

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Ohio



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



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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

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

FY 2010 Application Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Ohio Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 25 S. Front Street – 4th Floor Columbus, OH 43215
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Cynthia Lemmerman, Ed.D. Position and Office: Associate Superintendent, School Improvement Contact's Mailing Address: 25 S. Front Street – 4th Floor Columbus, OH 43215 Telephone: 614-466-5834 Fax: 614-387-0963 Email address: cynthia.lemmerman@ode.state.oh.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Deborah S. Delisle, Superintendent	Telephone: 614-466-7578
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date: 12/3/10
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:

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.

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.)

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.

3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:

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.

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

Ohio is using the same definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) as in its FY2009 application. However, where currently served Tier I and Tier II schools continue to fall into the bottom five percent based on the most recent achievement data, Ohio will go further on its list to identify its bottom five percent.

Ohio’s definition can be found at:

<http://www.education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=550>

The following methodology was used in generating the new list.

Method for Determining the Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools (Lowest Five Percent) for 2009-2010 School Year

Ohio's "Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools" includes the **lowest achieving five percent of Title 1 served schools in school improvement** and the **lowest achieving five percent of Title 1 Eligible secondary schools regardless of school improvement status**. In addition to the lowest achieving five percent, both groups of schools (Title 1 served and Title 1 eligible) must include any secondary school that has an average graduation rate less than 60 percent over a five year period.

Identifying eligible schools

To identify the lowest achieving schools eligible to receive SIG funding, all schools were divided into two categories:

1. **Title 1 Schools** (received Title 1 funding in FY 2011) that are in school improvement.
2. **Title 1 Eligible secondary schools** that do not receive Title 1 funding, regardless of school improvement status.

As authorized by the federal guidance, dropout recovery schools were not included in either group of schools for the purpose of determining the lowest achieving schools (Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools). This type of school pertains mainly to community schools that serve over-age, under-credited students who have dropped out of high school. These dropout recovery schools are eligible for SIG Tier 3 funding.

Measuring achievement

In determining the lowest achieving schools, SIG requires that states look at two factors – 1) the school's current performance in reading and mathematics, and 2) the school's progress on reading and mathematics over a number of years. SIG permits states to determine the "number of years" – Ohio has selected five years as its timeframe for measuring progress. In addition, states have the discretion to determine how they will weight these two factors when coming up with a "single" performance score.

To obtain a measure of each school's current performance, ODE combined each school's most recent performance (2009-2010 school year) in reading and mathematics (grades 3 through 11) into a single weighted-average percent proficient for that building. To measure each school's progress over time, ODE created a single weighted- average percent proficient for reading and mathematics over the most recent five year period (2006-2010). Each school year (ie., 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010) carries the same weight for the five year average.

Each school's current performance and its measure of progress over time were weighted equally at 50 percent and combined into a single measure – “combined percent proficiency.” This single number for each school was used to rank all eligible schools in each category (e.g., Title 1 served schools in school improvement or Title 1 eligible secondary schools). Using the rank, ODE then identified the lowest achieving schools. Note that only Title 1 served schools in school improvement and Title 1 eligible secondary schools with at least two years of performance and graduation data were included in the pool of eligible schools.

Identifying Ohio's persistently lowest achieving schools

The SIG guidance requires states to identify the **lowest achieving five percent** in each category of schools – Title 1 served schools in school improvement and Title 1 eligible secondary schools. Using ODE's ranking of the “combined percent proficiency” measure, the lowest five percent of the schools on the list are automatically put into the category of “persistently lowest achieving schools.”

*In addition to the lowest achieving five percent, SIG require states to include **secondary schools with average graduation rates less than 60 percent over a number of years** in their list of “persistently lowest achieving schools.”* Ohio has selected five years as its timeframe, which covers school years 2005-2009. The most recent graduation rate data available in Ohio was for the 2008-2009 school year.

