

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: Oklahoma State Department of Education Attention: Dr. Cindy Koss 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Dr. Cindy Koss Position and Office: Assistant State Superintendent, Office of Standards and Curriculum Contact's Mailing Address: <div style="text-align: center;"> Dr. Cindy Koss 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105 </div> Telephone: (405) 521-4514 Fax: (405) 521-2971 Email address: Cindy_Koss@sde.state.ok.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Sandy Garrett	Telephone: (405) 521-3301
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.	

Contents:

Section A: SEA Requirements

Eligible Schools

Definition of Persistently Low-achieving Schools

Section B: Evaluation Criteria

Part 1

Part 2

Section C: Capacity

Section D: Descriptive Information

Section E: Assurances

Section F: SEA Reservation

Section G: Consultation with Stakeholders

Section H: Waivers

PART I: STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY (SEA) REQUIREMENTS

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

The following list identifies each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III eligible school in Oklahoma. Oklahoma has elected not to identify newly eligible schools, made eligible by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. Local educational agencies (LEA) with Tier I and Tier II schools will receive their funds from the Title I 1003(g) ARRA and Regular 1003(g) School Improvement Grants. The LEA may apply for funds ranging from \$50,000-\$2,000,000 per each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school annually for up to three years. LEAs with Tier III schools will be funded according to rank order and the availability of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds.

LEA Name	NCES ID #	School Name	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE	REASON SKIPPED
Tulsa PS	403024	Gilcrease MS	403024002280	X					
Crutch PS	400915	Crutch ES	400915000386	X					
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Douglass MS	402277002354	X					
Tulsa PS	403024	Clinton MS	403024001601	X					
Oklahoma City PS	402277	F.D. Moon Academy ES	402277001126	X					
Oklahoma City PS	402277	U.S. Grant HS	402277001139	X			X		
Tulsa PS	403024	East Central HS	403024001607	X			X		
Tulsa PS	403024	Nathan Hale HS	403024001653	X			X		
Tulsa PS	403024	Will Rogers HS	403024001679	X			X		
Tulsa PS	403024	Central HS	403024001596	X			X		
Tulsa PS	403024	Daniel Webster HS	403024001596	X			X		
Atoka PS	400336	Atoka HS	400336000084		X				
Colcord PS	400825	Colcord HS	400825029663		X				
Tulsa PS	403024	Memorial HS	403024001650		X				
Wetumka PS	403243	Wetumka HS	403243001797		X				
Wewoka PS	403246	Wewoka HS	403246001801		X				
Millwood PS	402008	Millwood HS	402008002068		X				
Jay PS	401569	Jay HS	401569000736		X				
Kiefer PS	401650	Kiefer HS	401650000768		X				

Porum PS	402484	Porum HS	402484001307		X				
Watts PS	403186	Watts ES	403186001761			X			
Erick PS	401104	Erick ES	401104000525			X			
Vinita PS	403129	Hall-Halsell ES	403129001730			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Coolidge ES	402277001125			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Emerson Alternative ES	402277002325			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Rockwood ES	402277001181			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Willow Brook ES	402277001207			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Jefferson MS	402277001150			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	NE Academy Health/Sci/Engineering MS	402277001167			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Oklahoma Centennial MS	402277002405			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Santa Fe South MS	402277002386			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Star Spencer HS	402277001192			X			
Okmulgee PS	402280	Okmulgee ES	402280001211			X			
Tulsa PS	403024	McClure ES	403024029789			X			
Tulsa PS	403024	Byrd MS	403024001591			X			
Tulsa PS	403024	Lewis and Clark MS	403024001636			X			
Tulsa PS	403024	Franklin Youth Academy MS	403024002662			X			
Muskogee PS	402097	Muskogee 7 th & 8 th Grade Center	402097000599			X			
Jay PS	401569	Jay MS	401569000737			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Rogers MS	402277001182			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Roosevelt MS	402277001183			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Taft MS	402277001196			X			

Union PS	403060	Briarglen ES	403060001701			X			
Oklahoma City PS	402277	Webster MS	402277001202			X			

DEFINITION OF PERSISTENTLY LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

Tier I Definition of Persistently Lowest Performing Schools

These schools were identified based on the following definitions.

Tier I

Persistently lowest achieving schools include:

- (a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that –
 - (i) Is among the lowest achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in Oklahoma; 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.

To determine the schools among the lowest achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the following process was used:

1. All Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the 2008-2009 state reading and mathematics assessments used for adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations. These percents included all students who took tests administered through the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests, Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program, and the Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program. (Note: For the purposes of this ranking process, there were no caps placed on the number of students scoring proficient on the Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program or Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program tests.) Schools were each assigned points based on their rank so that the school with the lowest percent proficient received a score of 35 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.

