

# School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name: Oklahoma**



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



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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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



# SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

## **Purpose of the Program**

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

## **Availability of Funds**

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

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

## **State and LEA Allocations**

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

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

## **Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners**

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

# FY 2010 Submission Information

## **Electronic Submission:**

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

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

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

## **Paper Submission:**

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

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

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

## **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

## **For Further Information**

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

# **FY 2010 Application Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

**APPLICATION COVER SHEET**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: Oklahoma State Department of Education Attention: Dr. Cindy Koss 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Dr. Cindy Koss</p> <p>Position and Office: Assistant State Superintendent, Office of Standards and Curriculum</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Dr. Cindy Koss 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105</p> <p>Telephone: 405-521-4514</p> <p>Fax: (405) 521-2971</p> <p>Email address: Cindy_Koss@sde.state.ok.us</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Janet C. Barresi</p>	<p>Telephone: 405-521-3301</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X</p>	<p>Date:</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

# FY 2010 Application Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.</p>

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

**Tier I Definition of Persistently Lowest Performing Schools**

These schools were identified based on the following definitions.

**Tier 1**  
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 2009-2010 state reading and mathematics assessments used for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations. These percents included all Full Academic Year (FAY) 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 79 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.
2. After all Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were ranked based on students scoring proficient or advanced on the 2009-2010 state reading and mathematics assessments, 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 (2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) on the state reading and mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations. These percents included all FAY 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 79 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.
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.
  - a. Schools that are currently being served as Tier I schools through a School Improvement Grant were excluded, resulting in one school being eliminated from consideration.
  - b. Schools with less than four years of total achievement data (2009-2010 and at least three of the prior five years) were excluded since there was not enough data to determine if the school had made progress over a number of years. This resulted in one school being eliminated from consideration.
  - c. Schools with fewer than 30 FAY students who completed the reading or mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations in 2009-2010 were excluded. This minimum number was determined based on the reliability of scores as approved in Oklahoma's Accountability Workbook. This eliminated one school from consideration.

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. Schools that are currently being served as Tier I schools through a School Improvement Grant were excluded, resulting in four schools being eliminated from consideration.

## **Tier 2**

Persistently lowest achieving schools include:

- (a) 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.
- (b) Any secondary school that receives Title I funds and has an achievement rate for reading and mathematics combined that is in the lowest quintile of schools in the State.

(c) Any secondary school that has not made AYP for two consecutive years. (Note: All schools that meet this criteria were awarded FY2009 SIG funds, and not eligible for FY2010 SIG funds.)

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. A waiver has been requested from the United States Department of Education to include in the list of Tier II schools any school that receives Title I funds and has an achievement rate for reading and mathematics combined that is in the lowest quintile of schools in the State.
2. There are 308 secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds. There are 37 secondary schools that receive Title I funds and have an achievement rate for reading and mathematics combined based on data from the 2009-2010 year in the lowest quintile of secondary schools. Five percent of the 345 secondary schools in the pool for Tier II schools is 17 schools.
3. 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.
4. All secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds, and all secondary schools that receive Title I funds and are in the lowest quintile of secondary schools in the state were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the 2009-2010 state reading and mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations. These percents included all FAY 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 345 and the school with the highest percent proficient received a score of 1.
5. After all secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds, and all secondary schools that receive Title I funds and are in the lowest quintile of secondary schools in the state were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the 2009-2010 state reading and mathematics assessments, all secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds and all secondary schools that receive Title I funds and are in the lowest quintile of secondary schools in the state that were not excluded in step 4 were ranked based on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced for five years (2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) on the state

reading and mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations. These percents included all FAY 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 345 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 and all secondary schools that receive Title I funds and are in the lowest quintile of secondary schools in the state 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 17 schools with the highest total points were identified.
  - a. Schools that are currently being served as Tier I schools through a School Improvement Grant were excluded, resulting in one additional school being eliminated from consideration. (Note: The four schools eliminated from consideration in Tier I graduation rate calculations that are already being served as Tier I schools through a School Improvement Grant were also eliminated from consideration in Tier II achievement results for the same reason.)
  - b. Schools already identified as Tier I schools for this identification were excluded, resulting in one school being eliminated from consideration.
  - c. Schools with fewer than 30 FAY students who completed the reading or mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations in 2009-2010 were excluded. This minimum number was determined based on the reliability of scores as approved in Oklahoma's Accountability Workbook. This eliminated 33 schools from consideration.

