norman E.S.	320051000255			X		
Churchill	3200030	Numa E.S.	320003000431			X		
Clark	3200060	O'Callaghan M.S.	320006000404			X		
Clark	3200060	Orr M.S.	320006000117			X		
Elko	3200120	Owyhee J.H.S.	320012000684			X		
Pershing	3200420	Pershing Co. M.S.	320042000167			X		
Clark	3200060	Petersen E.S.	320006000589			X		
Clark	3200060	Pittman E.S.	320006000106			X		
Clark	3200060	Priest E.S.	320006000584			X		
Clark	3200060	Reed E.S.	320006000039			X		
Washoe	3200480	Risley E.S.	320048000201			X		
Clark	3200060	Robison M.S.	320006000025			X		
Clark	3200060	Ronnow E.S.	320006000014			X		
Clark	3200060	Ronzzone E.S.	320006000008			X		
Clark	3200060	Rowe E.S.	320006000067			X		
Clark	3200060	Rundle E.S.	320006000401			X		
Clark	3200060	Sawyer M.S.	320006000274			X		
Clark	3200060	Sedway M.S.	320006000538			X		
Lyon	3200300	Silver Stage M.S.	320030000424			X		
Elko	3200120	Southside E.S.	320012000140			X		
Clark	3200060	Squires E.S.	320006000015			X		
Clark	3200060	Stanford E.S.	320006000338			X		
Washoe	3200480	Sun Valley E.S.	320048000249			X		
Clark	3200060	Sunrise Acres E.S.	320006000102			X		
Clark	3200060	Swainston M.S.	320006000084			X		
Clark	3200060	T. Williams E.S.	320006000104			X		
Clark	3200060	Tartan E.S.	320006000652			X		
Clark	3200060	Tate E.S.	320006000081			X		
Clark	3200060	Taylor E.S.	320006000093			X		
Clark	3200060	Thiriot E.S.	320006000653			X		
Clark	3200060	Thomas E.S.	320006000097			X		
Clark	3200060	Tobler E.S.	320006000303			X		
Washoe	3200480	Traner M.S.	320048000215			X		
Washoe	3200480	Vaughn M.S.	320048000207			X		
Clark	3200060	Vegas Verdes E.S.	320006000109			X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

Clark	3200060	Virgin Valley E.S.	320006000110			X		
Clark	3200060	Von Tobel M.S.	320006000029			X		
Washoe	3200480	Warner E.S.	320048000219			X		
Clark	3200060	Warren E.S.	320006000095			X		
Clark	3200060	Wasden E.S.	320006000289			X		
Clark	3200060	West Prep E.S.	320006000744			X		
Clark	3200060	West Prep Secondary	320006000460			X		
Elko	3200120	West Wendover E.S.	320012000308			X		
Clark	3200060	Whitney E.S.	320006000115			X		
Clark	3200060	Wilhelm E.S.	320006000435			X		
Clark	3200060	Woodbury M.S.	320006000017			X		
Clark	3200060	Woolley E.S.	320006000372			X		
Clark	3200060	Wynn E.S.	320006000377			X		

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
CARSON CITY	3200390	EAGLE VALLEY MS	320039000315		X		
CLARK COUNTY	3200060	KIT CARSON ES	320006000064	X			
CLARK COUNTY	3200060	RANCHO HS	320006000089	X			X
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	DUNCAN ES	320048000218	X			
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	ECHO LODER ES	320048000209	X			
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	SMITHRIDG E ES	320048000245	X			
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	VETERANS ES	320048000251	X			
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	CLAYTON MS	320048000204		X		
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	DILWORTH MS	320048000216		X		
WASHOE COUNTY	3200480	O'BRIEN MS	320048000235		X		

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

TITLE I – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT Section 1003 (g)

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

ISSUED BY:

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

Grant Period: February 15, 2010 – September 30, 2012, if applicable, September 30, 2014
Applications Due: Tentatively scheduled due date, March 18, 2011; 5:00 PM; (dependent upon approval of the NDE's application by the USDOE)
Grant Amounts: \$50,000 minimum - \$2,000,000 maximum is available per funded school
Source of Funding: U.S. Department of Education

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

Questions related to this funding should be addressed to:

