

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Delaware Dept of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">401 Federal St. Suite 2 Dover DE 19901</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Lillian, Lowery, Ed.D.</p> <p>Position and Office: State Secretary of Education</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Delaware Dept of Education 401 Federal Street, Suite 2 Dover DE 19901</p> <p>Telephone: 302-735-4000</p> <p>Fax: 302-739-4654</p> <p>Email address: llowery@doe.k12.de.us</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Lillian M. Lowery</i></p>	<p>Telephone:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>302.735.4000</i></p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X <i>Lillian M. Lowery</i></p>	<p>Date:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>2/16/2011</i></p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Delaware - Revised January 2011



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: Delaware Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 401 Federal Street, Suite #2 Dover, DE 19901
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Amelia E. Hodges Position and Office: Associate Secretary, College and Workforce Readiness Contact's Mailing Address: 35 Commerce Way, Suite #1 Dover, DE 19904 Telephone: 302-857-3301 Fax: 302-739-1770 Email address: ahodges@doe.k12.de.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Lillian M. Lowery	Telephone: 302-735-4000
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X /s/Lillian M. Lowery	Date: 1/24/11
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.

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <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)	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <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"/> 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	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
	<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:

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

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.

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.

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.

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

Delaware’s definition of persistently low-achieving school (PLA) is defined in the state’s regulation for accountability. A full copy of Delaware Regulations, Administrative Code, Title 14, §103 may be found in at: <http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title14/100/103.shtml#TopOfPage>

See page 5 for information on PLA calculations and additional definitions.

Explanation of calculation methods to determine PLA schools and relevant definitions

Measures for Placing Schools into Tiers

English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rates were calculated using the Single Percentage Method for the most recent year of AYP determinations (i.e., 2010). The numerator for the percentage consisted of students who scored proficient or higher in English/language arts plus students who scored proficient or higher in mathematics. The denominator for the percentage consisted of the total number of students assessed in English/language arts plus the total number of students who assessed in mathematics. Students were included in both the numerator and denominator if they took either the regular assessment or the alternate assessment. Students were only included if they met the full school year definition used in Delaware's approved Accountability Workbook.

"Lack of Progress" was determined by first calculating the percent proficient for the two preceding years using the Single Percentage Method described above. The three years of proficiency percentages for 2008-2010 were then used to calculate a slope for each school over the three years. The slope represented the change in the percent proficient per year over the period. Positive slope values represented growth, whereas negative slope values represented regression.

Finally, the graduation rates used for Delaware's Other Academic Indicator for AYP determinations was calculated for 2008, 2009, and 2010 in order to examine whether they were below 60% over a number of years.

Assignment of Schools to Tiers I and III

Delaware has 35 Title I schools that are under improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2010-11 school year. The 35 schools were ranked on the dimensions of English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rates and "Lack of Progress". The school with highest percent proficient for 2010 was given a rank of 1, and the school with the lowest percent proficient was given a rank of 35. The school with the largest (positive) slope value was given a rank of 1 and the school with the smallest (negative) slope value was given a rank of 35. An overall weighted average ranking was created for each school by applying the weight of 50% to the percent proficient rank and applying the weight of 50% to the "Lack of Progress" rank and summing the resulting values. The lowest-achieving schools for Tier I were determined by taking the five schools with the highest overall weighted average ranks.

There were 11 high schools among the 35 Title I Schools. Using the criterion that **two of the last** three years of graduation rates must be below 60%, there were no additional schools identified for Tier I.

Among the remaining 30 schools, one school (Seaford High School) received funds as Tier II school in 2009-10 and was, therefore, excluded from Tier III. The remaining 29 Title I schools were assigned to Tier III. Applying the "minimum n" waiver, small schools identified under Tier I or Tier II were added to the Tier III list, which expanded Tier III to a total of 31 schools with two schools being added from Tier II.