2. All Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced for five years (2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08) on the state reading and mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations. These percents included all students who took tests administered through the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests, Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program, and the Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program. (Note: For the purposes of this ranking process, there were no caps placed on the number of students scoring proficient on the Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program or Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program tests.) Schools were each assigned points based on their rank so that the school with the lowest percent proficient received a score of 35 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

3. Because it is more difficult for high schools to show progress over a number of years since only one reading and one mathematics test used for AYP determinations are administered in high schools, elementary schools were given additional points. Elementary schools were assigned an additional 35 points, and high schools were assigned an additional 0 points.
 - a. Elementary schools are schools serving no students in Grades 9-12.
 - b. High schools are schools serving students in Grades 9-12, including schools that serve only a portion of these grades and schools that serve additional grades but include students in Grades 9-12.
4. Total points for each Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were determined by multiplying the points assigned in step 1 by 1.5, adding the points assigned in step 2, and adding the points assigned in step 3.
5. Schools were ordered based on their total points. The five schools with the highest total points were identified.

To determine the high schools that have 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, the following process was used:

1. High schools are schools serving students in Grades 9-12, including schools that serve only a portion of these grades and schools that serve additional grades but include students in Grades 9-12.
2. The graduation rates used for AYP determinations of all Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were averaged for five years (2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09).
3. All Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with an average graduation rate less than 60 percent were identified.

Tier II

Persistently lowest achieving schools include:

- (b) 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 in Oklahoma that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds; 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.

To determine the schools among the lowest achieving five percent of secondary schools in Oklahoma that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the following process was used:

1. Five percent of the 182 secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds is 9 schools.

2. Secondary schools are schools serving students in Grades 9-12, including schools that serve only a portion of these grades and schools that serve additional grades but include students in Grades 9-12.
3. Only secondary schools that tested a minimum of 30 students on the state reading and mathematics tests used for AYP determinations in 2008-09 were considered. This minimum number was determined based on the reliability of scores as approved in Oklahoma's Accountability Workbook. This eliminated 87 schools from consideration.
4. All secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds that meet the requirement in step 3 were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the 2008-2009 state reading and mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations. These percents included all students who took tests administered through the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests, Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program, and the Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program. (Note: For the purposes of this ranking process, there were no caps placed on the number of students scoring proficient on the Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program or Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program tests.) Schools were each assigned points based on their rank so that the school with the lowest percent proficient received a score of 95 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.
5. All secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced for five years (2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08) on the state reading and mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations. These percents included all students who took tests administered through the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests, Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program, and the Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program. (Note: For the purposes of this ranking process, there were no caps placed on the number of students scoring proficient on the Oklahoma Modified Alternative Assessment Program or Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program tests.) Schools were each assigned points based on their rank so that the school with the lowest percent proficient received a score of 95 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.
6. Total points for each secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds were determined by multiplying the points assigned in step 4 by 1.5 and adding the points assigned in step 5.
7. Schools were ordered based on their total points. The nine schools with the highest total points were identified.

To determine the high schools that have 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, the following process was used:

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

1. High schools are schools serving students in Grades 9-12, including schools that serve only a portion of these grades and schools that serve additional grades but include students in Grades 9-12.
2. The graduation rates used for AYP determinations of all high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds were averaged for five years (2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09).
3. There were no high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds with an average graduation rate less than 60 percent.

Tier III

All Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring not already identified for Tier I or Tier II were identified for Tier III.

SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA- An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth in the LEA's application.

Part 1-Section B

The SEA anticipates that LEAs will have undertaken preliminary work prior to receiving final approval for the grant funding. The requirements described in this section constitute the LEA's baseline information about the planning underway to ensure successful implementation and sustainability. Oklahoma will expect the implementation of LEA reform models to occur at the **beginning** of the 2010-11 school year.

(1) The SEA has assured that 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 model, using the following process:

Oklahoma will require each LEA to address and demonstrate the requirements of this section. The information will be submitted in the LEA application for a 1003(g) school improvement grant. The SEA will evaluate the information provided to the extent to which the LEA 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 by requiring the LEA to complete a comprehensive needs assessment as part of the application process for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it elects to serve with SIG funds.

To meet the requirements of this part, the LEA must:

- Analyze multiple sources of data based on *Oklahoma's Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators* (see Appendices), which may include, but is not limited to student and staff profiles; student achievement data; curriculum analysis data, state and local assessment data; instructional practices inventories; focus walks; school culture surveys; student, family and community surveys and demographic information;

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

professional growth and development inventories and evaluations,; leadership evaluations; organizational charts and job description; previous budgets and resource allocations; and results of previous annual plan reviews and updates, and provide in its application a detailed summary of this analysis.

- Identify, based on the results of the data analysis and needs assessment, an intervention model for each Tier I and Tier II school the district elects to serve and demonstrate in the application, and provide a narrative describing the correlation between the results of the data analysis, needs assessment report, and chosen model.
- The LEA will consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

The following rubric will be used by the SEA to evaluate the requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data sources used in analysis or summary of analysis is nonexistent. • The identified model is not supported by the data analysis or needs assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few data sources (2-3) were used in analysis, or analysis is lacking. • The identified model is partially supported by the data analysis and needs assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple data sources (4 or more) were used and have been summarized into a meaningful analysis based on School Profile indicators in the LEA application. • The identified model is fully supported by the data analysis and needs assessment.

(2) The LEA will have the opportunity to demonstrate 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.