Determining the Pool and Calculating the Five Percent for Tier 1

ODE included the following schools in its Tier 1 pool from which to draw five percent:

- Title 1 served schools that are in school improvement status and that are not currently served by SIG dollars and are not dropout recovery schools. (684 schools)
- All currently Title 1 served and Tier 1 SIG funded schools that did not receive the school improvement timeline waiver and that have not exited improvement status. (17 schools)
- All currently Title 1 served schools also receiving Tier 3 SIG funds that have not exited improvement status. (5 schools)
- All dropout recovery schools that are currently Title 1 served schools and that are in school improvement status. (53 schools)

ODE excluded from its eligible pool currently served Tier 1 schools that received a school improvement timeline waiver, which has resulted in these schools no longer being in school improvement. **As a result of the inclusions and exclusions, Ohio's pool of Tier 1 eligible schools is 759 schools. Five percent of 759 is 37.95; when rounded, this equates to 38 schools that must be identified for Tier 1.**

Identifying the Persistently Lowest Achieving Tier 1 Schools

Even though Title 1 served, currently SIG funded Tier 1 schools that did not receive the waiver *and* Title 1 served dropout recovery schools were included in the “pool” of eligible schools, these schools were excluded when determining the lowest performing Tier 1 schools. Once these exclusions were applied, ODE ranked all remaining schools on their “combined percent proficiency” measure and identified the 38 lowest performing schools. In addition to the lowest achieving five percent, federal guidance requires states to include secondary schools with an average graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years in their list of “persistently lowest achieving schools.” **Moving beyond the lowest performing five percent, there were nine Title 1 served secondary schools with graduation rates less than 60 percent. ODE combined these nine schools with the 38 lowest five percent to arrive at a total of 47 schools on Ohio’s list of “Persistently Lowest Achieving Tier 1 Schools”.**

Determining the Pool and Calculating the Five Percent for Tier 2

ODE included the following schools in its Tier 2 pool from which to draw five percent:

- Title 1 eligible secondary schools that did not receive Title 1 funding, regardless of school improvement status. (267 schools)
- All currently SIG funded Tier 2 schools that continue to be eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds. (10 schools)

A total of 277 schools are eligible for Tier 2. Five percent of 277 is 13.85; when rounded this equates to 14 schools that must be identified for the Tier 2 list.

Note: Ohio is not applying for the Tier 2 waiver, as corrected in Section H of the application.

Identifying the Persistently Lowest Achieving Tier 2 Schools

Even though Title 1 eligible schools that are currently receiving Tier 2 SIG funds were included in the “pool” of eligible schools, these schools were excluded when determining the lowest performing Tier 2 schools. Once this exclusion was applied, ODE ranked all remaining schools on their “combined percent proficiency” measure and identified the 14 lowest performing schools. In addition to the lowest achieving five percent, federal guidance requires states to include secondary schools with average graduation rates less than 60 percent over a number of years in their list of “persistently lowest achieving schools.” **Moving beyond the lowest performing five percent, there was one secondary school with an average graduation rate less than 60 percent. ODE combined this single school with the 14 lowest five percent to arrive at a total of 15 schools on Ohio’s list of “Persistently Lowest Achieving Tier 2 Schools.”**

Putting all eligible schools into three tiers for SIG

For the purpose of using SIG funds, the federal guidance requires states to put all eligible schools into the following three Tiers:

Tier 1 Schools – lowest achieving five percent of Title 1 schools in school improvement or Title 1 secondary schools with a five year graduation rate less than 60 percent. (47 schools)

Tier 2 Schools – lowest achieving five percent of Title 1 eligible secondary schools or Title 1 eligible secondary schools with a five year graduation rate less than 60 percent. (15 schools)

Tier 3 Schools – All Title 1 schools in school improvement that are not in Tier 1 (the persistently lowest performing schools) are put into Tier 3 for the purpose of using SIG funds. All Title 1 schools that are identified in school improvement and as a dropout recovery school are eligible for Tier 3 SIG funds. Note that this group includes five schools that are Title 1, currently SIG funded Tier 3 schools still in improvement status. (695 schools)

Attached to ODE's application is a table that identifies the **757 schools that are eligible for either Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 SIG funds**. This table also notes which schools in Tier 1 and in Tier 2 were pulled onto the eligible list only because their average five-year graduation rate was less than 60 percent.