Sue Moulden-Horton, Education Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113
Carson City, NV 89701
775-687-9137 (phone) or 775-687-9123 (fax)
smoulden@doe.nv.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I	Application Guidance	
	A. Introduction	4
	B. Application Requirements and Guidelines	8
Part II	Application	
	A. Certification Page	13
	B. List of Schools To Be Served	14
	C. Descriptive Information	15
	D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Summary	18
	E. Assurances	19
	F. Waivers	20
Part III	Appendices	
	A. Budget Guidance	22
	B. Budget Summary Form	24
	C. Pre-Implementation Table	25
	D. Supplemental Schedule Form	26
Part IV	Application Review Rubric	
	A. Application Review Rubric	28
	B. Rubric	29

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Application

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

Part I

A. Introduction

B. Application Requirements & Guidelines

A. INTRODUCTION:

The school improvement grants (SIG) program authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provides funding through State Educational Agencies (SEAs) to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) with the lowest achieving schools that have the greatest need for the funds and demonstrate the strongest commitment to use the funds to raise significantly the achievement of their students. To implement the SIG program, the U.S. Department of Education published final requirements in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

The October 28 SIG Final Requirements reflect Secretary Duncan’s determination to ensure that SIG funds are used to implement one of four rigorous school intervention models – Turnaround Model, Restart Model, School Closure, and Transformation Model – in each States persistently lowest-achieving schools. To direct school improvement funds to LEAs with these schools, the SIG Final Requirements require each SEA to identify three tiers of schools:

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

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

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

***The following chart summarizes how an SEA identifies an eligible school as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school. The left column represents the schools an SEA must identify in each of Tiers

I, II, and III; the right column represents the newly eligible schools based on the Appropriations Act that an SEA **MAY**, but is not required to identify in Tiers I, II, and III.

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

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

Turnaround Model

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

- (1) Replace the principal and grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- (2) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
 - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
 - (B) Select new staff;
- (3) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
- (4) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- (5) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- (6) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
- (7) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- (8) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (9) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

Restart Model

A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

School Closure

School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

Transformation Model

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- A. Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness:
 - (1) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
 - (2) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that —
 - (a) Take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and
 - (b) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
 - (3) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
 - (4) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
 - (5) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.
- B. Comprehensive instructional reform strategies:
 - (1) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
 - (2) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.
- C. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented engagement:

(1) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time; and

(2) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

D. Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(1) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and

(2) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

B. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES:

1. Eligible Applicants

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

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

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

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

2. Grant Awards

The initial funding period will be from ***April 8, 2011 through June 30, 2011***. Section 1003(g) awards to an LEA will be renewable for up to three additional one-year periods if schools in the LEA are meeting their identified goals and objectives as stated in their LEA application and which are documented through the NDE evaluation process. Section 1003(g) awards will not be less than \$50,000 for each school per school year and may not exceed the total amount of \$2 million for each school per school year.

3. Proposed Timeline

February 15, 2011	Application available to all eligible applicants
March 18, 2011	Applications due at the Nevada Department of Education on or before this date.
March 23-April 1, 2011	Applications Reviewed and Interview Process conducted.
April 8, 2011	Applicants notified of competition results.
April 8, 2011	First year grant period begins for LEAs with pre-implementation activities.
July 1, 2011	First year grant period begins for LEAs without pre-implementation activities.

4. Application Preparation/Submission:

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

Section A. Certification Page

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

Section B. List of Schools To Be Served

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

Section C. Descriptive Information

Directions for completing the Descriptive Information are found in Section C of the application. Each LEA that receives School Improvement Funds must implement one of the four intervention models described on page 15 of this application. As part of the Descriptive Information, each LEA must address the ten requirements that are listed in Section C.

Section D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedules

Complete the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule found in Appendix B for the amount listed on the Certification page (Section A). An LEA must include a budget for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. Should a district choose to fund activities to take place during the pre-implementation period, those costs must be budgeted out of the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan. Each LEA that applies for SIG funds will be required to submit a three-year budget for each school it commits to serve separated by fiscal years.

Signatures on the Budget Summary page must be in **blue** ink. The total of the Budget Summary should equal the total of the Supplemental Schedule. There **MUST** be a detailed narrative supplied for items and amounts requested in the Supplemental Schedule; each budgeted item

must be directly linked to the selected School Improvement Intervention Model Descriptive Information.

Section E. Assurances

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

Section F. Waivers

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

Please submit the original signed application and 3 copies of the LEA application to the NDE on or before March 18, 2011.

