

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Oklahoma



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

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

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. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

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 five 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 five 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). 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.

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2015.

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 SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 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 SIG 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.

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 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

The Department will require those SEAs that will use FY 2013 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. However, those SEAs using FY 2013 funds solely for continuation purposes are only required to complete the Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2013 School Improvement Grants Program located at the end of this application.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2013 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@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, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
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 November 15, 2013.

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.

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: Richard Caram 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105-4599
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Richard Caram Position and Office: Assistant State Superintendent, Office of School Turnaround Contact's Mailing Address: Oklahoma State Department of Education Attention: Richard Caram 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105-4599 Telephone: (405) 522-0855 Fax: (405) 522-5310 Email address: richard.caram@sde.ok.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Janet C. Barresi	Telephone: (405) 521-4885
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.	

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

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this definition, as its methodology for identifying its priority schools has already been approved through its ESEA flexibility request.

Oklahoma's Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools-Priority Schools: On February 8, 2012 the United States Department of Education approved Oklahoma's ESEA Flexibility Waiver. The **Priority School definition (as modified from ESEA Flexibility Waiver for Oklahoma)** is used to define Oklahoma's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools. A Priority School is: (1) a Title I school among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the achievement of the "all students" group in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, combined, and has demonstrated a lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group; (2) a school among the lowest five percent of all schools in the State based on the achievement of the "all students" group in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, combined, and has demonstrated a lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group; (3) a Title I-participating, a Title I-eligible, and/or a non-Title I high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent for three consecutive years; or (4) All Priority Schools receiving SIG funds to implement a school intervention model. The total number of Priority Schools in the State must be at least five percent of the Title I schools in the State. Any sections that formally apply to Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools now apply to Priority Schools.

Schools currently receiving the SIG grant are not eligible to apply for this competition.

Additionally, references made throughout the application to school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring, no longer exist under the ESEA Flexibility Waiver for Oklahoma.

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority 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.

Directions: SEAs that generate new lists should create this table in Excel using the format shown below. An example of the table has been provided for guidance.

See Attachment 1 for a complete list of Oklahoma Priority Schools.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS									
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS									
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
N/A			
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA’s application for a School Improvement Grant.

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.

Part I: *The three actions listed in Part I 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:*

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 2014-2015 school year.

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

Oklahoma will require each LEA to complete a comprehensive needs assessment as part of the application process for each Priority School it elects to serve with SIG funds. The analysis of the needs assessment will be submitted in the LEA application for a 1003(g) School Improvement Grant.

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

- Analyze multiple sources of data 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; professional growth and development inventories and evaluations; leadership evaluations; organizational charts and job descriptions; 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 Priority School the district elects to serve and demonstrate in the application with a narrative describing the correlation between the results of the data analysis, needs assessment report, and chosen model, and
- Consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Priority 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"> • No data sources were used in the analysis or summary of analysis is nonexistent. • The identified model is not supported by the data analysis and needs assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few data sources (1-3) were used and summarized into a limited analysis. • 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. • The identified model is fully supported by the data analysis and needs assessment.

(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, or each priority school, as applicable, 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 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 Implementation
The LEA has outlined its design and implementation activities for each intervention model. A detailed and realistic timeline has been established. The person/title of the position providing leadership for each requirement of the intervention has been determined.	All Models
The LEA has demonstrated that it has involved and received commitment of 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
Staff with the credentials and capacity to implement the selected intervention successfully has been identified. More information regarding school turnaround teacher competencies can be found on the Public Impact Web site at http://publicimpact.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/Turnaround_Teacher_Compencies.pdf .	All Models
The ability of the LEA to serve the identified Priority Schools has been addressed.	All Models
The ability to recruit new principals with the necessary credentials and capacity has been demonstrated. More information regarding school turnaround leader competencies can be found on the Public Impact Web site at http://publicimpact.com/images/stories/publicimpact/documents/Turnaround_Leader_Compencies.pdf .	All Models
The LEA has conducted a strategic planning process that supports the selection and implementation of the chosen model.	All Models
The LEA has developed budgets for three (3) fiscal years that directly align to the activities and strategies stated in the plan.	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
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
The LEA has plans to adopt alternative/extended school-year calendars that add time beyond the instructional day for each identified Priority School to be served.	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
The LEA has established an FTE for 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

The LEA has made a commitment to expand teachers' capacity to plan collaboratively in the academic areas where students fail to make annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics.	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
The LEA has identified a 1003(g) Turnaround Office(r) that meets regularly with SEA staff to discuss the progress of schools. Turnaround office staff are highly knowledgeable educators who specialize in school improvement, understand culture and climate, relate well to stakeholders, and understand the scope of comprehensive reform strategies required as a part of implementing a SIG model. The Turnaround Office(r) must also demonstrate that they communicate regularly with the LEA administrative team, including the LEA Superintendent.	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
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 Priority 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 of 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"> None of the indicators for the chosen intervention model are addressed in the LEA application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the indicators for the chosen intervention model are addressed in the LEA application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the indicators for the chosen intervention model are addressed in the LEA application.