LEAs should consider school, district, and community capacity when selecting an intervention model, as each intervention model requires unique responsibilities of those involved. The criteria the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) will use to evaluate the LEA’s capacity to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention in each school will be evaluated according to the indicators listed below:

Indicators	Model(s) of Intervention
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has outlined its design and implementation activities for each intervention model. A detailed and realistic timeline has been established. The person/position for providing leadership for each requirement of the intervention has been determined. 	All Models

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

Indicators	Model(s) of Intervention
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has demonstrated that it has involved and received commitment to support from relevant stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, teachers' unions (if appropriate), parents, students, and outside community members in activities related to decision making, choosing an intervention model, and/or development of the model's design. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff with the credentials and capacity to implement the selected intervention successfully has been identified. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability of the LEA to serve the identified Tier I and Tier II schools has been addressed. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to recruit new principals with the necessary credentials and capacity has been demonstrated. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has conducted a strategic planning process that supports the selection and implementation of the chosen model. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has developed three-year budgets that directly align to the activities and strategies stated in the plan. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has developed a monitoring plan that encompasses multiple visits to each school and requires evidence of effective LEA interventions if there is limited student academic success. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has plans to add at least an hour of additional instructional time per day, or adopt alternative/extended school-year calendars that add time beyond the additional hour of instructional time per day for each identified Tier I and Tier II school to be served. 	Transformation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has established an LEA Turnaround Office or Officer(s) that will be responsible for the day-to-day management of reform efforts at the school level and coordinating with the SEA. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has made a commitment to expand teachers' capacity to plan collaboratively in the academic areas where students fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has identified a 1003(g) Turnaround Team and/or a Turnaround Program Contact that meets regularly with SEA staff to discuss progress of schools. Turnaround Teams and/or Turnaround Program Contact are highly knowledgeable educators who specialize in school improvement, understand culture and climate, and relate well to stakeholders. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart

Turnaround Teams and/or Turnaround Program Contact must also demonstrate that they communicate regularly with the LEA administrative team, including the LEA Superintendent.	
• The LEA has demonstrated, through past grant applications, that they have sound fiscal management with limited audit findings.	All Models
• The LEA has completed a self assessment of its own capacity to design, support, monitor and assess the implementation of the models and strategies that it selects for its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.	All Models
• The LEA has demonstrated a commitment to the sustainability of the intervention model after the funding is no longer available.	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
• The LEA has access and proximity to higher achieving schools, including but not limited to charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.	School Closure
• The LEA completes the grant application within the timelines set forth in the application.	All Models
• Assurances are signed and submitted with the application.	All Models

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate the requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
• None of the indicators for the chosen intervention model have been demonstrated or fully addressed in the LEA application.	• Most of the above indicators for the chosen intervention model are demonstrated by the district and have been fully addressed in the LEA application.	• All of the above indicators for the chosen intervention model are demonstrated by the district and have been fully addressed in the LEA application.

(3) LEA budgets 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 each Tier III school throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

LEAs will be required to submit a separate budget narrative and budget pages for each identified school the district elects to serve. The LEA will be evaluated according to the extent it meets the criteria for this part listed below:

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

- The budget narrative must describe, in detail, the needs of the particular school in implementing all required components of the chosen model, a description of proposed initiatives, services, and/or materials, and the responsibility of the LEA and the school for timely distribution of funds during each year of the grant.
- The budget narrative must also describe in detail, how the LEA will meet and fund the additional requirements of this grant:
 - Establish an LEA-based Turnaround Office or Turnaround Officer(s) that will be responsible for the day-to-day management of reform efforts at the site level and coordinate and communicate with the SEA;
 - Provide at least ninety (90) minutes of protected collaboration time per week for each teacher to work in professional learning communities;
 - Provide at least five (5) days of site-based training as well as a five (5) day teacher academy or institute for each teacher in each Tier I and Tier II school to be served;
 - Provide additional training on the chosen intervention model and process aligned to the chosen model for new teachers that join turnaround schools after the start of implementation.
- Summary budget pages and justification pages for each school for each year of the grant will be required. A summary budget page and justification page will also be required of the district which includes totals of all schools in each function/object code and additional initiatives, services, and materials that will be provided at the district level.
- Budgets submitted must match the number of designated schools and be aligned to the models selected for each school. Budgets should not be less than the minimum amount of \$50,000 and should not exceed the maximum allowable amount of \$2,000,000 for each Tier I and Tier II school identified during each of the three years over the period of availability of the grant (2010-2011; 2011-2012; and 2012-2013).
- Budgets submitted for Tier III schools should not be less than the minimum amount of \$50,000 and should not exceed the maximum allowable amount of \$2,000,000 for each Tier III school identified during each of the three years over the period of availability of the grant (2010-2011; 2011-2012; and 2012-2013).
- LEA budget must be signed by the LEA Superintendent and the designated financial officer.

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate the requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.** Additionally, budget summary and justification pages will be reviewed by the SEA Title I Office for accuracy.

