


APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Colorado Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: 201 E. Colfax Ave. Denver, Colorado 80203</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Patrick Chapman</p> <p>Position and Office: Executive Director, Federal Programs Unit</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Colorado Department of Education 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, Colorado 80202-5149</p> <p>Telephone: 303-866-6780</p> <p>Fax: 303-866-6637</p> <p>Email address: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Robert Hammond</p>	<p>Telephone: 303-866-6646</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X </p>	<p>Date: 11-21-13</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 for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Colorado



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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

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

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

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

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@ed.gov.

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

Paper Submission:

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

Carlas McCauley, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013 (extended to November 22, 2013)

For Further Information

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

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

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

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority school in the State. (A State’s Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

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

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

Colorado has generated a PLA list in accordance with its approved ESEA flexibility request. Colorado defines priority schools as:

The 2013 – 2014 SIG Eligibility list is included in the table (Attachment A):

2013 SIG Eligibility Instructions (Methodology) is included as a separate attachment.

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 ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
Aurora Public Schools	Fulton Elementary School	Remaining funds will be added to FY 2013 funds and awarded to Cohort #5. These funds have been de-obligated due to USDE monitoring finding.	\$1,136,025.00
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			\$1,136,025.00

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

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, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The LEA must demonstrate through its application and the school level Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) that it has analyzed the needs of each Priority school that it plans to serve in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention that responds to the needs analysis for each school.

In order to develop a thorough needs analysis the LEA must gather and organize relevant data generated from a variety of sources as they prepare to plan. Within the unified improvement planning process, data is used to: identify trends and prioritize performance challenges (performance data), determine root causes (process and perception data), set targets (federal, state and local performance expectations), monitor progress towards performance targets (interim measures of student performance) and monitor implementation of major improvement strategies (process and

perception data). To effectively engage in unified improvement planning, planning teams from the LEA and school will need to access both state-provided and locally available data.

An action plan will then be developed in which root causes will be prioritized and addressed (see Attachment D of the RFP).

The following link to the UIP Handbook provides additional information about reviewing current performance, identifying trends, prioritizing performance challenges and identifying root causes.

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/uiip/downloads/unifiedimprovementplanning/uiphandbook.pdf>

The needs analysis will be reviewed and scored against the rubric in the LEA Request for Proposal (RFP).

- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

LEAs will demonstrate their capacity to support sites in Section II of the RFP by detailing specific actions the LEA has taken or will take to: (1) design and implement interventions consistent with the requirements, (2) recruit, screen and select external providers, if applicable to ensure their quality, (3) align other resources with the proposed interventions, and (4) modify practice or policies to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Any activities or strategies the LEA proposes must be clearly outlined in the electronic budget (see rubric, RFP).

In addition, in awarding 1003(g) School Improvement funds, CDE will evaluate each district's commitment according to its dedication to implementing one of four specific interventions in each Priority School that it commits to serve. These interventions include:

- *Restart*: Close and reopen the school under the management of a charter school operator, charter management organization, or educational management organization.
- *Turnaround*: Replace the principal and at least 50 percent of staff, adopt a new governance structure and implement comprehensive, research-based instructional programs.
- *Transformation*: Replace the principal, implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extend learning and teacher planning time, and provide operating flexibility.
- *Closure*: Close the school and enroll students in high-achieving schools in the district.

Demonstrated capacity and readiness

CDE will also consider a district's capacity and readiness to carry out proposed interventions in targeted schools, including supply of leaders, teachers and school providers; detailed dissolution and dispersal plan for school closures; capacity to administer and track interim assessments; capacity to engage in significant mid-course corrections (including by replacing key staff, leadership or external providers) if data do not indicate significant progress toward achievement benchmarks within the first year; and quality of instructional programs and

standards-based curriculum.

Governance reform

CDE will consider a district's commitment and capacity to establish oversight structures for identified schools outside of normal district constraints that will ensure necessary freedom and support, such as a separate district office, staffed by a person that has been given significant autonomy to make critical decisions that impact student achievement, reports to the district superintendent and has contracting and other authorities, or a contract with a Lead Turnaround Partner.

Ensuring flexibility

CDE will consider a district's commitment to ensure necessary flexibility for identified schools. Many of these flexibilities are required elements of the intervention models outlined above. For all schools, they will include flexibility over scheduling of school day and year; principal autonomy over staff hiring, firing and placement; and greater authority over budgeting at the school level. Districts may provide these flexibilities by obtaining innovation school/zone status, converting a school to charter status, or obtaining specific waivers from district policy or negotiated agreements as necessary.

Aligned resources

CDE will consider a district's commitment to align current and future funding sources in support of improvement goals, including its commitment to identify and reallocate existing district funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after federal funds expire.

Performance monitoring

CDE will consider a district's commitment and capacity to hold schools accountable for results. Specifically, districts must include in their application three year student achievement goals in reading/language arts and mathematics. Each Priority school the district commits to serve must be held accountable for meeting or being on track to meet those goals for all students and in each student disaggregated group. In addition, districts must hold schools accountable for progress on leading indicators (see step #4 below). In schools where the district proposes a "restart" model, it must also describe how it will hold the charter school operator, CMO or EMO accountable for meeting or being on track to meet student achievement goals and making progress on leading indicators.

District and community support

CDE will consider a district's demonstrated backing for necessary changes to accompany dramatic reform, as evidenced through involvement and support in the decision making process from the school board, superintendent, the local teachers' union, and parents.