Assignment of Schools to Tier II

Delaware has 24 secondary schools that are Title I eligible but not participating using the criterion of 35% of their students receiving free or reduced price lunch as of the fall of 2010. Applying the "minimum n" waiver, two of the schools were removed and assigned to Tier III based on meeting the "minimum n" waiver criteria. The remaining 22 schools were ranked on the dimensions of

English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rates and "Lack of Progress". The school with highest percent proficient for 2010 was given a rank of 1, and the school with the lowest percent proficient was given a rank of 22. The school with the largest (positive) slope value was given a rank of 1 and the school with the smallest (negative) slope value was given a rank of 22. An overall weighted average ranking was created for each school by applying the weight of 50% to the percent proficient rank and applying the weight of 50% to the "Lack of Progress" rank and summing the resulting values. The lowest-achieving schools for Tier II were determined by taking the first four schools with the highest overall weighted average ranks and the school with the sixth highest overall weighted rank. The school with the fifth highest overall weighted rank (Mt Pleasant High School) was excluded from Tier II because the school received funds as a Tier II school in the 2009-10 school year.

There were seven high schools among the remaining 16 secondary schools that are Title I eligible but not participating. Using the criterion that **two of the last** three years of graduation rates must be below 60%, no additional schools were identified for Tier II based on graduation rate. Therefore, the 16 remaining secondary schools that are Title I eligible but not participating were not assigned to a Tier.

Additional Definitions

"**DDOE**" means the Delaware Department of Education

"**Delaware Department of Education Achievement Metric**" or "**DDOE Achievement Metric**" means the calculation that is based on the risk and need of each school as demonstrated by its performance on the DSTP or successor statewide assessment.

"**Elementary School**" means a school with a grade configuration including any of the following: Kindergarten, grade 1, grade 2, grade 3, grade 4, grade 5, or grade 6. However, a school that has grade 6 as its lowest grade level may be considered a Middle School or Secondary School as those terms are defined herein.

"**High School**" means a school with a grade configuration including any of the following: grade 9, grade 10, grade 11, or grade 12. A High School shall also be considered a Secondary School as that term is defined herein.

"**Local Educational Agency**" or "**LEA**" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within Delaware for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a school district, or for a combination of school districts. The term includes an educational service agency and any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary school or secondary school.

"**Middle School**" means a school with a grade configuration with more than one of the following: grade 6, grade 7, or grade 8, but that does not include any grade lower than grade 5.

"**Persistently low-achieving school**" means

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

(b) is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent for two of the last three years; and

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

(a) 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

(b) is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent for two of the last three years; and

(iii) Any non-Title I eligible secondary school that would be considered a persistently low-achieving school pursuant to one or more of the aforementioned requirements if it were eligible to receive Title I funds

[The determination shall be based on the academic achievement of the "all students" subgroup in the school in terms of proficiency on the assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading and mathematics combined; and the school's lack of progress on those assessments over a period of three school years in the "all students" subgroup. Proficiency and lack of progress shall be weighted equally.]

"Secondary School" means a school with a grade configuration including any of the following: grade 6, grade 7, grade 8, grade 9, grade 10, grade 11, or grade 12. However, a school that includes grade 6 may be considered an Elementary School or Middle School as those terms are defined herein.

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

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

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Changes to 2010 evaluation criteria are minor and are highlighted in blue text.

Part 1

All LEAs are required to have an LEA Success Plan. The success plan is a required component of LEA applications for federal and state funds. The LEA Success Plan is the comprehensive strategic plan for the LEA. All LEA applications for funds must show how funds will support the overarching LEA Success Plan. Specifically, within funding applications, LEAs must show how Budgeted Activities directly support the LEA's effort to address the needs, goals, objectives, progress targets, and strategies within the overarching plan.

Within each success plan, the LEA must identify the following information:

- LEA Mission – A statement that defines the core purpose of the organization
- LEA Vision – A word picture of what the organization intends ultimately to become in the future
- Needs Assessment – The needs of the students, staff and community and, to the extent that they can be identified, the underlying causes of these needs
- Goals – Statements of future achievements that are designed to attain the mission
- Objectives – Measurable outcomes that support the goals
- Formative and Summative Progress Measures and Targets – Quantitative indicators that gauge the status of the objectives throughout the plan implementation
- Strategies – Statements that describe how the organization will influence the measures

Each LEA School Improvement Grant (SIG) application will require an amendment to the LEA Success Plan. The amended plan will include:

- Updated needs assessment information for all schools being served by SIG
- A separate SIG objective for each intervention chosen under the LEA Success Plan goal for Turning Around the LEA's lowest performing schools
- Identification of specific school(s) formative and summative progress measures and targets, and strategies directly related to each SIG objective
- Identification of all SIG-eligible state Partnership Zone schools

Beyond Success Plan amendments, each LEA SIG application will also require LEA responses to specific questions and a detailed budget. A copy of the full LEA application is attached in as a separate file.