FY2010 SIG Application Summary Table	
Tier 1	
Total Number of Schools included in the Tier 1 <i>Pool</i>	759
Count of Schools Identified in Lowest 5% for Tier 1	38
Count of Schools Added to Tier 1 because of Graduation Rate	9
Total Number of Schools Identified as Tier 1 Eligible	47
Tier 2	
Total Number of Schools included in the Tier 2 <i>Pool</i>	277
Count of Schools Identified in Lowest 5% for Tier 2	14
Count of Schools Added to Tier 2 because of Graduation Rate	1
Total Number of Schools Identified as Tier 2 Eligible	15
Tier 3	
Total Count of Schools Identified as Tier 3 Eligible	695
Total Count of Schools Included in the FY2010 Eligible Schools List ^a	757
^a Note that of the 1,036 schools included in the Tier 1 or Tier 2 <i>pools</i> , 284 schools are not eligible for FY2010 SIG Funds and, therefore, are not included in the FY2010 Eligible Schools List.	

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

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

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

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Ohio is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009. However, a date change is required: The LEA must project how funds will be used during the period of availability of grant funding. Budget amounts must be given for Year 1 (FY 11), Year 2 (FY 12) and Year 3 (FY 13).

This sentence is changed to reflect the correct fiscal years.

The LEA must project how funds will be used during the period of availability of grant funding. Budget amounts must be given for Year 1 (FY 12), Year 2 (FY 13) and Year 3 (FY 14). Ohio has requested the appropriate waiver to extend the period of availability of funds.

Under this grant, the Ohio Department of Education will award grants through a competitive process to LEAs for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. The funds are to be focused on each State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring ("Tier I schools") and, at an LEA's option, persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds ("Tier II schools"). An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools ("Tier III schools"). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Upon the grant award to Ohio, 95% of funds will then be distributed to qualifying LEAs who apply based upon a competitive process submitted through the electronic CCIP-Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Planning Application (see Appendix C for an explanation of the CCIP tool). LEAs may apply for funds ranging from \$50,000 to \$2,000,000 per building.

Ohio is projecting awarding substantial funding in School Improvement Grant to selected eligible Ohio LEAs. The Ohio Department of Education will evaluate each LEA SIG application using a rubric (attached as a separate document). Each item on the rubric will contain a six-point quality scale where a score of 1 is at the low end of the scale and a score of 6 is at the high end of the scale. **Please note:** The actual number of grants awarded will not be known until the application scoring and awarding process is completed. Any LEA receiving a score of 1 or 2 of the 6 point scale which would otherwise be funded through the competitive process will be contacted by ODE personnel and interviewed in order to provide technical assistance to that LEA in order to revise this section and all applicable sections of the award-worthy LEA grant.

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.**

As they compete for the funds, school districts (LEAs) must identify the schools they want to transform, and then determine which of the four following models is most appropriate. If a school has begun implementation of one of these four models or components of one of these models within the last two years, it may apply to use SIG funds to continue to implement the full model.

- **Turnaround model:** Replace the principal and rehire no more than 50 percent of the staff and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student outcomes.
- **Restart model:** Convert a school or close and reopen it under a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- **School closure:** Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.
- **Transformation model:** Implement each of the following strategies: (1) replace the principal and take steps to increase teacher and school leader effectiveness; (2) institute comprehensive instructional reforms; (3) increase learning time and create community-oriented schools; and (4) provide operational flexibility and sustained support. 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.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the LEA competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- LEA commits to serve Tier I, II, III schools.
- Intervention model selected by LEA; anticipated indicators of impact based upon the selected model are given.
- LEA must demonstrate that the selected intervention model or school improvement strategy matches the LEA's needs and examines the root cause for the school's identification of need for improvement (use of various data to analyze the needs of the LEA must include, but are not limited to student performance data, curriculum standards and assessment, effective teachers and leaders).
- LEA should provide information regarding how the selected intervention model or school improvement strategy matches the LEA's needs and examines the root cause for the school's identification of need for improvement (use of various data to analyze the needs of the LEA must include, but are not limited to student performance data, curriculum standards and assessment, effective teachers and leaders).
- LEA must address Reading achievement and Math achievement levels, graduation rate (if applicable), full implementation of intervention model (if applicable), and implementation of research-based school improvement strategies. This must be stated as *Indicators of Impact*.

Federal Assurances

In addition to assurances through the CCIP, the LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I

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

(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.

