

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Dr. Steven L. Paine, State Superintendent West Virginia Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: West Virginia Department of Education 1900 Kanawha Boulevard East Building 6, Room 358 Charleston, WV 25305</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Jan Stanley</p> <p>Position and Office: State Title I Director - Office of Title I</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Jan Stanley, State Title I Director West Virginia Department of Education Building 6, Room 330 1900 Kanawha Boulevard East Charleston, WV 25305</p> <p>Telephone: 304.558.7805</p> <p>Fax: 304.558.0459</p> <p>Email address: jstanley@access.k12.wv.us</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Steven L. Paine</p>	<p>Telephone: <i>(304) 558 - 2681</i></p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X <i>Steven L. Paine</i></p>	<p>Date: <i>11/29/10</i></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: West Virginia



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



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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

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

FY 2010 Application Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Dr. Steven L. Paine, State Superintendent West Virginia Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: West Virginia Department of Education 1900 Kanawha Boulevard East Building 6, Room 358 Charleston, WV 25305
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Jan Stanley Position and Office: State Title I Director - Office of Title I Contact's Mailing Address: Jan Stanley, State Title I Director West Virginia Department of Education Building 6, Room 330 1900 Kanawha Boulevard East Charleston, WV 25305 Telephone: 304.558.7805 Fax: 304.558.0459 Email address: jstanley@access.k12.wv.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Steven L. Paine	Telephone:
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

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

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

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

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

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
<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"/> <i>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.)</i></p> <p><input checked="" 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 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:

According to West Virginia’s Accountability Workbook, “For the purpose of determining AYP, WV public schools are defined as those elementary and secondary schools established and maintained at public expense through the total basic foundation program/state aid formula outlined in W.Va. Code §18-9A-3 and W.Va. Code §18-9A-12. For the purposes of AYP determination, an elementary school is one that has a grade configuration that may include **grades K-4, but does not contain grade 8 or higher**. A middle school is a school that does not

meet the definition of an elementary school and **contains grade 8**, but does not contain grade 12. A high school is any school that **contains grade 12**". West Virginia defines secondary schools as middle and high schools according to the definitions above.

For the purposes of identifying the lowest achieving schools, the West Virginia Department of Education used the all students group including those students who take the state's assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA—i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 11. The all students group includes limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities, including students with disabilities who take an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. All public schools in the state of WV were included. There are no charter schools in WV. West Virginia defined lack of progress as two consecutive years of not making adequate yearly progress in the all student subgroup, for school years 08-09 and 09-10. West Virginia identified the persistently lowest achieving schools by combining the percent proficient scores in the all student subgroup for reading/language arts and mathematics and ranking the schools from lowest to highest. Both the academic achievement and the lack of progress were given equal weight when identifying the schools for each tier.

In determining "persistently lowest-achieving schools" for Tier I, WV identified the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, since this number was greater than 5% of the number of schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. WV has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in WV were added to Tier I. WVDE considered the addition of Tier I schools based on the changes brought by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. West Virginia declines the option to add any Tier I schools at this time. This decision is based on reviewing the lowest ten percent of the elementary schools in the state.

In determining "persistently lowest-achieving schools" for Tier II, West Virginia identified the secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds, that are among the lowest-achieving 10% of secondary schools. The original list of schools based on the lowest-achieving 5% of secondary schools was modified based on the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. All schools identified for Tier II have a percentage of poverty above the respective district poverty rate and also above 40% poverty. WV utilized the guidelines from the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* to identify "persistently lowest-achieving schools" for Tier II. None of the schools added to the newly eligible list were any higher achieving than the highest achieving Tier II schools identified by the SEA under the December 10, 2009 SIG final requirements.

The schools on the Tier III list include the remaining Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as per the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under*

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The option to add schools to Tier III was not applied due to a desire to adequately fund programs of sufficient size and scope in Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

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

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

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

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Part 1

West Virginia will require each LEA to address the three requirements listed in Part 1 of this SEA application prior to submitting an LEA application for a 1003(g) school improvement grant. The information will be submitted by the LEA as part of the requirements in a letter of intent to apply for a school improvement grant. Refer to sample letter to the districts in Appendix A. The SEA will evaluate the information provided by the LEA for requirements 1-3 listed below utilizing the evaluation tool found in Appendix B.

Requirement 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.

As part of the requirements for the WV five year strategic plans, each district and school in the State must annually complete and/or update a comprehensive needs assessment. The sections of the needs assessment require each district and every school to review and analyze data in the following categories:

- Overview of school AYP data
- External trend data
- Student achievement data
- Other student outcome data
- Analysis of culture, conditions and practices

Accordingly, to align the grant application with the current requirements for the needs assessment in the district and school strategic plans, each LEA submitting an application for 1003(g) school improvement funds must analyze the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application using the indicators below.

Overview of school AYP data

- AYP status
 - Identification of the AYP targets the school met and missed
 - Student participation rate on State assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade and subgroup
 - School improvement status and applicable sanctions
 - Number of **required** instructional days/minutes within the school year
 - Number of instructional days/minutes **fulfilled annually (excluding days of instruction lost for inclement weather or other emergencies)**
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining AYP data.

External trend data-Summarize the conclusions reached after examining external trend data.

- Local demographic trends are reviewed for the impact on student achievement.

- District and school poverty rates
- Mother’s educational level
- Number of college graduates in the district
- Median age of district population
- Substance abuse
- Unemployment rate
- Mobility rate of students
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining external trend data

Student achievement data

- Data analysis includes review of student achievement trends over time from several data sources, not just WESTEST 2 scores.
 - Percentage of students at or above each performance level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade and subgroup
 - Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade, for the “all students” group, for each performance level and for each subgroup
 - Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
 - Comparative gap analysis for all subgroups
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining student achievement data

Other student outcome data

- Analysis includes review of other important student outcome data:
 - Attendance
 - Promotion/retention rates
 - Dropout rates (if applicable)
 - Discipline
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining other student outcome data.

Analysis of culture, conditions and practices

- Analysis includes a review of the following data:
 - Cultural Typology or Cultural Survey results conducted by the State System of Support (SSOS)
 - Current governance structure – presence of engaged principals, teacher input into decision-making, the organization of teachers by teams
 - Instructional Practices Inventory conducted by the SSOS
 - Use of standards-based instructional practices

- Availability of current technology and degree to which technology is integrated into instruction
- Federal monitoring reports for NCLB, IDEA and state reports for the Office of Education Performance Audits
- Questionnaires or observations completed by staff or external evaluators
- Description of the overall culture, conditions and practices that exist in the school
- Results of classroom walkthroughs
- Highly qualified teacher data
- Number of administrators in the building, definition of roles, years experience, specialized training and advanced degrees
- Use of professional and paraprofessional staff to support students
- Number of content and program specialists (e.g., counselors, health staff and social workers)
- Professional development (e.g., opportunities available to teachers and principals, number of days dedicated to professional development and the amount of teacher generated professional development, percentage of teachers regularly attending professional development)
- Teacher average monthly attendance rates
- Parent training and support for families
- Degree of meaningful parent involvement and amount/frequency of communication with parents
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining culture, conditions and practices data.

Root Causes

After the data has been examined and analyzed each school is required to determine the root causes from the results of the needs assessment. The root causes are identified for the following areas:

- Administrator(s) and teachers (i.e., teacher qualifications, number of years experience)
- Curriculum and resources (i.e., use of Teach 21 and balanced assessment system)
- Master schedule, classroom schedules and classroom management/discipline
- Students and parental involvement

Determining root causes means moving from problem finding to problem solving.

Examine Possible Reasons for Not Meeting Objectives			
Ask “WHY?” Five Times			
Curriculum and Resources	Schedule and Classroom	Administrator(s) and Teachers	Students and Parental Involvement

Selection of an Intervention Model

Based on the needs assessment and determination of root causes, identify an intervention model for each Tier I and Tier II school the district elects to serve. The justification for the selection of a specific model must be described in a narrative.

Below are questions the LEA should consider in the selection of an intervention model.

Turnaround Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and the process for selecting replacements?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
8. What is the LEA’s own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What

- organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
 10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

Restart Model

1. Are there qualified charter management organizations (CMOs) or education management organizations (EMOs) willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
2. Will qualified community groups initiate a home grown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—home grown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure and restart of the school?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

Transformation Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?

5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students attending the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

Requirement 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.

According to WV Code §18-2E-5, capacity is defined as a course of action for improving education by which resources are targeted strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. Development of electronic school and school system strategic improvement plans, pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, is intended, in part, to provide mechanisms to target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process to improve student, school and school system performance. The code further states, "When deficiencies are detected through the assessment and accountability processes, the revision and approval of school and school system

electronic strategic improvement plans shall ensure that schools and school systems are efficiently using existing resources to correct the deficiencies. When the state board determines that schools and school systems do not have the capacity to correct deficiencies, the state board shall work with the county board to develop or secure the resources necessary to increase the capacity of schools and school systems to meet the standards and, when necessary, seek additional resources in consultation with the Legislature and the Governor.”