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, 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 Priority School the district elects to serve. The LEA will be evaluated for this part according to the criteria listed below.

- The budget narrative must describe, in detail, the needs of the particular school 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 fiscal year of the grant.
- The budget narrative must also describe in detail, how the LEA will meet and fund the **additional Oklahoma requirements** of this grant:
 - Establish an FTE (the percent of FTE will be contingent upon LEA capacity) for 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;
 - Job Description of Turnaround Officer –
 - Work with the superintendent and district leadership team to manage, oversee, and monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Grant.
 - Work closely with the principal and the central office to support day-to-day needs of the school, discuss progress, and identify and overcome barriers to implementation.
 - Ensure alignment between the activities of the School Improvement Grant, district initiatives, and external providers.
 - Manage delivery of services from external providers. Provide technical assistance and support to the schools served with SIG 1003(g) funds.
 - Liaise between the OSDE, School Support Team Leader(s), central office, and the schools served with SIG 1003(g) funds.
 - Meet at least quarterly with OSDE staff to discuss progress of each school served with SIG 1003(g) funds. Provide quarterly status reports to OSDE.
 - Attend all OSDE required professional development and meetings.
 - 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 and a five (5) day teacher academy or institute for each teacher in each Priority School to be served.
 - Provide additional training for new teachers that join turnaround schools after the start of implementation of the selected intervention model on the requirements of the 1003(g) grant, chosen intervention model, and initiatives to support school improvement efforts.
- Each LEA will submit site summary budget pages and site justification pages for each school for every fiscal year of the grant. A district summary budget page and district justification page will also be required, which includes totals of all schools in each function/object code and additional initiatives, services, and materials that will be provided.
- Budgets submitted must match the number of designated schools and be aligned to the models selected for each school. Budgets should be sufficient to cover the minimum (\$50,000 per year) not exceed the maximum (\$2,000,000 per year) award range allowable for each Priority School identified during each of the three (3) fiscal years over the period of availability of the grant (2014-2015, 2015-2016, and

2016-2017).

- LEA budget(s) must be signed by the LEA Superintendent and the LEA 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 School Improvement Office for accuracy.

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the required budget criteria are addressed. • None of the additional grant requirements are 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"> • Some of the required budget criteria are addressed. • Some of the additional grant requirements are addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet. • The LEA has funded some 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 addressed. • All of the additional grant requirements are addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet. • The LEA has 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: 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:

- 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 it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

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 on each Priority School it elects to serve:

(1) The LEA will complete an Action Plan for each Priority School it elects to serve specifically addressing how the **design and implementation of interventions will be consistent with the final requirements** of the chosen intervention model. The Action Plans will be submitted 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 the needs of LEA initiatives;
- 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 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 Section B, Part 1 of the SEA application, to implement the selected intervention model(s).

The following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate each requirement 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 required information regarding the intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Plan addresses some of the requirements of the intervention model which includes the timeline, person responsible, and specific actions, including the <i>additional factors</i> identified above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Action Plan addresses all of the requirements of the intervention model which includes the timeline, person responsible, and specific actions, including the <i>additional factors</i> identified above.

(2) The LEA will develop a written procedure/policy to **recruit, screen, and select external providers** 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 following rubric will be used by OSDE to evaluate the requirement of this part on the LEA application.

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 or 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 <i>steps</i> 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 addresses all <i>steps</i> identified above.

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 Priority Schools to be served. The justification must include the following criteria:

- Documentation of research proven 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 Priority School and its selected intervention; and
- Data-based evidence of success in improving student academic achievement.