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 high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds and all secondary schools that receive Title I funds and are in the lowest quintile of secondary schools in the state were averaged for five years (2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09).

3. There were six high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds or receive Title I funds and are in the lowest quintile of secondary schools in the state with an average graduation rate less than 60 percent.
  - a. Two of these schools were eliminated from consideration because they have already been identified as a Tier II school based on achievement results.
  - b. One school was eliminated from consideration because it is currently being served as a Tier I school through a School Improvement Grant.
  - c. One school was eliminated from consideration because it had fewer than 30 FAY students complete the reading or mathematics assessments.
  - d. One school was eliminated from consideration because it had less than four years of graduation rate data, so there was not enough data to determine if the school had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

**Tier 3**

All Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring not already identified for Tier 1 or Tier 2 were identified for Tier 3. In addition, any schools excluded from Tier 1 or Tier 2 based on having fewer than 30 FAY students who completed the reading or mathematics assessments used for AYP determinations in 2009-2010 were identified for Tier 3.

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

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

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

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

**EXAMPLE:**

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

**EXAMPLE:**

<sup>1</sup> “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.

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

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

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

## **B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:**

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 2011-2012 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*, 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 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"> <li>• Data sources used in analysis or summary of analysis is nonexistent.</li> <li>• The identified model is not supported by the data analysis or needs assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few data sources (2-3) were used in analysis, or analysis is lacking.</li> <li>• The identified model is partially supported by the data analysis and needs assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The identified model is fully supported by the data analysis and needs assessment.</li> </ul>

***(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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	All Models

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff with the credentials and capacity to implement the selected intervention successfully has been identified. More information regarding turnaround leader competencies can be found on the Public Impact Web site at <a href="http://www.publicimpact.com">www.publicimpact.com</a>.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability of the LEA to serve the identified Tier I and Tier II schools has been addressed.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to recruit new principals with the necessary credentials and capacity has been demonstrated. For information about turnaround leaders see <a href="http://publicimpact.com/images/stories/publicimpact/documents/Turnaround_Leader_Compencies.pdf">http://publicimpact.com/images/stories/publicimpact/documents/Turnaround_Leader_Compencies.pdf</a></li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has conducted a strategic planning process that supports the selection and implementation of the chosen model.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has developed three-year budgets that directly align to the activities and strategies stated in the plan.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has plans to adopt alternative/extended school-year calendars that add time beyond the instructional day for each identified Tier I and Tier II school to be served.</li> </ul>	Transformation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has identified a 1003(g) Turnaround Office(r) that meets regularly with SEA staff to discuss progress of schools. Turnaround Office(r)s are highly knowledgeable educators who specialize in school improvement, understand culture and climate, relate well to stakeholders, and understand the scope of Oklahoma's Nine Essential Elements. The Turnaround Office(r) must also demonstrate that they communicate regularly with the LEA administrative team, including the LEA Superintendent.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has demonstrated, through past grant applications, that</li> </ul>	All Models

they have sound fiscal management with limited audit findings.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA has demonstrated a commitment to the sustainability of the intervention model after the funding is no longer available.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	School Closure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA completes the grant application within the timelines set forth in the application.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assurances are signed and submitted with the application.</li> </ul>	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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the indicators for the chosen intervention model have been demonstrated or fully addressed in the LEA application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the above indicators for the chosen intervention model are demonstrated by the district and have been fully addressed in the LEA application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All of the above indicators for the chosen intervention model are demonstrated by the district and have been fully addressed in the LEA application.</li> </ul>

***(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:

- 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 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 Teams, 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 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 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. More information on job-embedded professional development can be found at: <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/JEPD%20Issue%20Brief.pdf>.
  - 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 (2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014).
- 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 (2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014).
- 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"> <li>• None of the required budget criteria are adequately addressed.</li> <li>• None of the additional grant requirements have been addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet.</li> <li>• The LEA has not funded the required components of the chosen intervention model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the required budget criteria have been adequately addressed.</li> <li>• Most of the additional grant requirements have been addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All required budget criteria have been adequately addressed.</li> <li>• All of the additional grant requirements have been addressed in the narrative and included in the budget worksheet.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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"> <li>• The Action Plan is not complete or does not provide adequate information regarding the intervention model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Action Plan adequately addresses most of the requirements of the intervention model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

- (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).

Level I	Level II	Level III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The LEA has not developed a written procedure/policy for recruiting and selecting external providers and no procedure/policy exists.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>

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:

- 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 Tier I or Tier II school and its selected intervention.
- Data-based evidence of success in improving student achievement.