Specifically, the WVDE Office of Title I will determine LEA capacity through an evaluation of the district’s ability to plan, implement and target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process. Each LEA must complete a self analysis of the capacity it has to assist the low performing schools in the implementation of the selected intervention. This will be determined utilizing a scale of 1-3 ranking from poor (1), satisfactory (2) and commendable (3) for the following criteria:

District Capacity Index

Criteria	Poor 1 point	Satisfactory 2 points	Commendable 3 points	Points Earned
LEA governance	State takeover district	Limited SEA intervention	No SEA intervention	
Title I audit reports	Findings in areas requiring a repayment of funds	Findings in areas noted-repayment of funds not required	No findings in the fiscal area	
LEA overall achievement ranking	Bottom (5% = 3 districts)	Middle (70% = 38 districts)	Top (25% = 14 districts)	
Approval of the district strategic plan by the SEA (entire plan, not just the Title I section)	Not approved by the SEA	Approved by the SEA with revisions	Approved by the SEA without revisions	
Percentage of Title I schools that met AYP in the last testing cycle	0-50% of the Title I schools met AYP.	51-75% of the Title I schools met AYP.	76-100% of the Title I schools met AYP.	
Development of schools as professional learning communities	The school has not yet begun to address the practice of a PLC or an effort has been made to address the practice of PLCs, but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.	A critical mass of staff has begun to engage in PLC practice. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.	The practice of PLCs is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.	
Identification of district leadership team and assignment of	No district leadership team nor identified person assigned for	Lacks specific identification of personnel for the	A specific district leadership team is identified and one or	

responsibilities	monitoring implementation	district leadership team and for monitoring implementation.	more persons are assigned for monitoring implementation.	
School Leadership Team	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders (e.g., parents; representatives of institutions of higher education; representatives of RESA or representatives of outside consultant groups). Evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been exceeded.	
			Total Points	

Districts must obtain a score of 20 out of 24 possible points to demonstrate capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention/activities in each identified school.

Requirement 3: Each LEA intending to apply for the competitive 1003(g) school improvement funds will submit a preliminary budget to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school in the application. Further, for each Tier III school, an estimate of the funds needed to conduct school improvement activities shall be included in the preliminary budget. The preliminary budget shall cover the period of availability of these funds, as the SEA has applied for a waiver to extend the period of availability of funds.

An LEA serving Tier I and Tier II schools receives priority for full funding in the SEA competitive award process. Districts serving only Tier III schools may receive less than the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating Title I school, based on SEA allocation and the number of districts which submit an application. Each Tier III school funded in this competitive process will receive at least \$50,000 per year as required in NCLB Section 1003(g). Note that the proposed allocation for each school served depends on the interventions to be carried out and level of benefits provided, and not on the funding generated by the school under the statute.

The budget should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years.
3. The budget must be planned as a minimum of \$50,000 per year per school. The maximum amount cannot exceed \$2 million multiplied by the number of schools served or no more than \$6 million over three years.
4. The SIG portion of school closure costs may be lower than the amount required for the other models and will **be granted for only one year**.
5. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.
6. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
7. As soon as it receives the funds, an LEA may use part of its first year allocation (2011-2012) during the (2010-2011 school year) for SIG-related "pre-implementation" activities. Pre-implementation activities must (1) support the full and effective implementation of the intervention model selected by the LEA, (2) address the needs identified by the LEA, (3) be reasonable and necessary for implementation, and (4) help improve student achievement.

Under 1114(a)(2)(B), if an LEA has a school operating schoolwide program, the LEA may use "funds available to carry out this section" only to supplement the amount of non-Federal funds that the school would otherwise have received if it were not operating schoolwide program, including those funds necessary to provide services required by law for students with disabilities and LEP students. "[F]unds available to carry out this section" include Title I, Part A funds, other Federal education funds, and SIG funds. Thus, an LEA must provide a Title I school operating a schoolwide program all of the non-Federal funds the school would have received were it not a schoolwide school, and SIG funds, like Title I, Part A and other Federal education funds, must supplement those non-Federal funds.

Under section II.A.6 of the final requirements, an LEA that receives SIG funds to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds must ensure that each school receives all of the State and local funds it would have

received in the absence of the SIG funds. In other words, this requirement operates the same as the supplement not supplant requirement in section 111(a)(2)(B) of the ESEA.

Possible activities that an LEA may carry out during the spring or summer prior to full implementation may include the topics listed below. This list should not be considered as exhaustive or required.

Family and Community Engagement: Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotline, and direct mail.

Instructional Programs: Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising student achievement (e.g., summer school for incoming freshmen, summer school programs designed to prepare low achieving students to participate successfully in advanced coursework, such as Honors, AP or IB); identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

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

Preparation for Accountability Measures: Analyze data on leading baseline indicators or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

Preliminary Budget Form

District Name:

School Name by Tier	Intervention Models: Select the model that will be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.			
	Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Tier I School:				
Tier II Schools:				
Tier III Schools:	Not applicable to Tier III schools.			

Complete a separate table for each Tier I or Tier II school. Estimate the amount of funds required to implement the intervention model selected for each school.

School Name:	Tier:				
Turnaround Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Replace the principal					
Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment					
Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent of existing staff					
Select new staff					
Implement strategies to recruit, place and retrain staff					
Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development					
Adopt a new governance structure					
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					
Promote continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction					
Establish schedules and implement strategies to increase learning time					
Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented supports for students					
Additional options (specify activities)					

Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model or a new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy)					
Total:					
Restart Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Convert or close school and reopen under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.					
Enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.					
Total:					
School Closure Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Close the school			n/a	n/a	
Enroll the students in other higher-performing schools in LEA			n/a	n/a	
Total:			n/a	n/a	
Transformation Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
A. Develop teacher and school leader effectiveness					
Replace the principal					
Use rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems that take into account data on student growth					
Identify and reward school leaders, teachers and other staff who have increased student achievement and the graduation rate					
Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development					
Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
B. Comprehensive instructional reform					

programs					
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					
Promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
C. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools					
Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time as defined by ED and create community-oriented schools					
Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
D. Provide operating flexibility and sustained support					
Give schools operating flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach					
Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA and/or the SEA					
Provide intensive technical assistance and related support from a designated external lead partnership organization					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
Total for Transformation Model:					

Complete a separate table for each Tier III school. Estimate the amount of funds required to conduct school improvement activities.

School Name:					
List School Improvement Activities	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total

materials and services) will be used to support the selected intervention model in the grant application.

4. Modify its practices and/or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
 - The LEA will provide evidence that a review of district and school policies has been completed to ensure alignment with the selected interventions. Evidence will include copies of agendas and faculty senate minutes. If changes are required, additional documentation would include revised versions of policies and/or procedures and minutes of BOE meetings where the revised policies were approved.
5. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
 - The LEA will provide a narrative identifying resources, financial and otherwise, to demonstrate how the reform changes will be institutionalized within the school setting.

The SEA will evaluate the LEAs ability to sustain the reform efforts by considering the following items:

- Level and amount of technical assistance the LEA provides to the school in each year of the grant funding-It is expected that the LEA would provide intensive technical assistance the first year with decreasing amounts in the next two years.
- Commitment to examine budgets to determine how the improvement efforts established can be sustained. This may require an adjustment in how current funding is being utilized.
- Contract with the external partner/school improvement specialist would provide a component to provide professional development for both the LEA level and the school level staff to ensure the practice is institutionalized and may continue to be monitored by the LEA after the contract ends.

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:

The SEA revised the budget form in the LEA application to include a column for pre-implementation activities. The monies used for pre-implementation activities will be deducted from the first year SIG funding. Pre-implementation activities must (1) support the full and effective implementation of the intervention model selected by the LEA, (2) address the needs identified by the LEA, (3) be reasonable and necessary for implementation, and (4) help improve student achievement. SIG funds used for pre-implementation activities are subject to the 'supplement not supplant' requirement.

As soon as it receives the funds, an LEA may use part of its first year allocation (2011-2012) during the (2010-2011 school year) for SIG-related "pre-implementation" activities. Possible activities that an LEA may carry out during the spring or summer prior to full implementation may include topics listed below. This list should not be considered as exhaustive or required.

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, and local service

providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotline, and direct mail.

- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising student achievement (e.g., summer school for incoming freshmen, summer school programs designed to prepare low achieving students to participate successfully in advanced coursework, such as Honors, AP or IB); identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Analyze data on leading baseline indicators or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

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:

The West Virginia Department of Education Office of Title I will evaluate an LEA's capacity to implement a school intervention model utilizing a capacity index developed by the SEA. The capacity index included in Section B, Part 1 Requirement 2 will be submitted by the LEA to the SEA with the information required in Part 1. Upon receipt of the information for the three requirements in Part 1, the SEA will analyze the results of the capacity index included in Section B, Part 1 Requirement 2 to determine the LEA's overall capacity to lead the school improvement efforts. Thus, an evaluation of the district capacity will be completed prior to the district submitting a final application.

Even though WV has a small number of schools identified for Tier I and Tier II, a lack of district capacity may be an issue for this state. Should a district elect not to apply for the competitive funding under NCLB Section 1003(g), an individual contact will be made with the district superintendent to ascertain the reasons. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools, the SEA will evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Furthermore, the SSOS and the SEA Office of Title I will provide technical assistance to the LEA to build capacity, write the grant application and plan for the implementation and evaluation of the grant.

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:

Step One: A meeting will be held on January 14, 2011, with the superintendents and selected central office staff of the LEAs which have schools eligible to participate in the 1003(g) opportunities. An overview of the 1003(g) grant program and a review of the letter of intent to apply will be presented during this meeting. The letter of intent to apply, including all three requirements, will be due to the SEA Office of Title I on March 1, 2011.

Step Two: A grant writing workshop will be held with the LEAs on March 10, 2011. The SEA Title I staff members will be available to provide technical assistance. The grant application is due to the SEA on or before April 15, 2011.

Step Three: The competitive grant proposals will be reviewed by SEA Title I staff members utilizing a rubric (Appendix C). Any grant proposal that does not meet the minimum threshold, as determined through a review, will be returned to the LEA with specific suggestions for improvement. Title I school improvement coordinators will provide additional technical assistance as needed.