Application Questions: All questions must be directed to Sue Moulden-Horton at:

Sue Moulden-Horton, Education Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113
Carson City, NV 89701
775-687-9137 (phone) or 775-687-9123 (fax)
smoulden@doe.nv.gov

5. Process for Review of LEA Applications

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

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

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

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Application

Part II

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

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

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

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

SECTION A: CERTIFICATION

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

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Superintendent of Schools or Designated Representative

PART I - APPLICANT

Applicant (Legal Name of Agency)	
Mailing Address (Street, P.O. Box, City/Zip)	Application for FY2011
	Starting Date April 8, 2011 if Pre-Implementation Activities; July 1, 2011
Name, title and phone number of authorized contact person:	Ending Date June 30, 2012
Amount of application:	

PART II - STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION USE

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

SECTION B

LIST OF SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

School Improvement Section 1003(g)

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

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

SCHOOL NAME	NCE SID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaroun d	restar t	closur e	transformatio n

Note: An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, including both schools that are being served with FY 2009 SIG funds and schools that are eligible to receive FY 2010 SIG funds, may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

Example: For FY 2009, an LEA has seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools for a total of nine Tier I and Tier II schools. Using FY 2009 SIG funds, it implemented the transformation model in four of those schools. For FY 2010, the LEA has two additional Tier I schools and two additional Tier II schools for a total of 13 Tier I and Tier II schools. This means the LEA may implement the transformation model in a total of six schools, or two additional schools to those that are being served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

SECTION C

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

NOTE: All of the SIG funds an LEA uses in a Tier I or Tier II school must be used to support the LEA's implementation of one of the four school intervention models, each of which represents a comprehensive approach to addressing the particular needs of the students in a school as identified through the LEA's needs assessment. Accordingly, in determining whether a particular proposed use of SIG funds is allowable, the SEA will consider whether the proposed use is directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, whether it addresses the needs identified by the LEA, and whether it will advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

New to the 2011 SIG grant is the addition of opportunities to assist an LEA in carrying out SIG-related activities prior to full implementation. Pre-implementation activities are not a requirement in order to obtain an approved grant, rather, carrying out SIG-related activities during a "pre-implementation" period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year. The determining factors listed above will be applied to all pre-implementation activities as well.

Examples of possible pre-implementation activities are listed below. However, this list IS NOT to be considered required or exhaustive; they are just examples: 1) Family and Community Engagement, 2) Rigorous Review of External Providers, 3) Staffing, 4) Instructional Programs, 5) Professional Development and Support, or 6) Preparation for Accountability Measures.

Descriptive Information: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant. This information will be evaluated using the rubric, which begins on page 29. Please consult this rubric throughout this process in order to shape your application.

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

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

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

Insert narrative here:

SECTION D

BUDGET SUMMARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE

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

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

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

NEW AND IMPORTANT: Should an LEA choose to support pre-implementation activities, the LEA application requires the LEA to provide a budget that lists any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period to be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

NOTE: There is no specific limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during pre-implementation. However, funds for activities that are designed to prepare for full implementation in the 2011-2012 school-year SIG grant, which may be no more than \$2 million per school being served with SIG funds. Therefore, the LEA needs to be thoughtful and deliberate when developing its budget and should consider, at a minimum, the following:

1. SIG funds awarded for the first year must cover full and effective implementation through the duration of the 2011-2012 school year, in addition to preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period; and
2. All activities funded with SIG funds must be reasonable and necessary, directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, address the needs identified by the LEA, and advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

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

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

1. April 8, 2011 to June 30, 2011 (**Pre-implementation activities - Part of first year budget**)
2. July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012
3. July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013
4. July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014

SECTION E

**STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE
CERTIFICATION - FY2010**

Name Of District Or Agency:

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

The LEA must assure that it will –

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

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

Signature of Authorized Person

Date

SECTION F

WAIVERS

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

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

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

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

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Application

Part III

Appendices

- A. Budget Guidance*
- B. Budget Summary*
- C. Pre-Implementation Table*
- D. Supplemental Schedule*

GRANTS AND FUNDING GUIDANCE

A strong budget narrative can help sell your proposal as well as prevent any misunderstanding, plus help reviewers determine if the amount you are requesting is reasonable and accurate. Therefore the NDE is requiring that the following information be used in the FY 2010 budget section.