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the required budget criteria are adequately addressed. • None of the additional grant requirements have been addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet. • The LEA has not funded the required components of the chosen intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the required budget criteria have been adequately addressed. • Most of the additional grant requirements have been addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet. • The LEA has sufficiently funded most of the required components of the chosen intervention model, considering the needs assessment and the LEA's ability to align other resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All required budget criteria have been adequately addressed. • All of the additional grant requirements have been addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet. • The LEA has sufficiently funded all of the required components of the chosen intervention model, considering the needs assessment and the LEA's ability to align other resources.

Part 2-Section B

The requirements included in this section are actions that the LEA may have taken prior to submitting a grant application. It is likely the actions will be undertaken after approval of the grant application. The LEA is required to provide information regarding the following with relation to each Tier I and Tier II school it elects to serve:

- (1) The LEA will complete an Action Plan for each school it elects to serve in Tier I and Tier II specifically addressing how the **design and implementation of interventions will be consistent with the final requirements** of the chosen intervention model and submit the Action Plans to the SEA as part of the LEA application. Action Plans will include a description of the action steps necessary for implementation, a timeline for implementation, and a list of persons responsible for the actions and a description of the following additional factors.

Additional factors the SEA will consider when evaluating the LEA's commitment to the design and implementation of the final requirements of the selected intervention model(s) include:

- The LEA has staff in place with the credentials and capacity to design and implement the selected intervention model(s) while still meeting local needs;
- The LEA has committed time and resources to adequately facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of the selected intervention model(s);

- The LEA has an ongoing diagnostic process in place that will inform the design and implementation of the selected intervention model(s); and
- The LEA has demonstrated adequate capacity, as defined in Part 1 Section B of this application, to implement the selected intervention model(s).

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate each requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Plan is not complete or does not provide adequate information regarding the intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Plan adequately addresses most of the requirements of the intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Plan fully addresses all the requirements of the intervention model which includes the timeline, person responsible, and specific actions, including the additional factors identified above.

- (2) The LEA will develop a written procedure/policy to **recruit, screen, and select external providers**, if applicable, to ensure their quality and submit this written process with the LEA application. The written procedure/policy must include the following steps:
- Analyze the LEA/school operational needs and articulate specific goals and expectations for the provider;
 - Research and prioritize available providers, which may include contacting other LEAs that have used the provider;
 - Engage parents and other stakeholders in the review and selection process;
 - Evaluate the external provider’s progress toward goals and expectations; and
 - Define consequences for the provider if goals and/or expectations are not met (i.e., termination of contract).

The LEA will also submit in the application, a detailed justification for the selection of external providers that takes into consideration the needs of the identified Tier I and Tier II schools to be served. The justification must include the following criteria:

- History of success working with the LEA, school, or a particular population;
- Alignment of external provider and existing LEA services or initiatives;
- Capacity of external provider to serve the identified Tier I or Tier II school and its selected intervention.

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate the requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has not developed a written procedure/policy for recruiting and selecting external providers and no procedure/policy exists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has a written procedure/policy for recruiting and selecting external providers, but the policy addresses only some of the bullet points identified above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has fully developed a clear and specific written procedure/policy for recruiting and selecting external providers that fully addresses each requirement identified in the bullet points above.

(3) The LEA will complete an Integration of Services chart showing how the LEA and school will align **other resources with the interventions** and submit this chart as part of the LEA application. Resources LEAs may consider when completing the Integration of Services chart include:

Resource	Model(s)	Examples of Alignment with 1003(g)
Title I, Part A	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipends for teachers attending professional development Supplemental instructional materials for extended school hours
Title II, Part A	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration and travel for teachers attending National Conferences and Workshops Salary for instructional facilitator to provide ongoing professional development and coaching
Title II, Part D	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional technology to be integrated into core subjects Increased capacity of current data system to promote use of data by all teachers
Title III, Part A	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development in strategies for English Language Learners

Oklahoma State AAA Program	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	The AAA program became effective in Oklahoma law, July 1, 2005. The program provides monetary awards to qualified school employees that attain the: (1) highest overall student achievement and (2) the highest annual improvement in student achievement as measured by the Academic performance Index (API) in each of five groups based upon Average Daily membership. The law provides for the determination of the school sites in each of the five groups that achieve the highest score for categories one and two mentioned above.
----------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate the requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has integrated no resources to support the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has integrated limited resources (1-2) to support the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has fully integrated multiple (3 or more) resources to support the selected intervention model.

- (4) The LEA will describe how it has or plans to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively and submit the narrative with the LEA application. Examples of policy changes LEAs may adopt include:
- o Providing flexibility in hiring practices at the school site;
 - o Scheduling protected collaborative planning time;
 - o Changing the structure of a high school to enhance learning opportunities (i.e., small learning communities, dual-enrollment, credit-recovery programs).

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate the requirements of this part on the LEA application. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval is granted.**

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has provided no policy change to enable schools to implement the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has changed some policy or policies to match the necessary requirements of selected intervention(s) to enable schools to implement interventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has changed policy or policies to match the necessary requirements of selected intervention(s) or altered policies that will affect the implementation of the selected intervention(s) as appropriate.