Step Four: Each LEA team will present their competitive grant proposal and answer clarifying questions posed by WVDE staff members. Final determination of successful grant awardees will be based on the grant application and the presentation. All approved LEA grants will be awarded by June 1, 2011.

Step Five: Once the grants have been awarded, onsite technical assistance will be provided by the SEA Title I school improvement coordinators during June, July, and August 2011 to each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school receiving a grant. The LEAs will begin pre-implementation activities once the grants have been awarded. In addition, the district leadership team and school leadership team will begin a process to rewrite school strategic plans to reflect the selected school improvement model or activities adjust the achievement goals and identify the steps and timeline for implementing the model.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

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

2. Provided below is the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s school improvement grant if Tier I and Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of

the final requirements.

The SEA will review the WESTEST 2 results each August to determine whether the schools have made the progress specified on goals in the LEA grant applications. Furthermore, the SEA will review the progress on the leading indicators specified in Section III of the final regulations as reported by the LEAs. West Virginia recognizes that it will be difficult for a persistently low performing school to show improvement in academic achievement in the first year of implementation of one of the intervention models. If a Tier I or Tier II school does not meet the annual student achievement goals established by the LEAs, the SEA may renew the LEA's SIG application for that school if the school is making progress toward meeting the goals and leading indicators. In making this decision, the SEA will also consider the fidelity with which the school is implementing the selected intervention model.

3. Provided below is the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's school improvement grant if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals.

The SEA will review the WESTEST 2 results each August to determine whether the schools have made progress specified for goals in the LEA grant application. Furthermore, the SEA will review the progress on the leading indicators specified in Section III of the final regulations as reported by the LEAs. The SEA will renew the SIG applications for funding in Tier III schools provided the school meets or makes progress toward the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA.

4. The West Virginia Department of Education Title I school improvement coordinators will regularly monitor to ensure that each LEA receiving a grant is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The WVDE School Improvement Model will be utilized to assist the SEA in this monitoring process. This model includes clearly defined components as related to each of the three tiers:

- Governance
- Identification
- Protocols and Expectations
- Progress Determinants
- Data Collection
- Essential Components and Capacity Building
- Human Resource Capacity Building

- Options
- Monitoring
- Evaluation and Consequences

As indicated on the WVDE School Improvement Model, the grant effectiveness of Tier I and Tier II schools will be monitored by the Office of Title I as part of the State System of Support (SSOS) process in conjunction with the Office of School Improvement. In addition, Tier I and Tier II schools will be assigned a SEA Title I school improvement coordinator who will be responsible for continuous monitoring of each school's grant implementation. The coordinators will report the school's progress to the SSOS team on a monthly basis for Tier I and Tier II schools.

5. The explanation below describes 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.

The SEA will prioritize school improvement grants to LEAs if sufficient school improvement funds are not available for all the schools for which the LEA applies to serve. Priority will be given first to LEAs with Tier I and Tier II schools. If grant funds are not sufficient to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools for which LEAs apply then the following criteria will be utilized to determine which LEAs have the greatest need and strongest commitment:

- one or more schools in Tier I or Tier II
- a total score of twenty or more points on the capacity index
- inclusion of a signed assurance statement that the LEA will fully implement one of the rigorous intervention models
- LEAs with schools in the bottom 5% of achievement in reading and mathematics
- Total score received on the LEA application and presentation

6. The criteria the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools in LEAs are listed below.

The SEA will use the following to prioritize among Tier III schools:

1. Tier III schools selecting one of the four intervention models will be given first priority.
 2. The second priority will be given to schools further along in school improvement sanctions and they will be considered for higher levels of funding.
7. The SEA does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

See comments below item 8.

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

The provisions in items 7 and 8 are not applicable to WV at this time. However, according to West Virginia State Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, West Virginia has the legal authority to intervene directly in both low-achieving schools and districts.

State code and Policy 2320 authorize the West Virginia Board of Education to assign a low performing accreditation status to a school when the school falls below the criteria for full accreditation in three of the following performance measures: student achievement; participation rate; attendance rate or graduation rate. Whenever a school is issued low performing status, the West Virginia Board of Education appoints a team of improvement consultants to make recommendations to the Board within 60 days. If the school's low performance continues six months after the recommendations have been received by the school district, the West Virginia Board of Education appoints a monitor to the school, who will be paid by the school district. The monitor will work in the school, collaboratively with school leadership, to bring the school to full accreditation status.

If the low performance continues one year after the appointment of a monitor, the West Virginia Board of Education is authorized to intervene directly in the operation of the school. This intervention may include, but is not limited to, establishing instructional programs, taking such direct action as may be necessary to correct the low performance, removing the principal, and replacing administrators and principals in low performing schools in districts in nonapproval status with individuals determined by the state superintendent to be the most qualified for the positions. The state board of education may choose to appoint a monitor to assist the school principal after state intervention in the operation of the school has been completed.

E. ASSURANCES

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

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

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

Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:

The activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that WV plans to conduct with the State-level funds it has received from its school improvement grant are described below.

Technical assistance and professional development will be aligned with the requirements of NCLB Section 1116 and the WV Standards for High Quality Schools. One of our successes over the past five years has been the development of the WV Standards for High Quality Schools (Appendix D). These standards were developed to guide the process of state intervention in low-achieving schools. However, WV now realizes that these standards should drive the work of continuous improvement in all schools throughout the state. Creating consistency in school and district expectations will bring a concentrated focus and a common language regarding the components of a high performing school and school system. All schools will be at a different level of implementation of the WV Standards for High Quality Schools and thus will need different levels of support, but the goal of excellence should be the same for all schools. These standards will be finalized and adopted by the WV State Board of Education in December 2010 and will then be used in all schools throughout the state to guide school improvement planning, to structure accountability/compliance systems, and to drive the needs assessment process in struggling schools. The SEA will also align our work around these standards.

The purpose of the 1003(g) school improvement grant is to provide funding for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to substantially raise the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make AYP and exit improvement status. Furthermore, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's persistently lowest-achieving schools. Therefore, the technical assistance and professional development provided for the identified schools will also align with the goals listed below.

In order to build on the foundation of our past success, three goals and suggested activities have been identified, which are designed to improve student achievement in low-achieving schools:

Goal 1: Build the capacity of the SEA and LEAs to drive transformative interventions in low-achieving schools through the following activities:

- Engage external supporting partners to help LEAs build their capacity to support the transformation of struggling schools.
- Realign and expand the current capacity of the state system of support structure to monitor the process of transformation at all struggling schools in the state and build capacity at the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and LEA levels.
- Build strong teams to support struggling schools at the RESA, LEA and the school levels.
- Design a Whole Child Early Warning System and a Whole School Early Warning System that enable multiple users to use data to drive the school improvement process.
- Utilize an evaluator to design a rigorous evaluation and report formative results annually for 2 years and summative results at the end of year 3.

Goal 2: Strengthen teacher and leader effectiveness in low-achieving schools in order to improve the quality of instruction through the following activities:

- Utilize criteria developed by the West Virginia State System of Support to assist low performing schools in the selection of a school-based transformation specialist.
- Implement the structures, supports, and professional development that teachers need to be successful in professional learning communities.
- Provide professional development designed to assist teachers in implementing the Content Standards and Objectives utilizing standards based instructional strategies.

Goal 3: Develop comprehensive systems of support in low-achieving schools through the following activities:

- Provide a schoolwide system of differentiated supports for struggling students and students with disabilities.
- Establish school-based case management teams to identify non-academic issues for struggling students and then align the appropriate supports and services to the students' needs.

West Virginia is committed to transforming as many schools as possible over the next three to four years with intensive interventions supported by 1003(g) school improvement grants.

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

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

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

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

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including the Office of School Improvement and members of the WV Statewide System of Support.

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

Assurance

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

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

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

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

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

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

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

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

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

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

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

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

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

LEA Budgets

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

8. 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.
9. 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.
10. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
11. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
12. 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.
13. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix A

To: Select District Superintendents
Select District Title I Directors

From: Jan Stanley, State Title I Director

Date: January 14, 2011

Re: Title I, Part A 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

The school improvement grants (SIG) program is authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must “award grants to States to provide subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with Section 1116.”

From a grant received pursuant to that provision, a State educational agency (SEA) must subgrant at least 95 percent of the funds it receives to its local educational agencies (LEAs) for school improvement activities. In awarding such subgrants, an SEA must “give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate (A) the greatest need for such funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action and restructuring plans under Section 1116.”

The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the “greatest need” for SIG funds and the “strongest commitment” to ensuring that such funds are used to substantially raise student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in WV. “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” as determined by WV, means:

- (a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that
 - (i) Is one of the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State and

- (b) Any secondary school that is eligible for Title I funds that
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving ten percent of secondary schools that did not make adequately yearly progress for the last two consecutive years or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

A school that falls within the definition of (a) above is a Tier I school and a school that falls within the definition of (b) above is a Tier II school for purposes of using SIG funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. All other Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring compose the group of Tier III schools.

The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) records indicate your district has a school or schools which meet the criteria for Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools. Refer to the chart below.