- Budget narratives should explain every line item that appears on the budget form that contains a dollar figure. Salary and benefit line items, for example, should explain the annual salary for the position(s) of the people working on the project, their required experience or education, the percentage of their time they will spend on the project, and the percentage of fringe benefits that corresponds to the salary amount requested.
- In addition, each item included in the Budget narrative **must** be linked within the narrative to the chosen model(s).
- To illustrate, here is a [sample](#) personnel segment that the NDE would like to see portrayed in the budget:

Project Director (1.0 FTE) \$50,000

The project director will have oversight of the chosen intervention model(s). Duties include, but are not limited to, supervision, recruitment, and training of the implementation specialists, onsite monitoring of the plan, including monthly benchmark analysis and NDE site visits. At a minimum, this position requires a master's degree with an emphasis in social work or other related field.

Implementation Specialists (2 @ 1.0 FTE) (2 x \$35,000) = \$70,000

Two implementation specialists will be responsible for day-to-day school/community outreach activities as they are related to the intervention model. Implementation specialists will be responsible for coordinating and/or providing all professional development based on identified school needs as related to the chosen model. At a minimum, staff will hold a bachelor's degree (or equivalent) in the social services field.

Staff Assistant (1.0 FTE) \$25,000

The staff assistant will perform all clerical duties for the project staff. This position requires a high school diploma or equivalent.

Here are sample fringe benefits examples for the same proposal:

Happy Days School District will pay 100% medical, dental, vision, life, and disability for fulltime employees and is calculated at .25% of annual salary. The calculations are as follows:

Program Director (\$50,000 x .25) = \$12,5000

(2) Implementation Specialists (\$70,000 x .25) = \$17,500

Staff Assistant (\$25,000 x .25) = \$6,250

If you are purchasing equipment, it is helpful to indicate where the cost for the equipment originated. This might be a website, for example, or from a vendor quote. Again, let the reviewers know that these numbers are actual numbers provided by a reputable source.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State or Federal Budget Expenditure Summary

Agency: _____ Project Number: _____

Project Name: _____ Fiscal Year: _____

Check One: **Budget** **Budget Amendment** **Final Report**

OBJECT	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTION COST	SUPPORT SERVICES	TOTAL
100	Salaries			
200	Benefits			
300	Purchased Professional/Technical Services			
400	Purchased Property Services			
500	510 Student Transportation Services			
	580 Staff Travel			
	Other (520, 530, 540, 550, 560, 570, 590)			
	Total 500			
600	610 General Supplies (exclude 612)			
	* 612 Non-Technology Items of Higher Value			
	620 Energy			
	630 Food			
	640 Books and Periodicals (exclude 641)			
	641 Textbooks			
	650 Supplies - Information Technology Related (exclude 651, 652, 653)			
	651 Software			
	* 652 Technology Items of Higher Value			
	653 Web-based and Similar Programs			
	Total 600			
800	810 Dues and Fees			
	890 Other Miscellaneous			
	Other (820, 830)			
	Total 800			
Subtotal 100 – 600 & 800				
** Approved Indirect Cost Rate: _____ %				
700	730 Equipment			
	Other (710, 720, 740, 790)			
	Total 700			
TOTAL				

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

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

Signature of Authorized Agency Representative

Date

Department of Education Use Only	
Initial	Date Approved

Pre-Implementation Budget Table

If an LEA is considering implementing pre-implementation activities, the LEA must complete the following table in addition to the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule.

Sample

LEA XXX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 – Full Implementation			
Tier I XXX ES	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$1,000,000	\$900,000	\$3,100,000
LEA level activities, if applicable	\$200,000	\$400,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,100,000
Sub-Total	\$600,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,150,000	\$4,200,000
Total Budget	\$1,800,000		\$1,250,000	\$1,150,000	\$4,200,000

Table for Use

LEA BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 – Full Implementation			
School Name					
LEA level activities, if applicable					
Sub-Total					
Total Budget					

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

Project Number:

Page Number:

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

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

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

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION**

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

Application

Part IV

Application Review Rubric

PART IV

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

Applicant (Legal Name of Agency):		Total Amount Requested:	
Section Title		Pts. Available	Pts. Awarded
Section A. Certification Page		0	
Section B. List of Schools to be Served		25	
Section C. Descriptive Information		300	
Section D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule		175	
Section E. Assurance Certification		0	
Section F. Waivers		0	
TOTAL POINTS		500	
Section G. Pre-Implementation Activities – NOT REQUIRED		50	

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:

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

Comments-

Panel Member Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

SECTION A: CERTIFICATION PAGE

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

SECTION B: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Maximum Points for Section: 25 points