Ohio will build from the existing set of supports to provide professional development, coaching, and customized school climate tools to each LEA with persistently lowest-achieving schools. Professional development and coaching will leverage the existing infrastructure of school supports in Ohio, including state and local teams made up of Educational Service Centers (ESCs), Statewide Systems of Support (SSOS), and the Governor’s Closing the Achievement Gap (CTAG) Program (by mutual agreement of district and CTAG). Topics include increased family and community participation in the school, alignment with community health and human services resources, and increased student attendance and performance.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the LEA competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- Integration into Ohio Improvement Process (OIP): Applicants should address how the LEA’s Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) supports their grant proposal and work done in the Ohio Improvement Process (see Appendix E for an overview of the Ohio Improvement Process). Applicants should specifically address the following:
 - data utilized to determine the instructional improvement strategies and action steps identified in this proposal
 - how the strategies and action steps support the OIP plan
 - how the district/building(s) plans to monitor the selected intervention model(s) and/or improvement strategies
 - how the selected intervention model(s) and/or improvement strategies are integrated into the existing OIP
- Goals and Strategies (from district planning tool): 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. The goals must be *educational* goals and stated in the CCIP planning tool. All applicants must ensure that project goals and strategies are aligned and linked to the appropriate CIP Goals.

- Evaluation, monitoring, outcomes: Applicants must demonstrate how they will evaluate the progress in achieving project goals and objectives. Applicants must detail their comprehensive evaluation process and accountability measures. Projects *must* utilize evaluation measures that directly relate to their stated educational goals and performance indicators.
- Data Collection - Student Achievement: To meet one of the required performance indicators and educational goals, the applicant will need to determine how the selected intervention model will increase student achievement, and then measure the success of the intervention model.
- Stakeholder involvement: As appropriate, the LEA must consult with various relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools school improvement strategies in Tier III schools. Applicants must list any organization partners, providing a brief description of their roles related to the success of the project.
- Stakeholder collaboration: Eligible applicants should describe joint planning that occurred as well as the level of commitment among all parties (district and building level). Applicants must describe the stakeholder roles and their contributions to the success of the project.

(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).

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- Budget Narrative: The LEA must include a description of how funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the 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. Applicants must show how these funds will be spent. The application should include an explanation for each expenditure, its source if part of the match and how each expenditure aligns with project goals in an efficient and effective manner. Applicants will follow all current Ohio Department of Education fiscal

procedures as outlined in the CCIP Project Cash Request (PCR) process.

- The LEA must project how funds will be used during the period of availability of grant funding. Budget amounts must be given for Year 1 (FY 12), Year 2 (FY 13) and Year 3 (FY 14).
- Project Summary: Applicants will provide a brief summary of the project. The summary should be written so that readers, including peer reviewers, will understand the overall concept of the application. Applicants must provide an overview of the proposed project, including a description of the following:
 - The audience (who the project will directly impact);
 - The educational goals/need (what the project strives to ultimately accomplish); and
 - The activities (how the project will be carried out).

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, Ohio will assess the LEA's commitment to complete the requirements through the following process:

1. The SEA will perform initial screenings of the applications to ensure that all areas of compliance are met and the application is complete.
2. All areas of the electronic application will be evaluated using a calibrated scoring rubric.
3. The application quality score indicator will be generated using a rubric containing items that are directly tied to the response categories in the LEA application.
4. Each item will be rated using a six-point quality scale by each of three trained external (not associated with the LEA) readers.
5. A scoring rubric is provided and will be used in the review and scoring of each application.
6. A specific process for calibration will be followed (see pg. 16 for details)

Ohio will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- Action Steps: For each school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. Information must be given to explain how the **instructional model** will be implemented, and how the activities align with the elements of the state reform plan emphasizing standards and assessment, data systems to support instruction, great teachers and leaders, and turning around the lowest-achieving schools.
- Timeline: 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 and

services it will provide to each Tier III school. (tied to IMM tool)

This area of the competitive application will be scored using a calibrated instrument. See page 16 of this application for specific procedures. Any area receiving a score of two or less on the six point rubric of a fundable application will be required to work directly with SEA personnel for technical assistance within that area of the competitive application.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality:
 - proven track record of successful school improvement
 - matched to the needs of the students and the interventions
 - selected from list of approved external providers supplied by the Ohio Department of Education

This area of the competitive application will be scored using a calibrated instrument. See page 16 of this application for specific procedures. Any area receiving a score of two or less on the six point rubric of a fundable application will be required to work directly with SEA personnel for technical assistance within that area of the competitive application.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the CCIP by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- Applicants must identify the additional and supporting resources (e.g. internal building, local community, business and partner schools) that will be utilized in the project and demonstrate how these resources will impact success. Please explain how your project will leverage other and supporting resources (fiscal, human, technical, etc.) in the implementation of the intervention model.