[Insert chart for respective district]

LEA Name NCES ID#	School Name	NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Barbour 5400030	Philippi Elementary	540003000009	✓		

An LEA may apply for a 1003(g) school improvement grant if it has one or more schools that qualify under WV's definition of a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III school. **Districts electing to apply for the school improvement 1003(g) grants, must complete each of the following prior to submitting an application.**

The LEA must:

- A. Identify the Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve based on the eligible list provided above.
- B. Identify the school intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) the LEA will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school the district commits to serve (see Attachment 1 for descriptions of intervention models).
- C. For each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve, demonstrate that the LEA has met the following three requirements:
 1. Has analyzed the needs of each school and provided a narrative of the needs assessment according to the information in Attachment 2
 2. Has selected an intervention model (Tier I and Tier II) or activities (Tier III) for each school based on the individual school's needs assessment and identified root causes
 3. Has the capacity to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected as evaluated by the information in Attachment 3.
- D. If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why the district lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- E. Determine a preliminary budget (see Attachment 4) indicating the amount of 1003(g) school improvement grant funds the LEA will use to address the following items:
 1. Implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I school and Tier II school(s) it commits to serve
 2. Implement research-based activities in Tier III schools
 3. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I, Tier II and activities in Tier III schools

An LEA must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that will be used to monitor each school that receives SIG funds. Additionally, the United States Department of Education will hold each school receiving 1003(g) school improvement funds accountable for the following leading indicators:

- Number of instructional minutes within the school year
- Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade level and student subgroup
- Student participation rate on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup
- Average scale scores on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade level, for the "all students" subgroup, for each achievement quartile and for each subgroup
- Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
- Graduation rate (if applicable)
- Dropout rate (if applicable)
- Student attendance rate
- Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools or dual enrollment classes (if applicable)
- Discipline incidents
- Truants
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system
- Teacher attendance rate

Districts who intend to file an application for the SIG program must submit a letter of intent to apply for the 1003(g) school improvement funds and the required information electronically to Jan Stanley at jstanley@access.k12.wv.us on or before March 1, 2011. Questions concerning this intent for application should be addressed to Jan Stanley at 304.558.7805.

Attachment 1: Description of the Intervention Models

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.

West Virginia Applicability

West Virginia Board of Education Policy 6204 gives the State Superintendent of Schools the power to declare that there is a need for an emergency school closure. This power has not been used aggressively in the past, but WV will consider using this authority if closing a school within a district is the most appropriate intervention for the students at the school and the community.

Turnaround Model:

- Replace the principal and grant the newly assigned 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.
- Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students by:
 - Screening all existing staff and rehiring no more than 50 percent, and
 - Selecting new staff.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the final regulations-see definition below).

- Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

A turnaround model may also implement other strategies:

- Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model.
- A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

West Virginia Applicability

It is important to note that both the school closure and the turnaround intervention options are complicated by the rural nature of the state. More than half of all WV schools are located in rural areas and nearly 40 percent of students statewide are from rural areas, more than double the national average of 19.4 percent (Johnson & Strange, 2009, p. 80). Of the 55 school districts in WV, 25 support only one high school. In rural counties with small numbers of schools, school closure may not be a viable option, because students will not have another school to attend, if, for example, the one high school in their district is closed. The challenge posed by these small districts is also problematic for implementing the turnaround model because it will be difficult to replace the principal and more than fifty percent of the staff in districts that are currently struggling to fill all of their teaching positions with highly qualified teachers.

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 CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.)
- A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

West Virginia Applicability

In the restart model, an LEA would close a school and reopen it under a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO. This option is not currently available in WV because there is not a charter school law. If a charter school law is passed in the future, this may be an option for struggling schools in WV.

Transformation Model - the LEA must implement each of the required activities:

1. Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness

Required activities - The LEA must complete the following actions:

- Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.
- Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that:
 - Take into account data on student growth (as defined in the final regulations-see definition below) 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 graduations rates, and

- Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.
- 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 to improve their professional practice, have not done so.
- 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.
- 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.

Permissible activities - An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness:

- Provide additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.
- Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.
- Ensure 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.

2. Comprehensive instructional reform strategies

Required activities - The LEA must complete the following actions:

- 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.
- 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.

Permissible activities - An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies:

- Conduct 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.
- Implement a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model.
- Provide 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.

- Use and integrate technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- In secondary schools (schools in WV with a grade 8 and/or a grade 12 as defined in the WV Accountability Workbook)
 - Increase 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 may take advantage of these programs and coursework.
 - Improve student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies.
 - Increase graduation rates through research based initiatives (e.g., credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills).
 - Establish early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

3. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools

Required activities - The LEA must complete the following actions:

- Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined below).
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

Permissible activities - An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools:

- Partner 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.
- Extend or restructure the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff.
- Implement 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.
- Expand the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

4. Providing operational flexibility and sustained support

Required activities - The LEA must complete the following actions:

- 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.
- 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).

Permissible activities - The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support:

- Allow the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA.
- Implement a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Local education agencies in WV with low-achieving Tier I and Tier II schools will choose from the four intervention models outlined by the U.S. Department of Education. The restart, school closure and turnaround options will be challenging to implement in the most rural districts in the state, but will be more realistic options in districts with larger numbers of schools. As there are not more than nine low-achieving Title I schools in any district in WV, the federal restriction on the use of the transformation model does not apply.

Definitions from the 1003(g) Final Regulations

1. Increased learning time

This is defined as using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.

Note: Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that **expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year**. Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in school and out of school.

2. Interim assessments

This is defined in WV as Acuity benchmark assessments which are administered three times per year.

3. Student growth

This is defined as the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student's score on the State's assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Attachment 2

Needs Assessment and Root Causes

Requirement 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.

Overview of school AYP data

- AYP status
 - Identification of the AYP targets the school met and missed
 - Student participation rate on State assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade and subgroup
 - School improvement status and applicable sanctions
 - Number of **required** instructional days/minutes within the school year
 - Number of instructional days/minutes **fulfilled annually (excluding days of instruction lost for inclement weather or other emergencies)**
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining AYP data.

External trend data

- Local demographic trends are reviewed for the impact on student achievement.
 - District and school poverty rates
 - Mother's educational level
 - Number of college graduates in the district
 - Median age of district population
 - Substance abuse
 - Unemployment rate
 - Mobility rate of students
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining external trend data.

Student achievement data

- Data analysis includes review of student achievement trends over time from several data sources, not just WESTEST 2 scores.
 - Percentage of students at or above each performance level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade and subgroup
 - Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade, for the all students group, for each performance level and for each subgroup
 - Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
 - Comparative gap analysis for all subgroups
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining student achievement data.

Other student outcome data

- Analysis includes review of other important student outcome data:
 - Attendance
 - Promotion/retention rates
 - Dropout rates (if applicable)
 - Discipline
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining other student outcome data.

Analysis of culture, conditions and practices

- Analysis includes a review of the following data:
 - Cultural Typology or Cultural Survey results conducted by the State System of Support (SSOS)
 - Current governance structure – presence of engaged principals, teacher input into decision-making, the organization of teachers by teams
 - Instructional Practices Inventory conducted by the SSOS
 - Use of standards-based instructional practices
 - Availability of current technology and degree to which technology is integrated into instruction
 - Federal monitoring reports for NCLB, IDEA and state reports for the Office of Education Performance Audits
 - Questionnaires or observations completed by staff or external evaluators
 - Description of the overall culture, conditions and practices that exist in the school
 - Results of classroom walkthroughs
 - Highly qualified teacher data
 - Number of administrators in the building, definition of roles, years experience, specialized training and advanced degrees
 - Use of professional and paraprofessional staff to support students
 - Number of content and program specialists (e.g., counselors, health staff and social workers)
 - Professional development (e.g., opportunities available to teachers and principals, number of days dedicated to professional development and the amount of teacher generated professional development, percentage of teachers regularly attending professional development)
 - Teacher average monthly attendance rates
 - Parent training and support for families
 - Degree of meaningful parent involvement and amount/frequency of communication with parents.
- A description of the conclusions reached after examining the culture, conditions and practices.

Root Causes

After the data has been examined and analyzed each school is required to determine the root causes for the results of the needs assessment. The root causes are identified for the following areas:

- Administrators and teachers
- Curriculum and materials
- Master schedule, classroom schedules and classroom management/discipline
- Students and parents

Selection of an Intervention Model

Based on the needs assessment and determination of root causes, identify an intervention model for each Tier I and Tier II school the district elects to serve. The justification for the selection of a specific model must be described in a narrative.

Below are questions the LEA should consider in the selection of an intervention model.

Turnaround Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and the process for selecting replacements?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

Restart Model

1. Are there qualified charter management organizations (CMOs) or education management organizations (EMOs) willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?

2. Will qualified community groups initiate a home grown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—home grown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure and restart of the school?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
7. What is the LEA’s own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

Transformation Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
3. What is the LEA’s own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?

8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students attending the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

**Attachment 3
Demonstration of Capacity**

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

The WVDE Office of Title I will determine LEA capacity through an evaluation of the district’s ability to plan, implement and target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process. Each LEA must complete a self analysis of the capacity it can provide to assist the low performing schools in the implementation of the selected intervention. This will be determined utilizing a scale of 1-3 ranking from poor (1), satisfactory (2) and commendable (3) for the following criteria:

District Capacity Index

Criteria	Poor 1 point	Satisfactory 2 points	Commendable 3 points	Points Earned
LEA governance	State takeover district	Limited SEA intervention	No SEA intervention	
Title I audit reports	Findings in areas requiring a repayment of funds	Findings in areas noted-repayment of funds not required	No findings in the fiscal area	
LEA overall achievement ranking	Bottom (5% = 3 districts)	Middle (70% = 38 districts)	Top (25% = 14 districts)	
Approval of the district strategic plan by the SEA (entire plan, not just the Title I section)	Not approved by the SEA	Approved by the SEA with revisions	Approved by the SEA without revisions	
Percentage of Title I schools that met AYP in the last testing cycle	0-50% of the Title I schools met AYP.	51-75% of the Title I schools met AYP.	76-100% of the Title I schools met AYP.	
Development of schools as professional learning communities	The school has not yet begun to address the practice of a PLC or an effort has been made to address the practice of PLCs, but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.	A critical mass of staff has begun to engage in PLC practice. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.	The practice of PLCs is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.	
Identification of district leadership team and assignment of responsibilities	No district leadership team nor identified person assigned for monitoring implementation	Lacks specific identification of personnel for the district leadership team and for monitoring implementation.	A specific district leadership team is identified and one or more persons are assigned for monitoring implementation.	