Recommended Points _____

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

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

SECTION C: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Maximum Points for this Section: 300 points

Recommended Points: _____

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

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 17-25 Points
<p>The LEA has not used one of Nevada’s established tools for conducting a needs assessment; rather, the needs assessment seems haphazard and disorganized.</p> <p>The needs assessment does not establish a clear, databased link between the data itself and the schools needs. There is a disconnect between the problems and the proposed solutions.</p>	<p>The LEA has attempted to use an established tool for conducting its needs assessment, but the results of that attempt may be somewhat incomplete or limited.</p> <p>The needs assessment provides some evidence of the school’s needs, but it is unclear if the proposed solutions track closely to the data.</p>	<p>The LEA has employed an established tool for conducting its needs assessment (such as the SAGE Data Analysis Guide, the NCCAT-S, or the needs assessment tool contained in the state approved restructuring plan template).</p> <p>The needs assessment provides detailed, databased evidence that clearly shows the schools prioritized needs.</p>
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Level I 1-16 Points	Level II 17-33 Points	Level III 34-50 Points
<p>The LEA makes a very weak case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model. The evidence underlying the choice is non-existent or very limited.</p>	<p>The LEA makes a case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model, but the evidence might not be as convincing as it could be.</p>	<p>The LEA makes a strong case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model for a certain school and how it will implement <u>all</u> of the requirements of that intervention model; each requirement of the chosen model must be included in the LEAs description of how it will implement that model.</p>
TURNAROUND MODEL		
<p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items may not be addressed at all or in only the most limited of ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LEA provides little or no description of the process whereby the principal will be replaced, and the description of how the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility is also missing or extremely weak; 2. The LEA provides little or no description of the measure it will use to determine the effectiveness of staff and of how will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; 3. The LEA offers little or no description 	<p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items are addressed, but perhaps not to the extent that the reviewer might hope for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LEA describes a process whereby the principal will be replaced, but this description may lack focus. Additionally, the description of how the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility may lack detail as well; 2. The LEA provides some description of the measure it will use to determine the effectiveness of staff and of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; 3. The LEA offers some limited 	<p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items are addressed in detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LEA describes a detailed process whereby the principal will be replaced and the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement; 2. The LEA describes fully the measure used to determine the effectiveness of staff, and provides a detailed description of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; 3. The LEA describes completely such

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

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

<p>in the most sketchy or tangential way:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides little or no description of how the students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. The application does not demonstrate evidence that the schools where these students will be sent are within a reasonable proximity to the closed school nor does the application demonstrate how charter schools or new schools for which there is no achievement data will be considered as possible sites for student transfer.</p>	<p>1. The LEA describes how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available. However, the description of the process for closing the school and dispersing the students to other schools leaves the reader with some questions about the process.</p>	<p>1. The LEA describes in detail how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.</p>
---	--	---

TRANSFORMATION MODEL

<p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, the following items may addressed in only the most limited way or not at all:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides little or no consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness. Descriptions of the following activities may be extremely limited or not found in the application: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replace; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers</p>	<p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, the following items are addressed, but perhaps not to the extent that the reviewer might hope for:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides a limited consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, including all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a</p>	<p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, all of the following requirements must be addressed in detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides an in-depth consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, including all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a</p>
---	---	---

<p>that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factor sand that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and e) the LEA provides a description of how it will implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skill necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation school.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides little or no</p>	<p>significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and e) the LEA provides a description of how it will implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skill necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation school. While descriptions of all these elements must be present for the application to be scored as Level II in this area, the descriptions may lack depth and detail.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides a limited</p>	<p>significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a fully developed description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and e) the LEA provides an in-depth description of how it will implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides a detailed</p>
---	---	---

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

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

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

- Developing teacher and school leader effectiveness: An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers’ and school leaders’ effectiveness, such as--
 - A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
 - B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
 - C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.