To assist in the process of evaluating a provider, the SEA suggests utilizing the following resources:

1. *The Guide to Working With External Providers* by Learning Point Associates
www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/externalproviderguide.php
2. *Overview of The Guide to Working With External Providers* by Learning Point Associates
www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/externalproviderguide.php
3. *The Right People for the Job* (Webinar) from the Center on Innovation and Improvement
<http://www.centerii.org/webinars/>
4. *Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners/Providers for Low-Achieving Schools* from the Center on Innovation and Improvement
<http://www.centerii.org/leamodel/>

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"> • The <i>justification for the selection of external providers</i> does not include the following criteria: history of success, alignment with LEA initiatives, capacity to serve, and data-based evidence of success in improving student academic achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>justification for the selection of external providers</i> includes some of the following criteria: history of success, alignment with LEA initiatives, capacity to serve, and data-based evidence of success in improving student academic achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>justification</i> includes all of the following criteria: history of success, alignment with LEA initiatives, capacity to serve, and data-based evidence of success in improving student academic achievement.

(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
Title III, Part A	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development in strategies for English Language Learners

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 integrated resources to support the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has integrated some resources (1-2) to support the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has integrated multiple resources (3 or more) 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:

- Providing flexibility in hiring practices at the school site;
- Scheduling protected collaborative planning time; and
- Changing the structure of a high school to enhance learning opportunities (i.e., small learning communities, dual-enrollment, and 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.

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA does not describe how policy was or policies were modified to enable schools to implement the requirements of the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA describes how policy was or policies were modified to enable schools to implement some of the requirements of the selected intervention model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA describes how policy was or policies were modified to enable schools to implement all of the requirements of the selected intervention model.

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 and beyond implementation;
- There are written plans in place for transitions, including staffing, funding, exit of external providers (including Charter Management Organizations and Education Management Organizations), and changes in leadership;
- The LEA has a strategic plan in place for professional development to sustain the implemented strategies to improve student achievement;
- The LEA has processes in place to establish a schedule that will allow for teacher collaboration and teaming to produce effective delivery of instruction;
- The LEA has in place a strategic planning process that utilizes a Web-based planning and coaching tool;
- The LEA has a system of formative and summative data collection in place, including benchmarks;
- 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.

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 addressed none of the indicators of sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has addressed some of the indicators of sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has addressed all the indicators of sustainability.

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:

(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?

² “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

LEAs may use FY2009 carryover SIG 1003(g) ARRA funds for pre-implementation. This period enables an LEA to prepare for implementation of the chosen model at the start of the 2014-2015 school year. LEAs requesting to use funds for pre-implementation are required to submit a plan for the pre-implementation period. This plan is in addition to the required model implementation chart of the application. LEAs requesting to use funds for pre-implementation are also required to submit an FY2014 budget reflecting the amount requested for pre-implementation activities. These activities must be itemized on the budget worksheet and approved with the LEA application. This budget is in addition to the FY2014 budget page that reflects implementation activities beginning August 1, 2014.

The plan and the budget will be reviewed and approved with the LEA SIG application. Expenditures will be reviewed and determined allowable if they directly relate to the full and effective implementation of the intervention model; address the needs identified by the LEA in the comprehensive needs assessment; advance the overall goal of the SIG program and support the school goals as indicated in the SIG application; represent a meaningful change that will help improve student achievement; are supported by scientifically based research; are reasonable and necessary as defined in the general cost principals governing the SIG program; and are supplemental and in no way supplant funds.

Allowable activities for pre-implementation include, but are not limited to:

- Family and Community Engagement Activities
- Rigorous Review of External Providers
- Staffing
- Instructional Programs (i.e., remediation and enrichment)
- Professional Development and Support
- Preparation for Accountability Measures

Activities that are **not allowable** for pre-implementation include, but are not limited to:
 Pay Unassigned Teachers
 Buy-Out Current Principal Contract
 Conduct a Needs Assessment

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"> The LEA has not addressed the plan for the pre-implementation period and/or expenditures are not allowable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has addressed the plan for pre-implementation and expenditures are allowable, however, more specific detail is needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA has developed a plan for the pre-implementation period and all expenditures are allowable.

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

LEA Application Approval Timeline	
Action Step	Date
1. SEA will distribute the LEA grant application to all eligible LEAs via e-mail	Tuesday, February 25, 2014
2. LEA letter of intent to apply due via e-mail	Tuesday, March 4, 2014
3. SEA will provide technical assistance Webinar for all LEAs that have submitted a letter of intent with guidelines and application	Friday, March 7, 2014
4. Original copy of LEA application is due to SEA	Friday, April 11, 2014
5. SEA panel will review the applications and feedback will be provided to the LEA	Friday, April 25, 2014
6. LEA applications for three year awards will be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education (This is also the official date funding is awarded.)	Thursday, May 22, 2014
7. SIG Overview Meeting with new awardees	Tuesday, June 3, 2014
8. All approved LEAs will be posted on the OSDE Web site	Thursday, June 5, 2014
9. Implementation begins	Friday, August 1, 2014

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority schools, as applicable, 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, or one or more priority schools, in at LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The initial goals of the Priority Schools will be approved within the LEA application for 1003(g) SIG funds. Goals must be sustainable, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound (SMART).