School Leadership Team	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders (e.g., parents; representatives of institutions of higher education; representatives of RESA or representatives of outside consultant groups). Evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been exceeded.	
			Total Points	

Districts must obtain a score of 20 out of 24 possible points to demonstrate capacity 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/activities in each identified school.

Attachment 4 Preliminary Budget

Requirement 3: Each LEA intending to apply for the competitive 1003(g) school improvement funds will submit a preliminary budget to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school in the application. Further, for each Tier III school an estimate of the funds needed to conduct school improvement activities shall be included in the preliminary budget. The preliminary budget shall cover the period of availability of these funds, as the SEA has applied for a waiver to extend the period of availability of funds.

An LEA serving Tier I and Tier II schools receives priority for full funding in the WV SEA award process. Districts serving only Tier III schools may receive less than the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating Title I school, based on SEA allocation and the number of districts which submit an application. Note that the proposed allocation for each school served depends on the interventions to be carried out and level of benefits provided, and not on the funding generated by the school under the statute.

The budget should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. The year one budget may include 'pre-implementation' activities that will be conducted prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school term. Pre-implementation activities must (1) support the full and effective implementation of the intervention model selected by the LEA, (2) address the needs identified by the LEA, (3) be reasonable and necessary for full implementation, and (4) help improve student achievement. SIG funds used for pre-implementation activities are subject to the 'supplement not supplant' requirement.

Possible activities that an LEA may carry out during the spring or summer prior to full implementation may include topics listed below. This list should not be considered as exhaustive or required.

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotline, and direct mail.

- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising student achievement (e.g., summer school for incoming freshmen, summer school programs designed to prepare low achieving students to participate successfully in advanced coursework, such as Honors, AP or IB); identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Analyze data on leading baseline indicators or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

The budget must be planned at a minimum of \$50,000 per year. The maximum amount cannot exceed \$2 million multiplied by the number of schools served or no more than \$6 million over three years.

3. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.
4. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and school improvement activities the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.

Preliminary Budget Form

District Name:

School Name by Tier	Intervention Models: Select the model that will be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.			
	Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Tier I School:				
Tier II Schools:				
Tier III Schools:	Not applicable to Tier III schools.			

Complete a separate table for each Tier I school or Tier II school. Estimate the amount of funds required to implement the intervention model selected for each school.

School Name:	Tier:				
Turnaround Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Replace the principal					
Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment					
Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent of existing staff					
Select new staff					
Implement strategies to recruit, place and retrain staff					
Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development					
Adopt a new governance structure					
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					
Promote continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction					
Establish schedules and implement strategies to increase learning time					
Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented supports for students					
Additional options (specify activities) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model or a new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy)					
Total:					

Restart Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Convert or close school and reopen under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.					
Enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.					
Total:					
School Closure Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Close the school			n/a	n/a	
Enroll the students in other higher-performing schools in LEA			n/a	n/a	
Total:			n/a	n/a	
Transformation Model	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
A. Develop teacher and school leader effectiveness					
Replace the principal					
Use rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems that take into account data on student growth					
Identify and reward school leaders, teachers and other staff who have increased student achievement and the graduation rate					
Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development					
Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
B. Comprehensive instructional reform programs					
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					
Promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
C. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools					
Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time as defined by ED and create community-oriented schools					
Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement					

Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
D. Provide operating flexibility and sustained support					
Give schools operating flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach					
Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA and/or the SEA					
Provide intensive technical assistance and related support from a designated external lead partnership organization					
Other permissible activities as defined in the regulations (specify activities)					
Subtotal:					
Total for Transformation Model:					

For each **Tier III school**, estimate amount of funds required to conduct school improvement activities.

School Name:					
List School Improvement Activities	Pre-Implementation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Total:					

APPENDIX B

**WEST VIRGINIA
1003(g) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT
APPLICATION COVER**

County: _____

LEA Title I Director: _____ Email: _____

LEA Curriculum Director: _____ Email: _____

LEA Special Education Director: _____ Email: _____

Others may be added as needed:

Superintendent Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Title I Director Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Provide a summary of the LEA's proposed Title I school improvement

LEA APPLICATION

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a school improvement grant.

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

Tier I School:

School Name/ NCES ID#	Principal	Email Address	INTERVENTION			
			TURNAROUND	RESTART	CLOSURE	TRANSFORMATION

Tier II Schools:

School Name/ NCES ID#	Principal	Email Address	INTERVENTION			
			TURNAROUND	RESTART	CLOSURE	TRANSFORMATION

Tier III Schools:

School Name/ NCES ID#	Principal	Email Address

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a school improvement grant.

1. For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate each of the following:
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs and selected an intervention model for each school, and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

This information was provided in the Letter of Intent to Apply submitted by the LEA to the SEA. The Letter of Intent to Apply has been evaluated according to the established criteria and has been deemed to have met the standard required; therefore, this does not need to be addressed in this application. Attach a copy of the Letter of Intent to Apply to this application.

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

This criterion was met in the Letter of Intent to Apply.

3. For each Tier I and Tier II school being served, the LEA must describe the actions it has taken or will take to:
 - A. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements for the selected intervention model(s).
 - The LEA will provide a narrative that details how they will address all requirements of the selected intervention model.
 - B. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
 - LEA will develop procedures and a timeline to recruit, screen, and select external providers. The process will include input from a variety of stakeholders.
 - The LEA will provide a written explanation to the SEA outlining how the external provider selected meets the identified needs of the school, a copy of a sample contract, a copy of the projected work plan to be completed annually by the external provider and a description of how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of the external provider.
 - C. Align other resources with the intervention as detailed in the budget and the budget narrative for each school.
 - The detailed budget narrative the LEA submitted as part of the grant application will provide evidence of how other sources (regular school Title I, Title I 1003(a), Title II, Part A, Title III, Part A, state/local commitment and community resources) are aligned with the selected interventions.
 - The LEA will provide a narrative description of how other resources (e.g., personnel, materials and services) will be used to support the selected intervention model in the grant application.
 - D. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. The LEA will keep documentation of meetings (e.g., agendas, minutes) to review and possibly revise the policies and procedures.
 - The LEA will provide evidence that a review of district and school policies has been completed to ensure alignment with the selected interventions. Evidence will include copies of agendas and faculty senate minutes. If changes are required, additional documentation would include revised versions of policies and/or procedures and minutes of BOE meetings where the revised policies were approved.
 - E. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. The LEA will develop a plan and identify resources, financial and otherwise, to demonstrate how the reform changes will be institutionalized within the school setting.
 - The LEA will develop a plan and identify resources, financial and otherwise, to demonstrate how the reform changes will be institutionalized within the school setting.

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

School Name:

Steps to Implement Selected Intervention	Anticipated Completion Date

School Name:

Steps to Implement Selected Intervention	Anticipated Completion Date

*Add charts for additional schools as needed.

5. For each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school the LEA will serve, develop measurable summative and growth goals that will be used by the LEA to monitor progress of student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics.

School 1

School Name:
Annual Summative Achievement Goal for Reading/Language Arts: Annual Growth Goal for Reading/Language Arts:
Annual Summative Achievement Goal for Mathematics: Annual Growth Goal for Mathematics:

School 2

School Name:
Annual Summative Achievement Goal for Reading/Language Arts: Annual Growth Goal for Reading/Language Arts:
Annual Summative Achievement Goal for Mathematics: Annual Growth Goal for Mathematics:

* Add charts for additional schools as needed.

5. For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive and the activities the school will implement.

School Name:
1.
2.
3. etc.

School Name:
1.
2.
3. etc.

6. Provide a summary of the LEA consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Keep documentation of meetings (e.g., agendas, sign-in sheets) on file.

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

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

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.
- The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. The budget must be planned at a minimum of \$50,000 per school for each year. The maximum amount cannot exceed \$2 million multiplied by the number of schools served or no more than \$6 million over three years.
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools.
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.
- As soon as it receives the funds, an LEA may use part of its first year allocation (2011-2012) during the (2010-2011 school year) for SIG-related “pre-implementation” activities. These pre-implementation activities shall be budgeted separately. See budget sheet in Appendix A. Pre-implementation activities must (1) support the full and effective implementation of the intervention model selected by the LEA, (2) address the needs identified by the LEA, (3) be reasonable and necessary for full implementation, and (4) help improve student achievement. Possible activities that an LEA may carry out during the spring or summer prior to full implementation may include the topics listed below. This list should not be considered as exhaustive or required.
- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school

improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotline, and direct mail.

- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising student achievement (e.g., summer school for in-coming freshmen, summer school programs designed to prepare low achieving students to participate successfully in advanced coursework, such as Honors, AP or IB); identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Analyze data on leading baseline indicators or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period, (SY 11-12; SY 12-13; SY 13-14). The overall LEA budget must indicate how it will allocate school improvement funds, over a three-year period, among the Tier I and Tier III schools it commits to serve. If the county elects, part of the year one funds may be spent during the pre-implementation phase, before the start of the 2011- 2012 school year.