This area of the competitive application will be scored using a calibrated instrument. See page 16 of this application for specific procedures. Any area receiving a score of two or less on the six point rubric of a fundable application will be required to work directly with SEA personnel for technical assistance within that area of the competitive application.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- The LEA must describe how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

This area of the competitive application will be scored using a calibrated instrument. See page 16 of this application for specific procedures. Any area receiving a score of two or less on the six point rubric of a fundable application will be required to work directly with SEA personnel for technical assistance within

that area of the competitive application.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Specific Application Responses: Applicants must complete the questions posed in the competitive School Improvement Grant CCIP application by providing the requested information. Information is requested as narrative descriptions addressing each of the following points:

- Continuation, sustain- The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This area of the competitive application will be scored using a calibrated instrument. See page 16 of this application for specific procedures. Any area receiving a score of two or less on the six point rubric of a fundable application will be required to work directly with SEA personnel for technical assistance within that area of the competitive application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Using the competitive grant process described in the FY2009 application and outlined below, the SEA will require the LEA to list the proposed pre-implementation activities in the LEA application for funding. The LEA will be required to answer questions regarding each area listed in the FY2010 SIG Guidance. The pre-implementation activities will need to occur prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year. Funding for pre-implementation activities will come from the LEA's year 1 total. Pre-implementation activities and budget are optional. However, the pre-implementation activities should be considered when examining the overall implementation plan. The calibration rubric describes how this section is reviewed.

Pre-implementation Activities and Budget

Describe the activities the LEA will take prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year in order to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year. Include the proposed budget amount needed to carry out the pre-implementation activities. Examples of possible allowable activities include: Family and Community Engagement, Rigorous Review of External Providers, Staffing, Instructional Programs, Professional Development and Support, Preparation for Accountability Measures.

Noted examples should not be seen as exhaustive or required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities depending on the needs of particular SIG schools. SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools.



The SEA will award funds to the schools demonstrating capacity to implement.

Review Process

Funding for the Ohio SIG competitive grant project is projected to award substantial funding in School Improvement Grant to eligible schools. In order to assure that quality applications are funded, a competitive grant process will be used. LEAs will submit an electronic application. The SEA will perform initial screenings of the applications to ensure that all areas of compliance are met and the application is complete. All areas of the electronic application will be evaluated using a calibrated scoring rubric.

Evaluation Criteria

The application quality score indicator will be generated using a rubric containing items that are directly tied to the response categories in the LEA electronic application. Each item will be rated using a six-point quality scale by each of three trained external (not associated with the LEA) readers. A scoring rubric is provided and will be used in the review and scoring of each application. The application review process consists of the following steps:

1. Each complete proposal will be reviewed by at least three trained external peer reviewers.
2. Each proposal's score will be analyzed to minimize reader leniency/severity and will be statistically adjusted.
3. Each reader will be assessed for consistency and eliminated from the scoring process if they demonstrate significant inconsistency, or found to possess a conflict of interest
4. Each proposal will be rank ordered according to an overall adjusted score. Those with the highest ranks will be eligible for funding.

The funded projects will be chosen via a peer review process conducted under the guidance of professor emeritus of the Ohio State University. All applicants are required to submit the names and email addresses of two (2) reviewers (one committed and one alternate) from the eligible buildings applying for SIG competitive grant funds. One reviewer from each eligible building that applies for funding will participate in the Reviewers' Training scheduled to occur in May. No reviewer will be allowed to judge a proposal submitted by his/her own institution or an institution in which the reviewer has a conflict of interest. Expenses incurred for the grant readings are the grant applicant's responsibility.

Evaluation Rubric

All areas will use a six-point quality scale for each rubric item or question:

1. There is no evidence or irrelevant evidence that the data substantiates the educational needs described in the project summary.
2. There is minimal evidence and/or limited potential that the data provided substantiates the educational needs.
3. The data provides some evidence as to the educational need; however, there are some inconsistencies between the data supplied and the correlation to the need.
4. The summary provides some good examples of data substantiating the educational needs.