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

1. *Lessons Learned: Choosing a School Turnaround Provider* from Education Northwest [http://educatonnorthwest.org/webfm\\_send/1032](http://educatonnorthwest.org/webfm_send/1032)

2. *The Guide to Working With External Providers* by Learning Point Associates  
[www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/externalproviderguide.php](http://www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/externalproviderguide.php)
3. *Overview of The Guide to Working With External Providers* by Learning Point Associates  
[www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/externalproviderguide.php](http://www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/externalproviderguide.php)
4. *The Right People for the Job* (Webinar) from the Center on Innovation and Improvement  
<http://www.centerii.org/webinars/>
5. *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"> <li>• The provider has not fully met the above listed criteria including history of success, alignment with LEA initiatives, capacity to serve, and providing data-based evidence of success in improving achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provider has met some of the above listed criteria including history of success, alignment with LEA initiatives, capacity to serve, and providing data-based evidence of success in improving achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has fully met all of the above criteria including history of success, alignment with LEA initiatives, capacity to serve, and providing data-based evidence of success in improving achievement.</li> </ul>

(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"> <li>• Stipends for teachers attending professional</li> </ul>

		<p>development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplemental instructional materials for extended school hours</li> </ul>
Title II, Part A	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registration and travel for teachers attending National Conferences and Workshops</li> <li>• Salary for instructional facilitator to provide ongoing professional development and coaching</li> </ul>
Title II, Part D	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional technology to be integrated into core subjects</li> <li>• Increased capacity of current data system to promote use of data by all teachers</li> </ul>
Title III, Part A	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development in strategies for English Language Learners</li> </ul>
Oklahoma State AAA Program	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart	<p>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</p>

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

(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;
- 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"> <li>The LEA has provided no policy change to enable schools to implement the selected intervention model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA has changed some policy or policies to match the necessary requirements of selected intervention(s) to enable schools to implement interventions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period<sup>2</sup> to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

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

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

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

LEAs may use FY2010 and/or FY2009 carryover SIG funds for pre-implementation. This period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of the chosen model at the start of the 2011-2012 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 FY2011 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 FY2012 budget page that reflects implementation activities beginning July 1, 2011.

The plan and the budget will be reviewed and approved with the LEA SIG application. Expenditures will be reviewed and determined as allowable if they 1) directly relate to the full and effective implementation of the intervention model; 2) address the needs identified by the LEA in the comprehensive needs assessment; 3) advance the overall goal of the SIG program and support the school goals as indicated in the SIG application; 4) represent a meaningful change that will help improve student achievement; 5) are supported by scientifically based research; 6) are reasonable and necessary as defined in the general cost principals governing the SIG program; and 7) are supplemental and in no way supplant funds.

Allowable activities for pre-implementation include, but may not be 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 may not be 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
The LEA has not adequately addressed the plan for the pre-implementation period and/or expenditures are allowable.	The LEA has addressed the plan for pre-implementation and expenditures are allowable, however, more specific detail is needed.	The LEA has fully developed a plan for the pre-implementation period and all expenditures are allowable.

**C. CAPACITY:** The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section C Capacity here:**

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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	All Models

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff with the credentials and capacity to implement the selected intervention successfully has been identified. More information regarding turnaround leader competencies can be found on the Public Impact Web site at <a href="http://www.publicimpact.com">www.publicimpact.com</a>.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability of the LEA to serve the identified Tier I and Tier II schools has been addressed.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to recruit new principals with the necessary credentials and capacity has been demonstrated. For information about turnaround leaders see <a href="http://publicimpact.com/images/stories/publicimpact/documents/Turnaround_Leader_Compencies.pdf">http://publicimpact.com/images/stories/publicimpact/documents/Turnaround_Leader_Compencies.pdf</a></li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has conducted a strategic planning process that supports the selection and implementation of the chosen model.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has developed three-year budgets that directly align to the activities and strategies stated in the plan.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has plans to adopt alternative/extended school-year calendars that add time beyond the instructional day for each identified Tier I and Tier II school to be served.</li> </ul>	Transformation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has identified a 1003(g) Turnaround Office(r) that meets regularly with SEA staff to discuss progress of schools. Turnaround Office(r)s are highly knowledgeable educators who specialize in school improvement, understand culture and climate, relate well to stakeholders, and understand the scope of Oklahoma's Nine Essential Elements. The Turnaround Office(r) must also demonstrate that they communicate regularly with the LEA administrative team, including the LEA Superintendent.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has demonstrated, through past grant applications, that they have sound fiscal management with limited audit findings.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has demonstrated a commitment to the sustainability of the intervention model after the funding is no longer available.</li> </ul>	Turnaround, Transformation, Restart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	School Closure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA completes the grant application within the timelines set forth in the application.</li> </ul>	All Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assurances are signed and submitted with the application.</li> </ul>	All Models
<p>The SEA will also consider the following factors, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commitment of the LEA, school staff, parents, and community to the implementation of the intervention model;</li> <li>• The history of service provided by the LEA to the schools over a number of years;</li> <li>• The number of central office staff members;</li> <li>• The availability of other district resources; and</li> <li>• The number of schools identified as Tier I or Tier II within the LEA.</li> </ul> <p>This information will be reviewed by a state review team.</p>	