To support the budgeting process, budget spreadsheets and narrative instructions are included:

1. LEA Budget Detail
 - a. Budget Spreadsheet: Complete the LEA budget spreadsheet to detail how the requested funds will be used at the LEA level to support the school improvement models (Tier I and Tier II schools) and activities (Tier III schools).
 - b. Budget Narrative: A budget narrative that accompanies the LEA spreadsheet will provide an overview of the projects included in the budget. The LEA will also describe how other federal, state, and local funds will be leveraged to further support school improvement plans. Describe within the budget narrative any broad items in the budget, such as, personnel, contracted services, professional development, equipment and travel expenses.
2. School-Level Detail

- a. Budget Spreadsheet: The LEA will complete a separate budget spreadsheet for each eligible school receiving school improvement funds.
- b. Budget Narrative: A budget narrative that accompanies each school's budget spreadsheet will provide an overview of the school improvement activities included in the budget. The LEA must also
 - Describe how other federal, state, and local funds will be leveraged to further support school improvement plans.
 - Describe within the budget narrative any broad items in the budget, such as, personnel, contracted services, professional development, equipment and travel expenses.

Complete the budget spreadsheet in Attachment #1. For each item indicated, provide a budget narrative that describes the need for the item and provides additional details.

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a school improvement grant. Please check the applicable boxes.

The LEA must assure that it will:

- Use its school improvement grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
- Establish annual goals (summative and growth) 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, Tier II and Tier III school it serves with school improvement funds.
- Include in the contract or agreement a provision that the education management organization will be held accountable for complying with the final requirements if implementing a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school.
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under Section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: The SEA has obtained waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. The 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.

The LEA believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools.

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.
- "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I or Tier II schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

The LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section I.A.7 of the final requirements.

The LEA assures that it will implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a school improvement grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA will only implement the waivers(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in this application.

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	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Berkeley	5400060	Martinsburg North Middle School	540006000024		✓			✓
Doddridge	5400270	Doddridge County Elementary School	540027001059	✓				
Fayette	5400300	Mount Hope High School	540030000195		✓			✓
Kanawha	5400600	Malden Elemenary School	540060000416	✓				
Kanawha	5400600	Cedar Grove Middle School	540060001252		✓			
Kanawha	5400600	East Bank Middle School	540060000386		✓			
Kanawha	5400600	Riverside High School	540060001043		✓			✓
Kanawha	5400600	Stonewall Jackson Middle School	540060001442		✓			✓
Lincoln	5400660	Hamlin PK-8	540066001237		✓			✓
Lincoln	5400660	West Hamlin Elementary School	540066000502	✓				
Lincoln	5400660	Guyan Valley Middle School	540066001242		✓			
McDowell	5400810	Mount View High School	540081001246		✓			
McDowell	5400810	Sandy River Middle School	540081001046		✓			
Roane	5401320	Geary Elementary Middle School	540132001305		✓			
Wood	5401620	Franklin Elementary	540162000679	✓				

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
Barbour	5400030	Philippi Elementary School	540003000009			✓		
Boone	5400090	Brookview Elementary School	540009000880			✓		
Clay	5400240	Clay Middle School	540024000030			✓		
Doddridge	5400270	Doddridge County Middle School	540027000043			✓		
Grant	5400360	Petersburg Elementary School	540036000219			✓		
Hampshire	5400420	Romney Elementary School	540042000251	✓				
Jefferson	5400570	North Jefferson Elementary School	540057000345			✓		
Kanawha	5400600	Cedar Grove Elementary	540060001340			✓		
Kanawha	5400600	Watts Elementary School	540060000463	✓				
Mason	5400780	Pt. Pleasant Intermediate	540078001136			✓		
McDowell	5400810	Southside K-8	540081001468	✓				
McDowell	5400810	Welch Elementary School	540081000669	✓				
Mercer	5400840	Bluefield Intermediate	540084001101			✓		
Mineral	5400870	Keyser Primary/Middle School	540087001402			✓		
Monroe	5400960	Mountain View Elementary & Middle School	540096001044			✓		
Nicholas	5401020	Cherry River Elementary School	540102001263			✓		
Nicholas	5401020	Richwood High School	540102000847		✓			✓
Roane	5401320	Spencer Elementary School	540132001031	✓				
Wood	5401620	Van Devender Middle School	540162001180			✓		

Appendix C1: Scoring Rubric

WEST VIRGINIA TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT FUNDING SCORING RUBRIC

Part I: Letter of intent to apply for 1003(g) school improvement funds

Criteria/Indicator	SCALE	
Requirement 1: Data Analysis & Intervention Selection (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Overview of school AYP data</i> - <i>External trend data</i> - <i>Student achievement data</i> - <i>Other student outcome data</i> - <i>Analysis of culture, conditions & practices</i> - <i>Root causes</i> 	All data sets are current, carefully examined and provide unquestionable evidence students are performing at levels below state standards. The data analysis is used to identify the root causes for each area (administrators and teachers; curriculum and materials; master schedule, classroom schedules, and classroom management/discipline; students and parents).	All relevant data sets have not been examined, are vaguely examined or do not support the need for reform. Root causes are not identified.
Required Revisions:		
Requirement 2: LEA Capacity (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>LEA capacity</i>	LEA must score a minimum of 20 out of a maximum of 24 points on the capacity index provided in the letter of intent to apply in order to meet requirement.	LEA scoring below 20 points on the capacity index will accept technical assistance and support from the SEA to build capacity.
Required Technical Assistance:		

Requirement 3: Preliminary Budget (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
<p>- <i>Completed budget form</i></p>	<p>The LEA's preliminary budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covers a three year period, may include pre-implementation activities incorporated into the year one budget but conducted prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school term. - Includes the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and indicates the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school - Requests for each Tier I and Tier II school is of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years including pre-implementation activities incorporated into the year one budget. - Reflects the number of Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve and the school improvement activities to be implemented over the three-year grant period. - Request for each Tier III school includes the services the LEA will provide the school. - If the LEA utilizes funding for pre-implementation activities the activities must: (1) support the full and effective implementation of the intervention model selected by the LEA, (2) address the needs identified by the LEA, (3) be reasonable and necessary for implementation, and (4) help improve student achievement. SIG funds used for pre-implementation activities are subject to the 'supplement not supplant' requirement. 	<p>Requested information is omitted or not clearly stated.</p>
<p>Required Revisions:</p>		

Part II: LEA Application

Criteria/Indicator	SCALE	
A: Schools to be served (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>Identification of schools</i>	<p>Proposal includes clear identification of the schools to be served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.</p> <p>Additional information (i.e., NCES #, principal contact information, indicated Tier, and selected intervention for Tier I and Tier II schools) is clearly indicated.</p>	<p>Vague or unclear identification of schools to be served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.</p> <p>Omitted or vague information is provided for each school to be served.</p>
Required Revisions:		
B: Descriptive Information (40 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
<p>(1) - <i>Data analysis</i> - <i>LEA capacity</i></p> <p>(2) - <i>Lack of LEA capacity to serve a Tier I school</i></p>	<p>The letter of intent to apply includes this information and has been previously evaluated according to established criteria in Part 1: Requirement 1 above.</p> <p>A copy of the previously approved letter of intent is included in the application.</p>	<p>A copy of the previously approved letter of intent to apply is not included in the application.</p>
Required Revisions:		

	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(3) - <i>LEA intervention model actions</i>	<p>Proposal includes a thorough description of the actions the LEA has taken or will take to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Design and implement interventions for the selected intervention model(s) consistent with the final requirements. B. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure quality. C. Align other resources with the intervention as detailed in the budget and budget narrative for each school. D. Modify its practices and/or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. E. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends including the development of a plan which identifies resources, financial or otherwise, to demonstrate how the reforms will be institutionalized within the school setting. 	<p>Proposal is lacking information or includes a vague description of the actions the LEA has taken or will take to implement the intervention models.</p>
Required Revisions:		
	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(4) - <i>Timeline for intervention model implementation</i>	<p>Proposal includes a detailed timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school served, including pre-implementation activities incorporated into the year one budget but conducted prior to the 2011-2012 school term.</p>	<p>Proposal includes a vague description timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school served.</p>
Required Revisions:		

	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(5) <i>- Annual student achievement and progress goals</i>	Proposal includes realistic and measurable achievement and progress goals for each school to be served.	Proposal lacks realistic and measurable achievement and progress goals for each school to be served.
Required Revisions:		
	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(6) <i>- Identification of Tier III services and activities (if applicable)</i>	Proposal clearly identifies the services each Tier III school will receive. Specifically describes the activities for each Tier III school served. A timeline for implementation is included.	Proposal does not clearly identify the services each Tier III school will receive. Vague description of activities for each Tier III school.
Required Revisions:		

	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(7) - <i>Summary of LEA consultation</i>	<p>Proposal clearly identifies relevant stakeholders in the improvement process for Tier I and Tier II schools.</p> <p>Proposal thoroughly describes the stakeholder consultation process to communicate and seek input regarding the application and implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.</p>	<p>Proposal does not clearly identify relevant stakeholders in the improvement process for Tier I and Tier II schools.</p> <p>Proposal provides a vague description of the stakeholder consultation process to communicate and seek input regarding the application and implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.</p>
Required Revisions:		
C: Budget (20 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>LEA budget</i>	<p>The LEA budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covers a three year period, may include pre-implementation activities incorporated into the year one budget but conducted prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school term. - Includes correct amounts for the total, LEA, and each served individual school. - Includes indirect costs. - Reflects sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over the three year period (Tier I and Tier II schools), including pre-implementation activities incorporated into the year one budget. - Reflects sufficient funding amounts to effectively support school improvement activities for Tier III schools. <p>The budget aligns with the budget narrative, is representative of the contents of the proposal and clearly</p>	<p>Budget amounts or information is omitted or not clearly indicated.</p> <p>The budget does not clearly align with the budget narrative and/or is not representative of the contents of the proposal and does not clearly focus on full and effective implementation of the selected model(s) in Tier I and Tier II schools and on school improvement activities in Tier III schools.</p> <p>Does not clearly reflect how funding will be spent at the</p>