5. Strong, relevant data to substantiate the educational needs throughout the application are provided; high potential of need based upon data.
6. High-level of evidence, supported by relevant data, to substantiate the educational needs of the building; data strongly suggests educational needs.

The funded projects will be chosen via a peer review process. No reviewer will be allowed to judge a proposal submitted by his/her own institution or an institution in which the reviewer has a conflict of interest.

A list of approvable applications will be generated. If any application receives a score of 2 or less on the 6 point rubric, an interview process will be conducted by the SEA to substantiate and provide technical support to the LEA within that component area. Refinement to any unacceptable areas will occur.

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:

If the LEA does not apply to serve one of its identified Tier I or Tier II schools, it must describe why it lacks the sufficient capacity to do so. This description must appear in the LEA application. The claim must be substantiated. Through a review process, the claim will be evaluated:

- Each complete proposal will be reviewed by at least three trained external peer reviewers.
- Each proposal's score will be analyzed to minimize reader leniency/severity and statistically adjusted
- Each reader will be assessed for consistency and eliminated from the scoring process if they demonstrate significant inconsistency, or found to possess a conflict of interest
- Each proposal will be rank ordered according to an overall adjusted score. Those with the highest ranks will be eligible for funding.

The item on the competitive application noting the claim of the LEA to serve Tier I and Tier II school(s) or the claim that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve Tier I and Tier II school(s) will be scored. Ohio Department of Education personnel will then examine the rating given by the reviewers. Any LEA receiving a score of 1 or 2 of the 6 point scale which would otherwise be funded through the competitive process will be contacted by ODE personnel and interviewed in order to substantiate the claim of the LEA.

If the LEA is found to have more capacity than the LEA demonstrates, the ODE will provide technical assistance to that LEA in order to revise this section and all applicable sections of the award-worthy LEA grant.

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

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

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

Contingent upon availability of funding-

Project Timeline

The grant award program period will be from the date the grant is issued July 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012. In this application, Ohio is requesting a waiver of the period of availability to permit it to obligate the funds through September 30, 2014.

After successful implementation of the program, as determined by meeting the requirements specified in the grant assurances and the annual evaluation of selected program goals, and depending on funding availability, a follow-up or continuation grant may be awarded to help sustain the program.

January 2011	Request for Proposals (RFP) Release to eligible LEAs of Tier I and Tier II schools
February	Online letter of Intent and Contact Information submitted through SAFE account by the LEA superintendent, by 4:00PM EST.
February	CCIP SIG competitive application opens for the LEAs of Tier I and Tier II schools
February-April	Technical Assistance Meetings, Audio Conferences will be provided to eligible buildings
April 29	Grant applications of Tier I and Tier II schools due via CCIP Competitive application, submitted by 5:00 PM EST.
May	Grant reviewer training and grant review
June	Award Announcement of funded Tier I and Tier II schools
July 1	Funds available to LEAs of Tier I and Tier II schools

**Tentative Timeline for Tier 3 Competition
(pending availability of funding for Tier III schools*)**

May 2011	Request for Proposals (RFP) Release to eligible Tier III schools and online letter of Intent and Contact Information submitted through SAFE account by the LEA superintendent of eligible Tier III schools, by 4:00PM EST*
June	CCIP SIG competitive application opens for the LEAs of Tier III schools*
June-July	Technical Assistance Meetings, Audio Conferences will be provided to eligible buildings*
July 29	Grant applications of Tier III schools due via CCIP Competitive application, submitted by 5:00 PM EST. *
August	Grant reviewer training and grant review*

August	Award announcement of funded Tier III schools*
September	Funds available to LEAs of funded Tier III schools*

Year 1 – Project Implementation

Please note that there will be additional events and activities in which LEA recipients will be required to participate. Some of these will include, but are not limited to: new grant orientation meeting, professional development opportunities, state support team sessions, monitoring activities, data collection requests and requirements, as well as other necessary project components. Use of the electronic implementation management monitoring tool will be a requirement for the LEA (see Appendix F in FY 2009 application). SEA staff will review original target goal proposal and compare to actual achievement levels and outcomes. The LEA will be required to submit a continuation application (Appendix D in FY 2009 application). A rubric to evaluate the continuation application will be developed by the SEA and will be made available to the LEAs prior to the end of Year 1 of the grant funding.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

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

2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant if one or more schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final

requirements.