(5) The LEA will provide a plan for **sustaining the reforms after the funding period ends** and submit the plan as part of the LEA application. LEAs must provide evidence of the following indicators:

- All stakeholders, including school staff, parents, and members of the larger community, were involved in the planning phase and will share leadership throughout implementation;
- There are written plans in place for transition, including staffing, funding, exit of external providers (including Charter Management Organizations and Education Management Organizations), and changes in leadership;
- The LEA has in place a strategic planning process that utilizes Oklahoma’s Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE) Web-based planning and coaching tool;
- The LEA has a system of formative and summative data collection in place;
- Other funding sources are available or are being actively sought to enable the school to continue initiatives; and
- The Title I, Part A schoolwide plan includes goals and action steps that will sustain the reform, and a budget has been created to coordinate federal, state, and local funding to continue the intervention model.

Sustainability will be measured in the LEA-submitted application based on the description of factors such as the use of professional development to sustain the implemented strategies to improve student achievement, including the description of the use of the train-the-trainers model, as appropriate. The establishment of scheduling and processes that allow for teacher collaboration and teaming that produces more effective and efficient delivery of instruction will be an additional factor. A description of the plan for more effective and efficient communication strategies to involve parents and community will be a factor as well.

LEA application. **Note that a Level III in all areas must be met before approval is granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has addressed none of the indicators of sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has addressed a few (3 or less) of the indicators of sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has fully and thoughtfully addressed all the indicators of sustainability.

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

In addition, the LEA will be required to address its commitment to utilize the School Support Teams and Educational Leadership Coaching, as applicable, and its commitment to attend all required SEA school improvement meetings and conferences including, but not limited to:

- What Works in Schools: Phase I and II
- Pre-Data Retreat Leadership Meeting
- Summer Data Retreat
- 1003(g) Implementation Meetings

SECTION 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.

Once the SEA determines the schools eligible to receive funds under the 1003(g) competitive funds, the LEA will be contacted by the SEA. The LEA will receive all information regarding the requirements of the four intervention models and the requirements in the LEA application. Further, the LEA will be informed that it must serve each of its Tier I and Tier II schools using one of the four intervention models, unless the LEA lacks the capacity to serve all schools identified as Tier I and Tier II.

If after SEA review of the claim of Lack of Capacity and the required Capacity Chart below, the SEA determines an LEA has more capacity than it has claimed, the SEA will:

1. Notify the LEA of the SEA’s decision and require the LEA to provide additional evidence to support the lack of capacity claim within two weeks of such notice.
2. Provide technical assistance and support to the LEA to increase capacity to serve eligible Tier I and Tier II schools.
3. Require the LEA to submit a revised LEA application including the eligible schools. LEAs will have a two-week time period in which to submit an amended application.

The OSDE will use the chart also included in Part 1, Section B, (2) to determine district capacity.

Indicators	Model(s) of Intervention
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has outlined its design and implementation activities for each intervention model. A detailed and realistic timeline has been established. The person/position for providing leadership for each requirement of the intervention has been determined. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has demonstrated that it has involved and received commitment to support from relevant stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, teachers’ unions (if appropriate), parents, students, and outside community members in activities related to decision making, choosing an intervention model, and/or development of the model’s design. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff with the credentials and capacity to implement the selected intervention successfully has been identified. 	All Models

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability of the LEA to serve the identified Tier I and Tier II schools has been addressed. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to recruit new principals with the necessary credentials and capacity has been demonstrated. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has conducted a strategic planning process that involves all stakeholders and supports the selection and implementation of the chosen model. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has developed three-year budgets that directly align to the activities and strategies stated in the plan. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has developed a monitoring plan that encompasses multiple visits to each school and requires evidence of effective LEA interventions if there is limited student academic success. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has plans to add at least an hour of additional instructional time per day, or adopt alternative/extended school-year calendars that add time beyond the additional hour of instructional time per day for each identified Tier I and Tier II school to be served. 	Transformation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has established an LEA Turnaround Office or Officer(s) that will be responsible for the day-to-day management of reform efforts at the school level and coordinating with the SEA. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has made a commitment to expand teachers' capacity to plan collaboratively in the academic areas where students fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has identified a 1003(g) Turnaround Team and/or a Turnaround Program Contact that meets regularly with the SEA to discuss progress of schools. Turnaround Teams and/or Turnaround Program Contact are highly knowledgeable educators who specialize in school improvement, understand culture and climate, and relate well to stakeholders. Turnaround Teams and/or Turnaround Program Contact must also demonstrate that they communicate regularly with the LEA administrative team, including the LEA Superintendent. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has demonstrated, through past grant applications, that they have sound fiscal management with limited audit findings. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has completed a self-assessment of its own capacity to design, support, monitor and assess the implementation of the models and strategies that it selects for its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. 	All Models

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has demonstrated a commitment of the sustainability of the intervention model after the funding is no longer available. 	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has access and proximity to higher achieving schools, including but not limited to charter schools or new schools for which achievement data is not yet available. 	School Closure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA completes the grant application within the timelines set forth in the application. 	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assurances are signed and submitted with the application. 	All Models

The SEA will also consider the following factors, as applicable:

- The commitment of the LEA, school staff, parents, and community to the implementation of the intervention model;
- The history of service provided by the LEA to the schools over a number of years;
- The number of central office staff members;
- The availability of other district resources; and
- The number of schools identified as Tier I or Tier II within the LEA.