<p>- <i>Budget narrative describes how funding will support intervention model(s) and school improvement activities beyond school improvement 1003(g) funding</i></p>	<p>focuses on full and effective implementation of the selected model(s) in Tier I and Tier II schools and on school improvement activities in Tier III schools.</p> <p>Clearly reflects how funding will be spent at the LEA level and in each individual school served.</p> <p>Funding sources include school improvement, Title I, other federal sources (e.g., regular school Title I, Title I 1003(a), Title II, Part A, Title III, Part A, state/local commitment, and community resources).</p> <p>Narrative includes a clear description of large budget amounts.</p> <p>Narrative demonstrates how the LEA will continue to support intervention model(s) in Tier I and Tier II schools and school improvement activities in Tier III schools once school improvement 1003(g) funding has expired.</p>	<p>LEA level and in each individual school served.</p> <p>Additional funding sources are omitted or are vaguely described.</p> <p>Narrative omits or provides a vague description of large budget amounts.</p> <p>Narrative does not clearly indicate how the LEA will continue to support intervention model(s) in Tier I and Tier II schools and school improvement activities in Tier III schools once school improvement 1003(g) funding has expired.</p>
<p>Required Revisions:</p>		
<p>D: Assurances (no points for this section)</p>	<p>Meets Requirements _____</p>	<p>Requires Revision _____</p>
<p>- <i>Assurance Agreement</i></p>	<p>All assurance boxes have been checked indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances.</p> <p>The superintendent has signed and dated the school improvement grant application indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances.</p>	<p>All or some assurance boxes have not been checked indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances.</p> <p>The superintendent has not signed and/or dated the school improvement grant application indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances.</p>
<p>Required Revisions:</p>		

E: Waivers (no points for this section)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>Waiver Agreement</i>	The LEA has checked applicable boxes indicating which waivers it intends to implement for each applicable school served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.	The LEA has not checked applicable boxes indicating which waivers it intends to implement for each applicable school served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.
Required Revisions:		
Total Possible Points 100		Points earned

Appendix C2: Scoring Rubric

WEST VIRGINIA TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT FUNDING SCORING RUBRIC FOR TIER III SCHOOLS ONLY

Part I: Letter of intent to apply for 1003(g) school improvement funds

Criteria/Indicator	SCALE	
Requirement 1: Data Analysis & Intervention Selection (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Overview of school AYP data</i> - <i>External trend data</i> - <i>Student achievement data</i> - <i>Other student outcome data</i> - <i>Analysis of culture, conditions & practices</i> - <i>Root causes</i> 	All data sets are current, carefully examined and provide unquestionable evidence students are performing at levels below state standards. The data analysis is used to identify the root causes for each area (administrators and teachers; curriculum and materials; master schedule, classroom schedules, and classroom management/discipline; students and parents).	All relevant data sets have not been examined, are vaguely examined or do not support the need for reform. Root causes are not identified.
Required Revisions:		
Requirement 2: Capacity (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>LEA capacity</i>	LEA must score a minimum of 20 out of a maximum of 24 points on the capacity index provided in the letter of intent to apply in order to meet requirement.	LEA scoring below 20 points on the capacity index will accept technical assistance and support from the SEA to build capacity.
Required Technical Assistance:		

Requirement 3: Preliminary Budget (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>Completed budget form</i>	The LEA's preliminary budget: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covers a three year period. - Reflects the number of Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve and the school improvement activities to be implemented over the three-year grant period. - Request for each Tier III school includes the services the LEA will provide the school. 	Requested information is omitted or not clearly stated.
Required Revisions:		

Part II: LEA Application

Criteria/Indicator	SCALE	
A: Schools to be served (10 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>Identification of school(s)</i>	<p>Proposal includes clear identification of the school(s) to be served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.</p> <p>Additional information (i.e., NCES #, principal contact information, indicated Tier III) is clearly indicated.</p>	<p>Vague or unclear identification of school(s) to be served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.</p> <p>Omitted or vague information is provided for each school to be served.</p>
Required Revisions:		
B: Descriptive Information (40 points)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
<p>(1)</p> <p>- <i>Data analysis</i></p> <p>- <i>LEA capacity</i></p> <p>(2)</p> <p>- <i>Lack of LEA capacity to serve a Tier III school</i></p>	<p>The letter of intent to apply includes this information and has been previously evaluated according to established criteria in Part 1: Requirement 1 above.</p> <p>A copy of the previously approved letter of intent is included in the application.</p>	<p>A copy of the previously approved letter of intent to apply is not included in the application.</p>
Required Revisions:		

	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(3) - <i>LEA intervention model actions</i>	<p>Proposal includes a thorough description of the actions the LEA has taken or will take to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Design and implement components of the chosen intervention model(s) consistent with the final requirements. B. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure quality. C. Align other resources with the intervention as detailed in the budget and budget narrative for each school. D. Modify its practices and/or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. E. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends including the development of a plan which identifies resources, financial or otherwise, to demonstrate how the reforms will be institutionalized within the school setting. 	<p>Proposal is lacking information or includes a vague description of the actions the LEA has taken or will take to implement the components of the intervention model(s).</p>
Required Revisions:		
	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(4) - <i>Timeline for intervention model implementation</i>	<p>Proposal includes a detailed timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected interventions in each Tier III school served.</p>	<p>Proposal includes a vague description timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier III school served.</p>
Required Revisions:		

	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(5) - <i>Annual student achievement and progress goals</i>	Proposal includes realistic and measurable achievement and progress goals for each school to be served.	Proposal lacks realistic and measurable achievement and progress goals for each school to be served.
Required Revisions:		
	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(6) - <i>Identification of Tier III services and activities</i>	Proposal clearly identifies the services each Tier III school will receive. Specifically describes the activities for each Tier III school served. A timeline for implementation is included.	Proposal does not clearly identify the services each Tier III school will receive. Vague description of activities for each Tier III school.
Required Revisions:		
	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
(7) - <i>Summary of LEA consultation</i>	Proposal clearly identifies relevant stakeholders in the improvement process for Tier III schools. Proposal thoroughly describes the stakeholder consultation process to communicate and seek input regarding the application and implementation of school intervention models in Tier III schools.	Proposal does not clearly identify relevant stakeholders in the improvement process for Tier III schools. Proposal provides a vague description of the stakeholder consultation process to communicate and seek input regarding the application and implementation of school intervention models in Tier III schools.
Required Revisions:		

Required Revisions:		
D: Assurances (no points for this section)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>Assurance Agreement</i>	All assurance boxes have been checked indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances. The superintendent has signed and dated the school improvement grant application indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances.	All or some assurance boxes have not been checked indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances. The superintendent has not signed and/or dated the school improvement grant application indicating agreement to comply with the stated assurances.
Required Revisions:		
E: Waivers (no points for this section)	Meets Requirements _____	Requires Revision _____
- <i>Waiver Agreement</i>	The LEA has checked applicable boxes indicating which waivers it intends to implement for each applicable school served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.	The LEA has not checked applicable boxes indicating which waivers it intends to implement for each applicable school served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant.
Required Revisions:		

Appendix D

West Virginia Standards for High Quality Schools

Standard 1: Positive Climate and Cohesive Culture

In high quality schools, the staff shares sound educational beliefs and values, establishes high expectations and creates an engaging and orderly atmosphere to foster learning for all.

Function A: Shared Beliefs and Values

The staff works collaboratively around a set of shared educational beliefs and values and uses these to intentionally shape the school's climate and culture.

Function B: High Expectations for All

The staff establishes high expectations for self and student that are written, clearly communicated and readily observed in educational practice and personal behavior.

Function C: Safe, Orderly and Engaging Environment

The school environment is safe, well-managed and clean and contributes to an engaging and inclusive atmosphere for learning.

Standard 2: School Leadership

In high quality schools, the principal fosters and develops distributed leadership among staff, students, and stakeholders in order to focus collective action for improved school performance.

Function A: Principal Leadership

The principal exhibits the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that reflect strong leadership and effective management. (Note: Specific indicators of instructional leadership by the principal appear within each of the High Quality Standards).

Function B: School Teams and Councils

The school teams and councils function effectively to advance the mission and goals of the school through leadership, planning and problem-solving.

Function C: Teacher Leadership

Teachers assume responsibility for school and classroom improvement and are provided authentic opportunities and resources to lead and influence professional practice.

Function D: Student Leadership

Students are engaged in age-appropriate leadership opportunities that develop self-direction and a sense of responsibility for improving self, school and community.

Standard 3: Standards-Focused Curriculum, Instruction and Assessments

In high quality schools, the staff delivers a standards-focused curriculum that enhances the unique qualities of each learner and assures that all students attain the essential knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary in the global, digital age.

Function A: Classroom Learning Environment

Teachers create and manage an inviting classroom environment that is student-centered and fosters student reflection, intellectual inquiry and self-direction.

Function B: Standards-Focused Curriculum

Teachers implement a standards-focused curriculum aligned with the 21st Century Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools and the 21st Century Learning Skills and Technology Tools.