Continuation grants will be reviewed through the Consolidated Continuous Improvement Planning (CCIP) application. Baseline and current quantitative and qualitative data will be provided to the SEA by the LEA through the IMM tool (separate attachment). The Ohio Department of Education, Office of Federal Programs (ODE/OFPP) internal team will monitor that LEAs are progressing on annual goals. For the Tier I and Tier II schools, If the LEA does not implement the intervention model and make progress on the annual goals set forth in its application, the ODE/OFPP internal team will recommend non-renewal of the LEA School Improvement Grant.

Awardees will be required to attend quarterly meetings to present implementation data to the SEA. This data will be reported using the IM/M Tool and will provide information to the LEA regarding implementation of intervention models and school improvement strategies. Annual achievement data (from state and local assessments) will be reported by the LEA. The SEA will be responsible for monitoring and reviewing the data with the LEA to determine a formative assessment of progress.

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 SIG grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

Continuation grants will be reviewed through the Consolidated Continuous Improvement Planning (CCIP) application. Baseline and current quantitative and qualitative data will be provided to the SEA by the LEA through the IMM tool (separate attachment). The Ohio Department of Education, Office of Federal Programs (ODE/OFPP) internal team will monitor that LEAs are progressing on annual goals of the Tier III schools. These goals are listed in the LEA application as well as in the goals, strategies, and action steps of the CCIP. If the LEA does not make progress on the annual goals set forth in its application, the ODE/OFPP internal team will recommend non-renewal of the LEA School Improvement Grant.

Awardees will be required to attend quarterly meetings to present implementation data to the SEA. This data will be reported using the IM/M Tool and will provide information to the LEA regarding implementation of intervention models and school improvement strategies. Annual achievement data (from state and local assessments) will be reported by the LEA. The SEA will be responsible for monitoring and reviewing the data with the LEA to determine a formative assessment of progress.

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 identified in the LEA's application.

Within the LEA competitive application, the LEA must:

- Identify the current effect as well as the anticipated results related to increased student achievement and improved instructional practices given the program selected within the model chosen.
- Explain how the LEA plans to monitor efforts to improve instructional practices so that the interventions selected are designed to close the achievement gap and will meet the expectation to reach the same standard for all students.
- Explain how the identified improvement model is integrated into the existing work and is monitored using the CCIP Implementation Management/Monitoring (IMM) tool, a web-based tool designed to assist districts/schools with the data analysis and needs assessment process. The Implementation Management/Monitoring (IMM) Tool provides a way for districts to document how their District and School Plans will be implemented. The district or school can identify items to be measured, resources needed, persons/groups responsible, and the timeline for implementing. See Appendix F for further information.

Each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant must participate in focused monitoring sessions conducted by the Ohio Department of Education/ Office of Federal Programs (ODE/OFP) internal team. Regional support team members and external providers will offer training and work sessions during the focused monitoring sessions in order to support the LEAs as they implement the school intervention models. Through these sessions, the ODE/OFP will be alerted to LEAs struggling with full and effective implementation. Intensive support opportunities will be offered to these LEAs in addition to the focused monitoring sessions. However, if an LEA fails to fully implement the school intervention model within the timeline given through the IMM tool, the LEA will not receive funding for subsequent years.

Awardees will be required to attend quarterly meetings to present implementation data to the SEA. This data will be reported using the IMM Tool and will provide information to the LEA regarding implementation of intervention models and school improvement strategies. Annual achievement data (from state and local assessments) will be reported by the LEA. The SEA will be responsible for monitoring and reviewing the data with the LEA to determine a formative assessment of progress.

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.

Funding for the Ohio SIG competitive grant project is projected to be significant. While this investment is substantial, it is insufficient to fund all eligible schools; therefore, a competitive grant application process was developed to meet the requirements of this federal program. The application review process consists of the following steps:

1. Each complete proposal will be reviewed by at least three trained external peer reviewers.
2. Each proposal's score will be analyzed to minimize reader leniency/severity and will be statistically adjusted.
3. Each reader will be assessed for consistency and eliminated from the scoring process if they demonstrate significant inconsistency, or found to possess a conflict of interest

4. Each proposal will be rank ordered according to an overall adjusted score. Those with the highest ranks will be eligible for funding.