All LEA applications will be reviewed by a team of DDOE staff members including those responsible for Title I, school improvement, accountability, and federal finance. The DDOE review team will also include at least one representative from the department's Turnaround Unit. Each review team member will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on each section of the application. (The full DDOE Title I, 1003(g) SIG Review checklist is attached as a separate file.)

The LEA capacity section will be reviewed using the following criteria:

- The LEA must serve at least one Tier I or Tier II school (unless the LEA has no Tier I or Tier II schools) and all SIG-eligible state Partnership Zone schools within the LEA
- If the LEA is not serving all eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA must provide clear and logical rationale for the schools it has chosen to serve and for the schools it has chosen *not* to serve, including LEA staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations
- The LEA must provide rationale for the model chosen for each school served. Rationale must be clearly and logically linked to the needs for each school
- The LEA must identify which LEA-level staff members and outside experts will be supporting each school, and each person's expertise that will contribute to successful implementation of

the grant

- If the EMO/CMO management model is selected, the LEA must provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including a evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners
- If the school closure model is selected, the LEA must provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools)
- If the Turnaround model is chosen, the LEA must provide evidence that all required components of the model will be implemented
- If the Transformation model is chosen, the LEA must provide evidence that all required components of the model will be implemented. Beginning 2011-2012 school year, this will include participation in the Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS) as required under new state regulations 106 and 108. (Full copies of the new regulations may be found in PDF attachments accompanying this application) For the 2010-2011 school year this will include LEA commitment that participating schools will
 - Participate in state activities to develop multiple indicators of student improvement for DPAS, as revised by state regulation 106 and 108, for utilization state wide in the 2011-2012 school year
 - Review current DPAS to determine which criteria will be used to evaluate teacher and administrator effectiveness during the 2010-2011 school year in their respective school(s)
 - Conduct and document DPAS with the above highlighted criteria for evaluations for all staff during the 2010-2011 school year
 - Participate in training related to new DPAS system to be implemented during the 2011-2012 school year per new state regulation
- LEAs with 9 or more schools identified in Tiers I, II, and III, have chosen to implement the transformation model in no more than 50% of eligible schools.

The budget section will be reviewed using the following criteria:

- Budgeted items must be clearly and directly linked to the strategies in the LEA's SIG Objective(s)
- Budgeted items must clearly and directly address the reason why the school is in improvement (AYP cells missed and other data-determined needs indicated under this goal)
- Budgeted items must be necessary and reasonable for the proper and efficient performance and administration of the grant award
- Budgeted items must be realistic including
 - Able to be fully expended during the grant period, with the majority of funds to be expended during year 1 of the grant period as demonstrated in the Distribution of Funds section of the application
 - Of sufficient scope and amount to ensure strategy success (Example: Strategy in plan is to require all ELA teachers to participate in high quality professional development. Budgeted items must clearly show that there are sufficient funds to support all ELA teachers' participation)
- Budgeted items must be allowable under ESEA cost principles and state law and regulation
- Budgeted items for LEAs choosing the school closure model must not be for more than one year in duration and may only be allocated for costs related to school closure including, but not limited to:

- parent and community outreach efforts related to school closure
- parent and student transition services to the new school
- new school orientation activities for parents and students transferring from the closed school
- administrative and operational costs, only if they are in excess of normal LEA costs and directly related to the school closure (i.e. transportation costs exceeding normal LEA transportation costs for the students in the closed school)
- Budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a)(2)(B) and §1120A(b).