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">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 some 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 methods of ongoing monitoring and evaluation of goals for Priority Schools. The SEA will perform School Support Team Leader (SSTL) visits at each Priority School receiving 1003(g) funds. The primary function of SSTL 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, Priority Schools will be required to utilize Oklahoma’s Web-based planning tool. This online planning and coaching tool will allow the SEA and SSTL to continuously monitor a school’s progress toward goals. The coaching feature of this online system also provides opportunities for Priority Schools to communicate with their assigned SSTL 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 to the SEA a School Improvement Status Report (SISR) for each Priority School receiving SIG funds. This report will require the LEA to provide a narrative report and supportive documentation as evidence of progress toward established goals. The SISR includes, but is not limited to the following data:

- Number of minutes within the school year;
- Participation rate by subgroup on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics;
- 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;
- Postsecondary student enrollment;
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA’s teacher evaluation system; 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 Priority 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 toward the goals set in the plan on the SISR will receive intensive support from the SEA through SSTL visits, the online planning and coaching tool, and other differentiated technical assistance. All efforts will be made to ensure each Priority 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 take into consideration recommendations from the School Improvement Grant Advisory Board to determine eligibility for renewal.

(2) 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. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Oklahoma does not have Tier III schools.

(3) 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, or the priority schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

In addition to the methods of monitoring and evaluation described in Section D, Part 1 of the SEA application, monthly School Support Team Leader visits that produce SISRs, and the online planning and coaching tool progress review will be ongoing (at least quarterly). The SEA will have progress meetings (initial, interim, and end-of-year) with the school leadership team and district personnel to determine the fidelity to which the intervention model is being implemented.

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:

The SEA will conduct a detailed review of relevant school data, including student benchmarking data, to determine the progress made toward the established goals and the fidelity to which the intervention model is being implemented.

End of Year Implementation Meeting:

The School Improvement Grant Advisory Board and SSTLs will analyze 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;
- Online 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.

(4) 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.

LEAs with identified schools will be granted School Improvement Grant 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 school. Should the SEA not have sufficient funds to fund all eligible schools, the SEA will serve in rank order according to the SEA's list of persistently lowest achieving schools. The rank order is based upon achievement data as outlined in steps 1-5 of the PLA definition. For example, schools will be served first that demonstrate the greatest overall need, as evidenced by student academic progress over a number of years.

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Oklahoma does not have any Tier III schools.

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

Oklahoma will not take over any Priority Schools.

(7) 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, or for priority schools, as applicable, 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.

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

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.

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

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 outlined in the final requirements.
- 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, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, 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 or priority school, as applicable.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG 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.

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

- Continue and expand the principal and/or district leadership mentoring provided by School Support Team Leaders,
- Continue and expand the development and implementation of ongoing professional development for district level personnel, principals, and teachers of schools receiving SIG funds,
- Continue to train and implement the Oklahoma Data Review Model, and
- Develop and implement a training program for district level school improvement teams on Oklahoma’s online planning and coaching tool.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

By checking this box, the SEA assures that it has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

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.

Oklahoma 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 or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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 2013 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.

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 2013 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.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of “priority schools” in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Assurance

The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority schools, approved through its ESEA flexibility request, provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State’s lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

[Enter State Name Here] requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve

the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or 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 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the requirement in section 1116(b) of the ESEA to identify schools for improvement through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

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 2014–2015 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 the 2014–2015 school year 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.

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the schoolwide poverty threshold through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

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 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.

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

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 APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs.

The LEA application for Oklahoma is an attached document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses 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.

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, or each priority school, as applicable, the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school, or in each priority school, as applicable.

SCHOOL NAME	NCE SID #	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY 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, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority 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;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - 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, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,

- Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (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 or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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, or each priority 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, or priority 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 or priority 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, or the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school 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, or each priority 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, or priority 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, or priority 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) 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 school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Continuation Awards Only Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2013 SIG funds:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	COHORT #	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:			

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocating those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction).

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards² to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]’s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If 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.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

By submitting the assurances and information above, [State] agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a new FY 2013 SIG application; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the full application package (page 3).

² A “new award” is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.