This information will be reviewed by a state review team.

SECTION D: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

(1) Oklahoma’s process and timeline for approving LEA applications is as follows:

Upon approval of the SEA application, the SEA will commit to the following timeline for approving LEA applications:

Action Step	Date
1. SEA will distribute the LEA grant applications to all eligible LEAs via e-mail and postal mail.	Tuesday, April 20, 2010
2. SEA will provide a technical assistance meeting for all LEAs that intend to submit an application.	Friday, April 30, 2010 and Wednesday, May 5, 2010
3. The SEA will provide a videoconference for technical assistance with guidelines and applications.	Wednesday, April 28, 2010
4. Time will be provided for the LEAs to develop applications, and receive technical assistance from the SEA via videoconference, technical assistance meetings, and other trainings as necessary.	Tuesday, April 20, 2010 – Thursday, May 20, 2010
5. Original copy of LEA application is due to the SEA.	Thursday, May 20, 2010
6. SEA panel will review the application and feedback will be provided to the LEA.	Thursday, May 20, 2010 – Wednesday, May 26, 2010

7. LEA applications will be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education.	Thursday, May 27, 2010
8. All approved LEAs will be posted on the OSDE Web site.	Monday, June 7, 2010
9. Initial Implementation Meeting	Tuesday, June 8, 2010
10. 2010-2011 School Year Implementation of Selected Intervention(s)	2010-2011 School Year

(2) The SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s school improvement grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the indicators in Section III of the final requirements is as follows:

The initial goals of the Tier I and Tier II schools will be approved within the LEA application for 1003(g) school improvement grant funds. Goals will be evaluated on the extent to which they are SMART: sustainable, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. Additionally, the SEA will provide information and technical assistance to LEAs in creating SMART goals.

The SEA will use the following rubric to evaluate the initial goals established by the Tier I and Tier II schools. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval can be granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals do not include any components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals include fewer than 2 components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals are clearly defined and include all components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.

The SEA has established two methods of ongoing monitoring and evaluation of goals for Tier I and Tier II schools. The SEA will perform School Support Team (SST) visits at each Tier I and Tier II school receiving 1003(g) funds, based on priority need. The primary function of the SST visits is to review and analyze all facets of a school’s implementation of the identified intervention model and collaborate with leadership, staff, and other stakeholders pertinent to goal attainment. In addition, schools identified in Tier I and Tier II will be required to utilize Oklahoma’s Web-based planning tool, Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE). This online planning and coaching tool will allow the SEA and SST to continuously monitor progress towards goals. The coaching feature of this online system also provides opportunity for the Tier I and Tier II schools to communicate with their assigned Educational Leadership Coach and the SEA.

The SEA also has in place a process to annually review the extent to which the LEA has met its goals and to determine whether to renew an LEA’s application. Three times a year, the LEA will submit a School Improvement Status Report (SISR) for each Tier I and Tier II school receiving Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

school improvement grant funds. This report will require the LEA to report on progress toward the goals and provide supportive documentation as evidence of progress. In this report, LEAs must report progress being made toward established goals and provide additional data to the SEA including, but not limited to:

- Number of minutes within the school year;
- Participation rate on state assessments by student subgroup;
- Dropout rate, if applicable;
- Graduation rate, if applicable;
- Student attendance rate;
- Number of students enrolled in advanced coursework or dual-enrollment classes, if applicable;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truancy rate;
- Distribution of teachers by experience and student achievement; and
- Teacher attendance rate.

The SEA will review the SISRs to evaluate annually the progress the LEA has made toward established goals by using the following process:

- The SEA will review the initial goals established by the LEA.
- The SEA will collect and analyze the state academic achievement and graduation rate data for each Tier I and Tier II school.
- The SEA will compare the initial goal set by the LEA to the data.
- If the data has a greater value than the measurable outcome of the initial LEA goal, the goal will be considered met.

LEAs or schools reporting little or no progress towards the goals set in the plan on the School Improvement Status Report will receive intensive support from the SEA through SST visits, the WISE planning and coaching tool, and other differentiated technical assistance. All efforts will be made to ensure each Tier I and Tier II schools has the support it needs to meet the goals. However, in the instance that a school does not meet the goals set forth in the application despite technical assistance efforts, the SEA will review the grant application and determine eligibility for renewal.

(3) 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 is as follows:

The initial goals of the Tier III schools will be approved within the LEA application for 1003(g) school improvement grant funds. Goals will be evaluated on the extent to which they are SMART: sustainable, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. Additionally, the SEA will provide information and technical assistance to LEAs in creating SMART goals.

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

The SEA will use the following rubric to evaluate the initial goals established by the Tier III schools. **Note that a Level III must be met before approval can be granted.**

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals do not include any components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals include 3 or fewer components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals are clearly defined and include all components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.