Part 2

Processes for LEAs

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements

The State's plan to support turnaround begins with its regulations, which mandate a process for identifying lowest-achieving schools, and initiating reform through the State's Partnership Zone. Each year, schools that have been selected to participate in the Partnership Zone will be required to implement one of the four school intervention models outlined in Race to the Top and the 1003(g) State Plan. Delaware regulation requires local bargaining units to work with LEAs to modify collective bargaining agreements to secure the flexibility necessary for that implementation to be successful. **The Turnaround Unit has shared the state-developed LEA self-assessment rubric with all PZ schools and is helping PZ school planning teams use the rubric effectively to guide their planning process. A copy of the LEA self-assessment rubric is attached. The Turnaround Unit will also monitor LEA implementation of the model, as described in Section D, Parts 2-8 of this application.**

LEAs applying for SIG funds for Tier I and/or Tier II schools that do not fall into the state's Partnership Zone will also be required to **implement one of the four school intervention models outlined in Race to the Top and the 1003(g) State Plan.**

All schools eligible to apply will be invited to a technical assistance meeting at the opening of the grant application period. During this meeting(s) the state will share the LEA self-assessment rubric and train LEA teams to use the rubric during their planning process.

Non-PZ schools that are awarded funds must also develop and submit project management plans through the web-based Education Success Planning and Evaluation System. Project management plans must be submitted within 30 business days after the LEA receives notification of grant award. The Title I Office will review all project management plans to ensure they reflect full model implementation. A sample project management plan is attached. The Title I Office will also monitor LEA implementation of the model, as described in Section D, Parts 2-8 of this application.

The Title I Office conducts a quarterly onsite review with LEA staff responsible for SIG. This review includes checking progress as indicated in the online project management plans to ensure the LEA is on target to meet its commitment to implement the selected intervention model. If the LEA is not meeting its implementation targets as outlined in the project management plan, the SEA will provide additional technical assistance and support to help the LEA get back on track. If the LEA continues to fall behind on targets, the SEA will place conditions on the 1003(g) funding.

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

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will provide a range of supports to LEAs as they turn around lowest-achieving schools, from identification as a Persistently Low Achieving School, to potential identification as a Partnership Zone school, to the planning process, to recruitment of leaders and staff, and finally, to the launch and operations of the turnaround school. Supports will include providing access to turnaround experts and mentors, providing help with recruiting operational partners, and identifying and disseminating best practices. Schools that choose to convert to a charter school will be supported by the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office and the Charter School Office. The State has established a partnership with US Education Delivery Institute to support its turnaround efforts. The state is also working with local foundations, non-profits, and the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center to provide all persistently low achieving schools information about high quality providers. These opportunities include:

- School visits to showcase various providers including, but not limited to, New Tech High School, Big Picture High School, Early College High School.
- The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center has developed a compendium of research-based EMO and CMO models. This information will be shared with eligible applicants.
- Workshop with the National Institute for Time and Learning. They came to Delaware to assist the LEAs and the Charters examine their current instructional time, provided tools to do an extensive audit of time, and presented various samples of how other learning communities have increased instructional time anywhere from 15% to 25%.

In addition to the supports the SEA is providing above, the Title I Office will review the LEAs project management plans to ensure they detail the process they will undertake to ensure they are recruiting, screening, and selecting quality external providers. The Title I Office also conducts a quarterly onsite review with LEA staff responsible for SIG. This review includes checking progress as indicated in the online project management plans and discussions about recruiting, screening and selection processes. In addition, LEAs will be required to provide documentation/proof of these processes. If the LEA is not following through with its commitment for recruiting, screening, and selecting quality external providers as outlined in the project management plan, the SEA will provide additional technical assistance and support to help the LEA get back on track. If the LEA continues to fall behind on targets, the SEA will place conditions on the 1003(g) funding.

Align other resources with the interventions

LEA and School Success Plans are comprehensive plans – not individual plans for separate initiatives. The 1003(g) SIG, the Consolidated Application, and the 1003(a) school improvement grants all require funds to be directly linked to goals, objectives, targets and strategies within the Success Plan. Although Success Plans may be amended, all grants, and any amendments, are reviewed to ensure alignment of resources and interventions. Any LEA awarded 1003(g) SIG funds will be required to show alignment of federal and state program funds with the SIG interventions. Similarly, and school awarded 1003(g) SIG funds (through its LEA) will be required to show alignment of state and Title I 1003(a) school improvement grant funds (if eligible) and SIG interventions.

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

The State will enter into MOUs with LEAs, requiring schools to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP)

within two years of operations within the Partnership Zone. The State will monitor progress and provide supports and consequences if schools are off-track to meeting their AYP targets.