**D (PART 1). TIMELINE:** An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

**Insert response to Section D (Part 1) Timeline here:**

<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Date</b>
1. SEA will distribute the LEA grant applications to all eligible LEAs via e-mail and postal mail.	Wednesday, April 6, 2011
2. SEA will provide a technical assistance meeting for all LEAs that intend to submit an application. Videoconference at 1:30	Tuesday, April 12, 2011
3. 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 12, - May 6, 2011
4. The SEA will provide a videoconference/webinar for technical assistance with guidelines and applications.	Thursday, April 14, 2011 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.
5. Question and Answer Videoconference for SIG Principals and others	Tuesday, April 26, 2011
6. Original copy of LEA application is due to the SEA.	Monday, May 16, 2011
7. SEA panel will review the application and feedback will be provided to the LEA.	Tuesday, May 17, 2011 – Friday, May 20, 2011
8. LEA applications will be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education.	Thursday, May 26, 2011
9. Pre-Implementation period of LEAs.	After- Thursday, May 26, 2011
10. Initial Implementation Meeting	Monday, June 13, 2011
11. All approved LEAs will be posted on the OSDE Web site.	Wednesday, June 15, 2011
12. 2011-2012 School Year Implementation of Selected Intervention(s)	2011-2012 School Year

\*Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE): All eligible schools must complete a needs assessment using the WISE online planning tool. Dates to be announced.

**D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

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

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

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 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 take into consideration recommendations from the School Improvement Grant Advisory Board to 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. 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"> <li>• Goals do not include any components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals include 3 or fewer components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals are clearly defined and include all components of SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.</li> </ul>

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 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 the School Improvement Grant Advisory Board 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 the School Improvement Grant Advisory Board 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.**

1. 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 prioritize the schools as follows:

Tier I schools will have first priority for School Improvement Grant Funds. If the SEA does not have sufficient funds to serve all of its Tier I schools, the Oklahoma Department of Education 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.

2. Tier II schools will be served after all eligible Tier I schools have been served.

3. Tier III schools will be served after all eligible Tier I and Tier II schools have been served.

**(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.**

## E. ASSURANCES

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

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

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

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

**Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:**

The 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:

- Continue and expand the principal and district leadership workshops and seminars provided by The Leadership and Learning Center that will begin June 2011.
- Continue and expand the development and implementation of ongoing professional development for district level personnel, principals, and teachers of schools receiving SIG funds in coordination with Marzano Research Laboratory.
- Expand the data review model by hiring additional data facilitators.
- Develop a training program for district level school improvement teams on the Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE) Planning Tool.
- Contract with a national consultant to provide training to district school improvement teams in areas such as building leadership capacity and Professional Learning Communities.

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

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

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

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

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including district personnel, district human resources personnel, union representatives, and turnaround officers.

**H. WAIVERS:** SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

#### WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

**Enter State Name Here** 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.

##### **Waiver 1: Tier II waiver**

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

##### Assurance

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

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

**Waiver 2: n-size waiver**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** 30.

Assurance

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

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

**Waiver 3: New list waiver**

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

Assurance

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

**WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

**Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver**

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot**

**request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.**

**Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver**

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER**

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

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

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

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

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

**(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)**

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

**PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

**LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Example:**

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

## APPENDIX A

### SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

#### **Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010**

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

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

## **Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations**

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

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

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

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

## **Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap**

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

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

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

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

### **LEA Budgets**

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

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

## **SEA Allocations to LEAs**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## APPENDIX B

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

<sup>‡</sup> “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

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

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

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

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

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

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