The SEA has established two methods of ongoing monitoring and evaluation of goals for Tier III schools. The SEA will perform School Support Team (SST) visits at each Tier III school receiving 1003(g) funds, based on priority need. The primary function of the SST visits is to review and analyze all facets of a school’s implementation of the identified intervention model and collaborate with leadership, staff, and other stakeholders pertinent to goal attainment. In addition, schools identified in Tier III will be required to utilize Oklahoma’s Web-based planning and coaching tool, Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE). This online planning and coaching tool will allow the SEA and SST to continuously monitor progress towards goals. The coaching feature of this online system also provides opportunity for the Tier III schools to communicate with their assigned Educational Leadership Coach and the SEA.

The SEA also has in place a process to annually review the extent to which the LEA has met its goals and to determine whether to renew an LEA’s application. Three times a year, the LEA will submit a School Improvement Status Report (SISR) for each Tier III school receiving school improvement grant funds. This report will require the LEA to report on progress toward the goals and provide supportive documentation as evidence of progress. In this report, LEAs must report progress being made toward established goals and provide additional data to the SEA including, but not limited to:

- Number of minutes within the school year;
- Participation rate on state assessments by student subgroup;
- Dropout rate, if applicable;
- Graduation rate, if applicable;
- Student attendance rate;
- Number of students enrolled in advanced coursework or dual-enrollment classes, if applicable;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truancy rate;
- Distribution of teachers by experience and student achievement; and
- Teacher attendance rate.

The SEA will review the SISRs to evaluate annually the progress the LEA has made toward established goals by using the following process:

- The SEA will review the initial goals established by the LEA.
- The SEA will collect and analyze the state academic achievement and graduation rate data for each Tier III school.
- The SEA will compare the initial goal set by the LEA to the data.
- If the data has a greater value than the measurable outcome of the initial LEA goal, the goal will be considered met.

LEAs or schools reporting little or no progress towards the goals set in the plan on the School Improvement Status Report (SISR) will receive intensive support from the SEA through SST visits, the WISE planning and coaching tool, and other differentiated technical assistance. All efforts will be made to ensure each Tier III school has the support it needs to meet the goals. However, in the instance that a school does not meet the goals set forth in the application despite technical assistance efforts, the SEA will review the grant application and determine eligibility for renewal.

The SEA has established actions LEAs must take in order to achieve renewal of the grant. Actions include, but are not limited to:

- Reanalysis of results of initial needs assessment and/or incorporating a needs assessment by an external provider, including the Marzano Research Laboratory Study;
- Changing the selected intervention model to more closely align with needs;
- Replacing the principal or staff that have been ineffective in implementing the intervention model;
- Making significant and data-driven decisions to the grant budget;
- Allowing for more policy change and increase flexibility to enable implementation of the intervention; and
- Creating additional student instructional time.

All efforts will be made to ensure each Tier III school has the support it needs to meet the goals. However, in the instance that a school does not meet the goals set forth in the application despite technical assistance efforts, the SEA will review the grant application and determine eligibility for renewal.

(4) 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, using the following process:

In addition to the methods of monitoring and evaluation described in Sections (2) and (3) of this part, three formal School Support Team visits that produce three formal School Improvement Status Reports, and the WISE online planning and coaching tool progress review will be ongoing (at least quarterly). The SEA will have progress meetings with the school leadership team, parent and community representatives, and district personnel to determine the fidelity to which the Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

intervention model is being implemented (initial, interim, and end of year). Monthly coaching will occur for those Tier I schools identified for restructuring.

- **Initial Implementation Meeting:**

Upon approval of the LEA application, the SEA will discuss the approved SIG grant with school and district staff to ensure that all parties are familiar with the requirements of the intervention models and understand the approved goals, implementation strategies, and the consequences for not making progress toward meeting the goals.

- **Interim Implementation Meeting:**

After the second School Improvement Status Report is submitted to the SEA, the SEA review panel, SSTs, and external evaluators will conduct a detailed review of the progress being made toward the established goals and the fidelity to which the intervention model is being implemented.

- **End of Year Implementation Meeting:**

After the third School Improvement Status Report, members of the SEA review panel, SSTs and external evaluators will analyze the SST reports, the comprehensive needs assessment conducted by Marzano Research Laboratory, and relevant school data, including state student achievement data to determine the progress made toward meeting the established goals and the fidelity to which the intervention model has been implemented. The end-of-the-year meeting will also review successes, challenges, and opportunities to improve in the next school year. Data reviewed in the End-of-the-Year Implementation Meeting may include, but is not limited to:

- Student academic and state achievement data;
- WISE planning and coaching tool reports;
- Feedback from faculty, staff, parents and students through surveys;
- Progress toward improvement in the indicators included on the SISR;
- Staff data and placement; and
- Effect of policy changes on implementation.

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

Tier I schools have been identified using Oklahoma’s definition of persistently low-achieving schools. LEAs with identified schools will be granted school improvement funds if the LEA submits a grant application that adequately addresses the needs of the school(s) and demonstrates the capacity to implement the model it selected for each Tier I school. Should the SEA not have sufficient funds to fund all LEAs with schools in Tier I, the SEA will prioritize schools that demonstrate the greatest overall need, as evidenced by student academic progress over a number of years.