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will monitor LEAs with SIG schools to ensure all duties are carried out and SIG schools are making significant progress. If the LEA is experiencing problems or barriers to full SIG implementation, the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will work with the LEA to alleviate those issues and/or to amend plans appropriately. The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will monitor progress by regularly reviewing, at minimum, project management plan documentation, progress on formative targets within the LEA Success Plan SIG Goal(s), and LEA requests for assistance.

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will also be responsible for recommending consequences to the SEA if LEAs are not carrying out SIG grant duties or are not implementing LEA SIG strategies. Supports and consequences may include, but are not limited to, increased technical assistance, required actions with deadlines, and non-renewal of SIG funding.

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

The State will support LEAs in improving more than just the persistently lowest-achieving schools through the use of quantitative and qualitative assessments, improved reform plans, and added capacity, support, and oversight. The goals of these efforts are to prevent schools from being defined as PLA.

The state's education reform plan has instituted several new statewide programs that will support LEAs and schools as they carry out bold reform. Each of these supports is designed to build capacity for long-term change and improved outcomes for students. See the Delaware Race to the Top application for full detail about reform efforts that lead to sustainable change.

In addition, the state has established:

- a new assessment system, DCAS, which provides real-time data to teachers, schools, and districts so they may effectively adapt instruction to students' needs. DCAS implementation includes training and supporting documentation for educators. See: <http://de.portal.airast.org/educator.html> for detailed information.
- an LEA Support Program consisting of monthly meetings with chief school officers and their teams and bi-monthly technical assistance meetings with LEA teams to assist them in strengthen their reform plans under Race to the Top and to ensure all schools improve student achievement. Detailed information from this program may be found at: http://www.doe.k12.de.us/rttt/lea_pages/support_programs.shtml
- a partnership with US Education Delivery Institute to support its reform efforts. The state's Delivery Unit provides support and oversight for LEA reform implementation using the US Education Delivery Institute model. The Delivery Unit is responsible for tracking progress towards goals and intervening when progress is off-track. This includes regular "stocktaking" meetings with each LEA to assess plan progress.

Each LEA SIG application and Race to the Top plan will be reviewed with an eye for sustainability of reform. This includes analyzing all budgeted items to ensure they are of sufficient scope and amount to ensure strategy success within the grant period. For example, any budgeted items for personnel must either be short-term (period of the grant) or be accompanied with an explanation of how the position will be funded after the grant period.

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:

Any LEA wishing to carry out pre-implementation activities will need to indicate their intent in a specific section of the grant application. This section also will require LEAs to list pre-implementation activities and explain how each activity will help the LEA prepare for full model implementation next school year. (The full DDOE Title I, 1003(g) SIG Review checklist is attached as a separate file.)

The "pre-implementation" activities and budget will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- Activities and budgeted items must be clearly and directly linked to the strategies in the LEA's SIG Objective(s) and requirements of the selected intervention model
- Activities and budgeted items must be necessary and reasonable for the proper and efficient model implementation during the following school year
- Activities and budgeted items must be realistic
- Activities and budgeted items must be allowable under ESEA cost principles and state law and regulation
- Activities and budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a)(2)(B) and §1120A(b).

In addition, the full application budget will be analyzed to ensure:

- 1) Budgeted items are able to be fully expended during the grant period and
- 2) The majority of the budgeted items will be expended during year 1 of the grant period

See budget section of the approval checklist and Section B, Part 1 of this application.

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:

Changes to 2010 evaluation criteria are minor and are highlighted in blue text.

Processes for LEAs with Partnership Zone schools

Delaware received waivers to fully implement SIG in accordance with state regulation for LEAs with Partnership Zone schools. State accountability regulation mandates a state process for identifying lowest-achieving schools and initiating reform through the State's Partnership Zone. Each year, schools that have been selected to participate in the Partnership Zone will be required to implement one of the four school intervention models outlined in Race to the Top and the 1003(g) State Plan. Delaware regulation now requires local bargaining units to work with LEAs to modify collective bargaining agreements to secure the flexibility necessary for that implementation to be successful.

Under state regulation, if the State does not agree with the LEA's proposed option and plan to implement it, the State can refuse to agree to a Partnership Zone MOU. Regulation provides that if an MOU is not agreed to within 120 days, the LEA's options are then limited to closure, reopening the school as a charter, or contracting with a private management organization to operate the school. The limited options available as alternatives to the MOU provide strong incentive for a meaningful agreement to be reached.