Function C: Instructional Planning

Teachers design long and short term instructional plans for guiding student mastery of the Content Standards and Objectives based on the needs, interests and performance levels of their students.

Function D: Instructional Delivery

Teachers facilitate engaging instructional experiences that enhance individual student progress in mastery of the curriculum using multiple strategies, appropriate assessments, learning resources, digital tools and processes aligned with instructional targets.

Standard 4: Student Support Services and Family/Community Connections

In high quality schools, the staff places student well-being at the forefront of all decisions, provides support services to address student physical, social/emotional and academic growth, and forms positive connections to families and the community.

Function A: Positive Relationships

Positive relationships exist between the school staff and the students, families and the larger community.

Function B: Student Personal Development

The school staff attends to student physical, social-emotional and academic well-being through coordinated student support services for health, child nutrition, character education, guidance and counseling, special education and English second language.

Function C: Parent and Community Partnerships

The school staff forms partnerships with various community agencies and organizations to enhance the ability to meet the needs of all students.

Standard 5: Educator Growth and Development

In high quality schools, staff members participate in processes of self reflection, collaboration and evaluation that lead to professional growth and development in order to impact student learning.

Function A: Professional Development

The staff engage in continuous learning opportunities for professional growth designed to improve school and classroom practice.

Function B: Teacher Collaboration

The teachers participate in high functioning professional learning communities to collaborate on the improvement of student learning through the study of relevant data, problem analysis and the implementation of strategies that improve instructional practice.

Function C: Evaluation, Feedback and Support

The staff participates in processes of evaluation that facilitate self-reflection and informs the process of professional growth.

Standard 6: Efficient and Effective Management

In high quality schools, efficient and effective management procedures assure that facilities, fiscal resources, personnel, and data and technology systems add value to student learning and comply with law and policy.

Function A: Facilities

Facilities are clean, well maintained, safe and secure, aesthetically pleasing, and configured to meet the learning needs of students.

Function B: Fiscal Resources

Policies and processes are established and applied to obtain, allocate and efficiently manage school fiscal resources.

Function C: Personnel

High quality personnel are selected according to West Virginia Code and are purposefully assigned and retained to effectively meet the identified needs of students.

Function D: Data, Information Systems, Technology Tools and Infrastructure

The school has appropriate technology infrastructure and utilizes data information systems and technology tools to support management, instructional delivery and student learning.

Standard 7: Continuous Improvement

In high quality schools, there is collective commitment to collaboratively identify, plan, implement, monitor, evaluate, and communicate the changes necessary to continuously increase student learning.

Function A: Focused and Coherent Plan

The staff establishes a coherent approach for improving the performance of students based on the mission and goals outlined in the strategic plan.

Function B: Processes and Structures

The staff has well-defined structures for building professional relationships and processes necessary to collaboratively engage all stakeholders in actions to increase student learning.

Function C: Monitoring for Results

The staff monitors changes in practice and implements adjustments, evaluates the results of student learning, and communicates the progress to all stakeholders.

Final Draft

Appendix E1: Waiver Comments from stakeholders

Comments from Stakeholders Regarding SIG and the Request for Waivers

- On behalf of Kanawha County Schools' Title I program, I applaud your efforts, the efforts of the Title I COP and the efforts of the WV SSOS members for their continued support in pursuing funding to provide assistance to our lowest performing school. This year, Kanawha County had five schools benefits from the funding and support provided under the first round of the SIG grant award. We are looking forward to continuing to working with the WVDE through the SIG program to continue these improvement efforts.

Again, thank you for your support -

Pam Padon
Director, Federal Programs Title I
Kanawha County Schools

- Berkeley County Schools has reviewed the 2010 SIG funding application and is in support of the requested waivers including the Tier II waiver, the school improvement timeline waiver, and waiver to the period of availability of funds.

Kim Hough, Federal Program Director

To: Jan Stanley, State Title I Director
From: Roy Wager, Federal Programs Director, Upshur County School
Committee of Practitioners Member
Re: School Improvement Grant and request for waivers

- As a member of the West Virginia Committee of Practitioners I have reviewed the Fy 2010 School Improvement Grant and waiver requests and am pleased to support the submission of this grant. This grant has been of great benefit to those low performing schools that otherwise may not have the funding to make the changes needed in order to improve achievement and allow students to gain the quality of education they deserve. I hope that you will look favorably upon this request.
- As a previous SIG grant recipient, I can attest to the enormous positive impact the grant has made and continues to make on school improvement at our lowest achieving school. Being able to provide the school with national presenters that have documented experience in school culture and instructional practices have completely transformed the school in a very short period of time. In addition, assistance provided by the WVDE in terms of specific professional development and the assignment of a WVDE school liaison has been a key to the recent success of the school. With the support and assistance of the WVDE, we feel confident that the school will again make AYP this year and no longer be on improvement.

John Merritt, Federal Programs Director, Wood County Schools

- As a member of West Virginia's Committee of Practitioners, I have reviewed West Virginia's application for funding from fiscal year 2010 School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I support the request for the three waivers made in the SEA's application:
 - Waiver 1: Tier II waiver (waiver of SEA requirement)
 - Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver (waiver of LEA requirement); and
 - Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver (period of availability waiver).



John Ford, Title I Coordinator
West Virginia Department of Education

- I am commenting on the waiver request the state is submitting to the federal government concerning extending the period of availability of the funds until Sept. 2014, allowing schools that implement a turnaround model to start over in the improvement timeline, and substituting a definition for persistently lowest-achieving schools. I am in agreement with the waiver request and I believe it will be profitable for our schools.

Thank you,
Dr. Sarah Lee Brown
Director C & I and Title I
Summers County Board of Education

- Mrs. Stanley,

Thank you for allow me to review the SIG grant application and waiver letter. I want to commend you and your staff for the hard work and dedication to the federal programs. As a stakeholder in the process, I am proud of the work. Last year our county applied for a SIG grant, but was not successful. Perhaps this year we will be more successful.

David Albani, Title I Director
Mineral County Schools

- I have reviewed the application and am in support of both the application and the waivers. I am confident that the process which was used for the 2009 application, which was funded, satisfies the intent of the application is appropriate to be identified in the 2010 application. If additional information is needed, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your work on this project.

Lori Wiggins
Executive Director
Office of Professional Preparation, WVDE

- I suppose this email will serve as the comments concerning the application and a statement of support for the application of waivers. I am in support of both.

Mary Ann Freeman, Federal Program Director
Fayette County Schools

Appendix E2- Consultation with Stakeholders

Memorandum

To: West Virginia District Title I Directors
West Virginia Title I Committee of Practitioners
West Virginia Office of School Improvement
West Virginia Statewide System of Support

From: Jan Stanley, State Title I Director

Re: Consultation with Stakeholders for the 1003(g) School Improvement Funds

Date: November 19, 2010

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA, are grants to LEAs for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to substantially raise the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. In accordance with the final requirements published in the Federal Register in October 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (Tier I schools) and, at an LEA's option, persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds (Tier II schools). An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools (Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. A list of the schools eligible for these grants is posted on the WVDE Title I website.

As part of the State application process, West Virginia (WV) must consult with stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant. A copy of West Virginia's School Improvement Grant (SIG) application is included with this notification. Please review the application and provide feedback concerning the application.

Comments concerning WV's School Improvement Grant should be submitted to Jan Stanley at jstanley@access.k12.wv.us before Monday, November 29, 2010.

Appendix E: Waiver Notification to Districts

Memorandum

To: Select District Title I Directors

From: Jan Stanley, State Title I Director

Re: Waivers for the 1003(g) School Improvement Funds

Date: November 19, 2010

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA, are grants to LEAs for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to substantially raise the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. In accordance with the final requirements published in the Federal Register in October 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (Tier I schools) and, at an LEA's option, persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds (Tier II schools). An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools (Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. A list of the schools eligible for these grants is posted on the WVDE Title I website.

As part of the State application process, West Virginia (WV) must notify LEAs of any waiver requests submitted to the federal government. WV is requesting a waiver of the federal requirements listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

Waiver of SEA Requirements

Tier II Waiver

- 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

Appendix E: Waiver Notification to Districts

lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematic combined.

Waivers of LEA Requirements

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 schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

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 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

The State believes that the requested waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to substantially raise the achievement of students in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Comments concerning WV's intent to apply for the aforementioned waivers should be submitted to Suzette Cook at scCook@access.k12.wv.us on or before noon on Monday, November 29, 2010.

Appendix F: Website posting for waivers

West Virginia Seeks Waivers of Title I Regulations

This press release is posted on the WVDE website at <http://wvde.state.wv.us/news/2209/>.

The West Virginia Department of Education is seeking waivers of federal regulations concerning School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The grants are distributed through state educational agencies, such as the West Virginia Department of Education, to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Schools that receive such funding must demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources to substantially raise the achievement of their students, including helping schools make adequate yearly progress and raise exit improvement status.

In accordance with the final requirements published in the Federal Register in October 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on each state's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (Tier I schools) and, at an LEA's option, persistently lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I, Part A funds (Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools (Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II schools that an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

West Virginia's waiver request 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.

West Virginia Department of Education officials believe that the requested waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. The waivers will enable LEAs to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to substantially raise the achievement of students in West Virginia's persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The requests include:

Waiver of SEA Requirements

Tier II Waiver

- 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.

Waivers of LEA Requirements

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 schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

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 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

For more information, contact Jan Stanley, state Title I director, at (304) 558-7805, or the Office of Communications at (304) 558-2699.