(6) The following criteria will be used to prioritize among Tier III schools:

Tier III schools are any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools in Tier I. Tier III schools will be prioritized based on the greatest overall need as evidence by student academic progress over a number of years.

(7) Oklahoma will not take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

(8) Oklahoma does not intend to provide services directly to any school in the absence of a takeover.

SECTION E: ASSURANCES (As Required in SIG 1003(g) 2010 Application)

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

- 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.
- Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- Carry over 25 percent of its FY2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the state receives FY2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the state).
- 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 interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school, the LEA will hold the charter school operator, charter management organization, CMO, or EMO accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.

- Post on the OSDE 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; amount of the grant; 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.

SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION

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

The SEA plans to use the State-level funds it receives to provide technical assistance to the LEAs through the Office of School Support. The activities the Office of School Support plans to conduct include, but are not limited to:

- Expand School Support Teams by hiring additional SST leaders.
- Expand Educational Leadership Coaches (ELCs) for principals by hiring additional ELCs and by training designated LEA ELCs.
- Administration of the School Improvement Grants (SIG).
- Provide professional development and training for principals.
- Provide professional development and training for teachers.
 - a. Utilize nationally recognized experts to assist teachers with integrating technology into the classroom to support the goals of the LEA application.
 - b. Utilize nationally recognized experts to assist teachers with implementing effective strategies for adolescent literacy.
 - c. Utilize nationally recognized experts to assist teachers in implementing effective, collaborative teams at the school level, such as Professional Learning Communities.
 - d. Utilize nationally recognized experts in assisting teachers with differentiated instruction.
 - e. Utilize data facilitators to assist teachers with effectively analyzing student achievement data and assist teachers in making appropriate student interventions through the Data Retreat® Process.
 - f. Utilize nationally recognized experts to assist teachers in the What Works in Schools processes.

The SEA also plans to use Title I funds to develop an advisory board. The advisory board will include representatives from the Committee of Practitioners, various departments within the Oklahoma State Department of Education, and School Support Team Leaders.

SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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 has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including superintendents meeting on December 7, 2009. Documentation is included in the appendices.

Consultation with the Title I Committee of Practitioners occurred on December 16, 2009, via conference call. Documentation is included in the appendices.

Consultation with the Title I Committee of Practitioners subgroup occurred on February 1, 2010. Documentation is included in the appendices.

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

SECTION H: WAIVERS

The Oklahoma State Department of Education requests a waiver of the requirements it has 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.

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 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 Tier I and Tier II schools.

- 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, 2013.
- Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

- 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 or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to 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 may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in 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 this request 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 this waiver request 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 the notice.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, 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, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

**Oklahoma State Department of Education Announcement:
Public Notice and Comment
School Improvement Grant 1003(g), Revised**

January 27, 2010

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) is providing this public notice to solicit comments from local educational agencies and the public regarding specific waiver requests for School Improvement Grants authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA application for a grant.

Comments received will be forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education with the requested waivers. OSDE will accept comments between January 28, 2010, and February 4, 2010, via electronic submission or U.S. mail.

PURPOSE OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (1003(G) PROGRAM

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (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 raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Under the interim final requirements, published in the Federal Register in January 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Tier I schools are the State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Tier II schools are the State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, secondary schools that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Tier III schools are any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

FOUR INTERVENTION MODELS:

Any Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, must implement one of four school

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Turnaround model - Replace the principal and rehire no more than 50 percent of the staff and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student outcomes.

Restart model - Convert a school or close and reopen it under a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.

School closure - Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.

Transformation model - Implement each of the following strategies: (1) replace the principal and take steps to increase teacher and school leader effectiveness; (2) institute comprehensive instructional reforms; (3) increase learning time and create community-oriented schools; and (4) provide operational flexibility and sustained support.

AVAILABLE WAIVERS:

The State believes that by requesting the following waiver(s) LEAs will have additional flexibility to 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 implement more effectively 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 Tier I and Tier II schools.

Oklahoma is requesting the following waivers:

- 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, 2013. (Tier I, II, and III schools)
- Waive Section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

OSDE assures that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the interim final requirements and final requirements.

OSDE also assures that it will permit an LEA to implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to Implement the waiver(s) in its application.

Oklahoma 1003 (g) Application

As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable.

The following Local Educational Agencies may be eligible for one or more of these waivers through the Title I 1003(g) grant:

- Oklahoma City Public Schools with schools in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III.
- Tulsa Public Schools with schools in Tier I, II, or Tier III.
- Any LEA with a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is identified as a Tier III.

COMMENT SUBMISSIONS:

Please submit your comments in writing to Cindy Koss, Assistant State Superintendent, Office of Standards and Curriculum, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105, or electronically to Cindy_Koss@sde.state.ok.us.

For more information on the School Improvement Grant 1003(g), log on to the U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/index>.

Information can also be obtained from the Federal Register, and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access: www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html.

The waiver notice above was sent on various listservs to all School Improvement principals, to all districts the notice would affect, and to School Support Team members and Committee of Practitioners. The notice was also posted on the OSDE Web site. No comments were submitted.