Regulation also requires the LEA and the local bargaining unit to secure an agreement providing sufficient operational and staffing flexibility for the model to be implemented successfully. As with the MOU, the assurance that the LEA and the local bargaining unit will negotiate meaningful change at this point is provided by a combination of the parties' interest in rapidly turning around the school, the limited alternative choices available, and the authority granted to the DDOE in the regulation described below.

Finally, regulation specifies: if the LEA and the collective bargaining unit cannot reach agreement with respect to necessary changes to the collective bargaining agreement within 75 days, the LEA and the collective bargaining unit must each provide their last offer to The Delaware Secretary of Education, who will then have final authority to select one of those options for implementation. The Secretary will select one of the options submitted by the LEA and/or its collective bargaining unit. If The Secretary does not find that either of the options is satisfactory, she may send the parties back to continue negotiations for an additional 30 days. If agreement is not reached in that timeframe, the LEA will be forced to enter an MOU selecting a different model. If no MOU is entered within 120 days from the date of notification that the school was selected for the Partnership Zone, the LEA's options are limited to choosing between closure, reopening the school as a charter, or contracting with a private management organization to operate the school.

Once a plan is agreed upon and implemented, the regulations again provide the State with the authority to intervene to ensure rapid improvements in performance. In addition to regular monitoring of progress, regulation states that if, after two years of operations, the school has not made AYP, the MOU process will be repeated. The school will again have the opportunity to pursue further reform, secure additional flexibilities in staffing and operations, and, if necessary, narrow the set of options further to exclude the failed option.

Processes for LEAs with non- Partnership Zone schools

The LEA capacity section of the SIG application includes, in part, the following criteria:

- The LEA must serve at least one Tier I or Tier II school (unless the LEA has no Tier I or Tier II schools)
- If the LEA is not serving all eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA must provide clear and logical rationale for the schools it has chosen to serve and for the schools it has chosen not to serve, including LEA staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations

DDOE SIG review team members will scrutinize the rationale for any Tier I or Tier II schools that are not identified as Partnership Zone participants and that an LEA chooses not to serve. If the review team believes the LEA application is substantially approvable but does not clearly prove lack-of-capacity evidence, the team will require the LEA to revise their application per the review process described in section D. The revision will need to either a) provide additional and substantial evidence supporting the LEA's claim of lack of capacity or b) include a detailed plan and budget for all schools in Tier I and Tier II. Should subsequent resubmissions still provide insufficient evidence of lack of capacity and not include all Tier I and Tier II schools, then the LEA application will not be awarded.

Reviewers will take the following factors into consideration when reviewing lack of capacity claims by LEAs:

- The number of LEA schools in each Tier
- How the LEA prioritized which schools would be served
- Any key LEA staff position vacancies that impact the likelihood of grant success (i.e. Superintendent)
- The LEA award threshold (i.e. LEA has already reached award maximum)
- Lack of access to or availability of quality partners (i.e. EMO, CMO, outside experts)
- Other salient factors submitted by LEA

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:

Timeline for LEA applications:

August – Final school-level AYP determinations

September 1 – determine Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school lists and identify Partnership Zone Schools

September through December – Partnership Zone schools determine intervention model and establish an MOU per state regulation 103; non-Partnership Zone schools select intervention model in collaboration with staff, parents and community members

January 2 or within one month of US Ed approval of SEA plan – open SIG grant to eligible LEAs

By January 31 or within 30 days of grant opening to LEAs – final submission date for all LEA applications

By February 5 or within one week of grant closing date – all DDOE reviews completed, all LEAs notified of any revisions needed, approved applications forwarded for Associate Secretary and Secretary Review, unfunded applications notified

By February 18 or within two weeks of SEA grant review – all resubmissions due

By February 23 or within 3 days of LEA resubmission – all DDOE re-reviews completed, all LEAs notified of any revisions needed, approved applications forwarded for Associate Secretary and Secretary Review

By February 28 or within 5 days of DOE re-review – any subsequent resubmissions due

March or within one week of grant approval – any final DDOE re-reviews completed, approved applications forwarded for Associate Secretary and Secretary Review

Once the state application for 1003(g) is approved, eligible LEAs will be notified that the LEA application is open. The SIG application process is:

1. LEAs will have 20 business days to submit their applications to DDOE using the web-based Education Success Planning and Evaluation System.
2. The DDOE application SIG review team will receive electronic notification immediately when each grant is submitted.
3. The DDOE SIG review team will then review each application and enter comments within 5 business days of submission.
4. DDOE review team members will sign off on all grants that are approvable.
5. If an application is not substantially approvable, meaning it would require major revisions in order to be funded or that the application is incomplete, that application will not be funded.
6. If an application is substantially approvable but requires minor revisions to be fully approved, it will be set to revise status within 1 business day and LEA personnel will receive an automatic electronic notification.
 - a. The LEA will have 7 business days to revise the application in light of reviewer comments and resubmit.
 - b. DDOE will also provide the LEA with technical assistance, as necessary and as requested, during the revision timeline.

- c. The DDOE SIG review team will review each revised submission within 3 business days.
 - d. Subsequent revisions, if necessary, will repeat until such time as the application is fully approvable. For subsequent revision, LEAs will be required to revise and resubmit the application within 3 business days.
7. Once an application is approved by all review team members, the Associate Secretary for College and Career Readiness and the Secretary of Education will review and sign the grant. Should either the Associate Secretary or Secretary not approve the grant, he or she will contact the Director of Career, Technical and Title I Resources and explain the rationale denying approval. The director will then enter additional comments in the LEA application and the process will revert back to step 6 above.
 8. Once the Secretary has signed the grant, financial processing will begin. All funds will be loaded to the LEA and the LEA will be notified of the grant award within 5 business days of the Secretary's approval.

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:

Part 2

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will be responsible for monitoring performance in all SIG LEAs and schools, including those within the Partnership Zone. Each LEA will be required to enter a minimum of 3 progress updates for each formative measure under the LEA Success Plan SIG Goal(s) during the first three quarters of the grant period. (Progress updates are entered into the web-based LEA Success Plan.)

The summative progress update for each summative measure under the SIG Goal(s) must be entered within one month of the end of the grant period or within one month of data becoming available from the state assessment.

All LEAs are required to provide formative and summative updates online within the Success Plan. First, the LEA/school enters performance data as compared to each measure and target set. Next, the LEA/school indicates the level of progress toward the target. Finally the LEA/school describes their level of progress and rationale for why they did or did not meet their target. Rationale must include supporting evidence.

Designated Turnaround Unit and Title I Office personnel will receive an automatic email when progress updates are submitted, which alerts them to review each submission. Turnaround Unit and Title I Office personnel will then contact LEA/school staff with any concerns or offers of technical assistance.

LEAs that do not show reasonable progress will receive regular feedback from the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office (quarterly review of formative progress and annual review of summative progress). The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will be responsible for providing timely technical assistance to LEAs and for making determinations for non-renewal. Non-renewal decisions will be based on 1) consistent lack of progress across all formative and summative measures and 2) lack of LEA response to recommendations and/or technical assistance from the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office.

For Partnership Zone schools, state regulation requires that if, after two years of operations, a school has not made AYP, the MOU process will be repeated. The school will again have the opportunity to pursue further reform, secure additional flexibilities in staffing and operations, and, if necessary, narrow the set of options further to exclude the failed option.

Part 3

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will be responsible for monitoring performance in all SIG LEAs and schools, including Tier III schools funded through SIG. Each LEA will be required to enter a minimum of 3 progress updates for each formative measure under the LEA Success Plan SIG Goal(s) during the first three quarters of the grant period. (Progress updates are entered into the web-based LEA Success Plan.) The summative progress update for each summative measure under the SIG Goal(s) must be entered within one month of the end of the grant period or within one month of data becoming available from the state assessment.

Part 4

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will be responsible for monitoring performance in all SIG LEAs and schools, including Tier III schools funded through SIG.

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will monitor SIG schools to ensure they are making significant progress and are on track to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the following ways:

- Monitoring LEA progress updates for each formative measure under the LEA Success Plan SIG Goal(s) and ensuring progress is being made (at least quarterly).
- Monitoring summative progress updates for each summative measure under the SIG Goal(s) to ensure student achievement targets are being met (annually).
- Monitoring LEA progress on SIG project management plans (at least quarterly).
- Monitoring LEA expenditures (at least quarterly).