Tier I and Tier II schools will receive funding priority, with the remaining funds allocated to the Tier III schools. LEA's which have Tier I and Tier II school(s) will be prioritized. Applications from LEAs with Tier I and Tier II schools will be scored separately from the applications of LEAs with only Tier III schools. Funding allocation has been reserved so that all Tier I and Tier II schools submitting fundable applications will receive funds. Remaining allocations will be made to rank ordered LEAs with Tier III schools. These LEA applications (of the Tier III schools) will rank ordered using the detailed calibration scoring process.

Within the SEA allocation, up to \$2,000,000 will be reserved for each Tier I and Tier II school. However, it is recognized that not all schools may require the full amount to implement a turnaround, restart, or transformation model. It is the goal of this SEA to facilitate **QUALITY**, not quantity within the grant awards to the LEAs. Through the competitive grant process, all LEA applications will be evaluated as to the quality of the individual components of the program to be implemented. Within the competitive LEA application (see Appendix G), the following items address this:

Needs assessment driven by data:

- Student impact: total number of students impacted
- Capacity to implement and the total number of Tier I and Tier II schools within the LEA

Budget needs: LEAs are required to explain this alignment within the budget narrative

- Alignment of activities to fiscal expenditures
- Resources that are assigned to each goal, strategy

The educational goals and the quality of activities needed to accomplish the goals

- Action step activities provide breadth and depth
- Active monitoring of student data and

Likelihood of success

- Integration into the LEA's Improvement Process
- Modification of practices and policies needed to implement the interventions fully
- Stakeholder involvement

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

A competitive grant application process (stated above in Item #D4) will be used to prioritize Tier III schools to be served.

Tier I and Tier II schools will receive funding priority, with the remaining funds allocated to the Tier III schools. LEA's which have Tier I and Tier II school(s) will be prioritized. All remaining Tier III schools will participate in the grant funding process as follows:

All eligible, applying Tier III LEA's will be rank ordered using the process stated above, using the attached rubric. Tier III schools with the highest scores will receive allocations as funding allows. Applications

from LEAs with Tier I and Tier II schools will be scored separately from the applications of LEAs with only Tier III schools. Funding allocation has been reserved so that all Tier I and Tier II schools submitting fundable applications will be receive funds. Remaining allocations will be made to rank ordered LEAs with Tier III schools. These LEA applications (of the Tier III schools) will rank ordered using the detailed calibration scoring process.

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.

At the time of application, Ohio does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II school. However, if that information changes, a project amendment will be filed detailing the school(s) and the intervention model(s) that will be implemented in the schools.

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.²

At the time of application, Ohio does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover. However, if that information changes, a project amendment will be filed detailing the Tier I and Tier II school(s) and the intervention model(s) that will be implemented in the schools. Evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide services directly will be provided at that time.

² If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES

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 Ohio Department of Education (ODE) will retain five percent of the funds provided. These funds will help build the capacity of the system of support for schools and districts. For Ohio to successfully support LEAs, it will use funds to support the following strategies described in the School Improvement Grant application.

- Professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members, technical assistance providers, and LEA personnel informed by student achievement and other data measures. LEA grantees will participate in sustained professional development and technical support opportunities to build and sustain capacity to implement school improvement intervention models and/or strategies. This capacity building will be offered through the Ohio Department of Education’s Office of Transforming Schools and the direct assignment of transformation specialists to identified LEAs.
- Qualified third-party applicants will provide technical support to ODE in the development, implementation and monitoring of the school improvement grant (SIG). The contractor will work in collaboration with ODE and SIG grantees (LEAs) to guide professional development toward dramatically transforming school culture and increase student outcomes in persistently lowest-achieving schools.
- Other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified in the School Improvement Grant. Strategies, as outlined in the grant initiative, including, but not limited to:
 - Intervention models
 - Extended learning opportunities
 - Engagement with stakeholders (parents, community, etc.)
 - Data and monitoring
 - Effective teachers and leaders
 - Standards and assessment
 - Coherence and sustainability
 - Effective instructional models and supports for all students
 - Effective use of resources and resource allocation (fiscal, time, facilities, technology, personnel)
 - Safety net strategies such as early intervention, Response to Intervention, supplemental learning opportunities

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

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

Assurance

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (5) 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;
- (6) 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;
- (7) 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
- (8) 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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