- Comprehensive instructional reform strategies: An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--
 - A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
 - B) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
 - C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;

D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
E) In secondary schools--

(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;

(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;

(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessment, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or

(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

- Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools: An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--
 - (A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith-and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;
 - (B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
 - (C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
 - (D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

- Providing operational flexibility and sustained support: An LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--
 - (A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
 - (B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<p>Comments:</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
<p>The LEA fails to provide a description of how determined goals for student achievement in both ELA and Math will monitor Tier III schools that it is applying to serve.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a limited description of how selected annual goals for student achievement in both ELA and Math on State assessments will be used to monitor Tier III schools that it is applying to serve.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a clear description of how predetermined annual goals for student achievement on State assessments in both ELA and Math will be used to monitor Tier III schools that it is applying to serve. Such goals might be the same goals as the LEA established for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or could be goals that align with the State’s established AYP benchmarks, such as making AYP or making AYP through Safe Harbor.</p>
Comments:		

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

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
The LEA fails to provide a description of how it consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools.	The LEA provides a vague or limited description of how it consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its identified Tier I and Tier II schools.	The LEA provides a detailed description of the process it used to consult with relevant stakeholders (i.e., staff, parents, community, etc.) regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its identified Tier I and Tier II schools.
Comments:		

SECTION D: BUDGET

Maximum Points for Section: 175 Points

Recommended Points: _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION E: ASSURANCES

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will ---

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

SECTION F: WAIVERS

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

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

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

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

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

SECTION G: PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

Maximum Points for Section: 50 Points

Requirement 1: If applicable, the LEA must identify the services and/or activities that the LEA commits to implement during the pre-implementation period in order for Tier I and Tier II schools to be prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

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

Requirement 2: An LEA must include a budget, and narrative, for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use for pre-implementation activities in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
<p>The LEA provides an extremely limited budget narrative or none at all. The narrative provides the reader with no clearly delineated description of how the funds will be used to provide pre-implementation activities or services to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; does not demonstrate how the LEA will conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEAs Tier I and Tier II schools; and fails to show how the LEA will support school improvement activities for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a budget narrative that provides some description of how the funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation models in the LEAs Tier I and Tier II schools; and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a detailed budget narrative that describes how the requested funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEAs Tier I and Tier II schools; and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.</p>
Comments:		

Subject: FW: Please Share with COP
Date: Wednesday, December 1, 2010 10:41 AM
From: Fawn Lewis <flewis@doe.nv.gov>
To: Susan Moulden <smoulden@doe.nv.gov>
Priority: Highest

----- Forwarded Message

From: Fawn Lewis <flewis@doe.nv.gov>
Date: Wed, 01 Dec 2010 10:38:08 -0800
To: Amber Carr <ACarr@washoe.k12.nv.us>, <Jmoddrell@lander.k12.nv.us>, "Frazier, Brian" <BFRAZIER@dcsd.k12.nv.us>, <cppeters@nsn.k12.nv.us>, <bmclaury@sbcglobal.net>, <bmblack@cox.net>, <rswanberg@washoe.k12.nv.us>
Conversation: Please Share with COP
Subject: FW: Please Share with COP

----- Forwarded Message

From: Susan Moulden <smoulden@doe.nv.gov>
Date: Wed, 1 Dec 2010 10:34:10 -0800
To: Fawn Lewis <flewis@doe.nv.gov>
Cc: Marcia Calloway <mcalloway@doe.nv.gov>
Subject: Please Share with COP

December 1, 2010

Dear Committee of Practitioners,

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) is applying to the U.S. Department of Education for a second year of Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding. You may remember that NDE applied for and received SIG funding last year under ARRA that, combined with the regular Title I 1003(g), amounted to a total of \$22,268,433. NDE awarded \$16,133,583 to districts that had identified "persistently lowest achieving" schools through the LEA application process during the summer of 2010 for implementation during the FY10-11 school year.

For FY10-11, Nevada is eligible to apply for \$3,358,520 in SIG funding; combined with the \$6,134,850 remaining required carry-over from last year's award, which will allow the NDE approximately \$9,493,370 to award to this year's "persistently lowest achieving" schools. The NDE is therefore asking you, as members of Nevada's Title I Committee of Practitioners, to review the attached SIG application prior to our submittal this coming Friday, December 1, 2010. We apologize for the quick turnaround time on this, but the NDE only received

notification of this opportunity to apply on November 1st, 2010 and have been working hard to write a successful application.

Please review and respond BY 5:00PM THURSDAY (12/2) or with any questions pertaining to the application to either:

Sue Moulden-Horton (775) 687-9137 OR Marcia Calloway (775) 687-9161.

Thank you for your time and attention to our request.

Sue Moulden-Horton, Ed.D.
Title I Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
smoulden@doe.nv.gov

----- End of Forwarded Message

----- End of Forwarded Message