LEAs are required to submit at least 3 formative and 1 summative progress update; however, they may submit up to 12 formative updates a year. The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will therefore monitor each award at a minimum of 4 times a year (quarterly) and up to 12 times a year (monthly).

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will also have access to monitor LEA expenditures on a monthly basis, but will monitor expenditures no less than quarterly (once every 3 months). It is anticipated that the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will monitor expenditures monthly.

Part 5

SIG awards will be granted statewide in the following priority order:

1. State Partnership Zone schools that are in SIG Tier I and II (beginning 2011-2012)
2. Other SIG Tier I and II schools as follows:
 1. Rank remaining (non-Partnership Zone) Tier I schools from lowest to highest achieving in most recent test administration
 2. Determine LEA demonstrated capacity for Tier I applications within the state allocation
 3. Fund LEA applications in rank order, lowest achieving to highest, where LEA applications demonstrate capacity for full model implementation
 4. Rank remaining (non-Partnership Zone) Tier II schools from lowest to highest achieving in most recent test administration
 5. Determine LEA demonstrated capacity for Tier I applications within the state allocation
 6. Fund LEA applications in rank order, lowest achieving to highest, where LEA applications demonstrate capacity for full model implementation
3. Tier III schools - only where Tier I and/or Tier II schools are already being funded and where Tier III schools choose to implement one of the four SIG models
4. Tier III schools - only where Tier I and/or Tier II schools are already being funded or in LEAs where there are not Tier I or II schools that choose *not* to implement one of the four SIG models

Part 6

Tier III schools will be prioritized in two ways:

1. LEAs that serve both Tier I and/or Tier II schools and Tier III schools will have first priority to apply for funds supporting Tier III schools (LEAs with only Tier III schools will only be eligible once all Tier I and Tier II schools are funded)
2. LEAs that choose to implement one of the four models required for Tier I and Tier II in their Tier III schools will receive priority over applications from LEAs that choose other supports for Tier III schools.

Part 7

The SEA does not intend to take over any schools.

Part 8

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will provide a range of supports to LEAs as they turn around lowest-achieving schools, from identification as a Persistently Low Achieving School, to potential identification as a Partnership Zone school, to the planning process, to recruitment of leaders and staff, and finally, to the launch and operations of the turnaround school. Supports will include providing access to turnaround experts and mentors, providing help with recruiting operational partners, and

identifying and disseminating best practices. The State has established a partnership with US Education Delivery Institute to support its turnaround efforts. LEAs that choose to convert schools to a charter school to be authorized by the SEA, not LEA, will be supported by both the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office and the Charter School Office. Supports would include, but not be limited to, training to charter school staff regarding state and federal operating requirements such as financial management, data management and reporting, program requirements, curricula alignment, Success Planning, grant application processes, and charter school program requirements.

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will also provide targeted support for Partnership Zone schools as delineated in the MOU. Types of assistance will vary depending on the intervention model chosen, specific LEA and school needs, and MOU contents.

The state has identified four Tier I schools in three different LEAs for the Partnership Zone (Glasgow HS, Stubbs ES, Positive Outcomes Charter School, and Howard HS). Those LEAs are currently in the planning and MOU process. Final plans and MOUs will be approved in January 2011. Once final plans and MOUs are approved, we will share state supports referenced in those plans.

The state is also working with local foundations, non-profits, and the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center to provide all persistently low achieving schools information about high quality providers. These opportunities include:

- **School visits to showcase various providers including, but not limited to, New Tech High School, Big Picture High School, Early College High School.**
- **The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center has developed a compendium of research-based EMO and CMO models. This information will be shared with eligible applicants.**
- **Workshop with the National Institute for Time and Learning. They came to Delaware to assist the LEAs and the Charters examine their current instructional time, provided tools to do an extensive audit of time, and presented various samples of how other learning communities have increased instructional time anywhere from 15% to 25%.**

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:

SEA activities carried out through the state-level reservation funds will include:

- Title I Team costs to provide pre-application workshops including LEA plan and application self-assessment rubric training
- Turnaround Unit and Title I Office costs to provide post-award individualized technical assistance to LEAs
- Turnaround Unit and Title I Office costs to carry out SIG monitoring, evaluation, and reporting duties

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 DSEA and the LEA Chief School Officers

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

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

Assurance

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

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

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

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

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

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

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

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

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

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

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

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

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

LEA Budgets

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

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.