Sustainability

Finally, CDE will consider evidence of the district's plan to sustain gains in student achievement beyond three years; and to commit one-time funds strategically to enable future interventions in other low-performing 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, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Each LEA will submit to the CDE a budget with detailed expenditures for each of the schools in which it will intervene. The budget will be scored against the RFP's rubric. An LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each participating school. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen and SEA guidelines. Grants are renewable for 2 additional 1-year periods except in the cases of school closure. The district's rationale and justification for the grant amount request will be reviewed by CDE staff and external stakeholders, with final approval from the Deputy Commissioner of Education. If CDE staff and external stakeholders and the Deputy Commissioner disagree with the LEA's rationale and activities, the LEA will be required to revise and resubmit their proposed budget.

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

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;

LEAs will develop a 1003(g) action plan for each site including interventions consistent with the final 1003(g) requirements which will be judged against a rubric (see RFP page 20). LEA's will also complete an Addendum (see RFP page 29) to their Unified Improvement Plan that provides a description of how each requirement will be met.

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

CDE will provide guidance through (noted in the application, timeline, and attachments):

1. Webinars to be held for all eligible applicants.
2. CDE-provided technical assistance, support for needs assessments, and support for planning to eligible applicants.
3. Guidance, resources, and support developed and offered by the USDE, Comprehensive Centers, Regional Labs, and other organizations.

CDE expects that LEAs will:

4. Develop a rigorous process to select an external partner whose experience and qualifications match the specified goals (e.g., a written application, due diligence to confirm track record of success and financial stability, an in-person interview with the external provider's leadership team, and, if appropriate due to scope, a site visit to schools receiving services from the external partner);
5. Negotiate a contract outlining roles and responsibilities of the external partner as well as the district and relevant schools, and if applicable, state department of education, as well as explicit and measurable outcomes, including interim indicators of growth;
6. Provide support as needed and appropriate but do not micro-manage external partner;

7. Evaluate the external partner’s progress toward goals; and
8. Define consequences for failure (e.g., termination or modification of contract).

- **Align other resources with the interventions;**
In the RFP districts will be required to describe the specific actions they have taken to align other resources (e.g., Title I, II, III, Local grants, state and local funds) with the proposed interventions. Answers will be scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).
- **Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,**
In the RFP districts will be asked to describe specific actions they have taken (or will take) to ensure flexibility, modify practices, policies, oversight structures, outside formal restraints, if necessary to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively (e.g., flexible scheduling, principal autonomy over staff hiring/firing and placement, budget autonomy, obtaining innovation school/zone status, teacher/union agreements). Answers will be scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).
- **Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**
In the RFP, districts will be asked to describe specific actions they have taken (or will take) to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends (e.g., professional development, trainer of trainer models, district commitment of continuation of resources). Districts will also be asked to describe how they will align current and future funding in support of improvement goals and sustainability (e.g., specific funds identified, how existing funds (state funds, local funds, Title IA, Title IIA, 1003a, etc.) will be reallocated to sustain the grant after federal funding ends). Answers will be scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).

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

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

School sites that desire to use 1003(g) funds for pre-implementation activities will be required to describe the associated activities in their grant narrative and budget.

Budgets will include a drop-down menu for LEAs to indicate if expenditures are part of the pre-implementation period. For any expenditures noted as pre-implementation, grant reviewers will review proposed budgets for to ensure costs are reasonable, necessary, and aligned to planning and preparation necessary prior to full implementation. All costs must still meet allowable use of funds under federal guidance. CDE staff will review and approve each proposed budget.

- (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?

CDE will refer to the SIG 1003(g) Non-Regulatory Guidance, OMB Circulars and other resources concerning allowable use of funds to ensure costs are reasonable and necessary during pre-implementation. Examples of potential costs include, but are not limited to: meetings with community, staff, parents, etc.; costs associated with additional time for planning with staff; recruitment and retention strategies; district level policy changes.

Guidance pertaining to allowable costs is provided in Attachment C of the LEA RFP.

² “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–

2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

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

[Insert the SEA’s timeline for the FY 2013 SIG competition here] The following timeline is included in the local RFP for School Improvement Grant funds:

Tiered Intervention Grant Timeline

February 10, 2014 Release of Tiered Intervention Request For Proposal (RFP) via the CDE weekly communication “The Scoop” and posted to the CDE Web site
at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/NCLB/tia.asp>
(Dependent upon approval of plan by USDOE – the RFP will not be released until approval is final)

Feb. 10 – 28, 2014 CDE Performance Managers provide support at local stakeholder meetings as well as guidance for turnaround planning.

Feb. 19, 2014 CDE will conduct an informational webinar for applicants.

Feb. 28, 2014 Letter of Intent to Apply due to CDE

March 14, 2014 Applications due to CDE on or before 4:00 p.m.

April 3, 2014 Review of proposals by CDE

Teams of CDE staff and external experts with background in School Improvement and federal grants administration will review and score proposals against the attached rubric. CDE’s Grants Fiscal Management staff will review proposed budget expenditures. (See scoring rubrics on pages 16 – 21 of the Tiered Intervention Grant RFP). Reviewer comments will be shared with applicants. In some cases, reviewer comments may necessitate proposed plan or budget revisions in order for an LEA to receive approval.

The review of the Tiered Intervention Grants will be a standards based process. LEAs will not be funded unless they meet all criteria in each section of the application. This approach will prevent a proposal that has deficiencies in one section of the plan from compensating for those deficits in other sections. In this way, the review process will ensure that funded Tiered Intervention Grants address all the critical components in a manner that results in a comprehensive plan. LEAs may be asked to submit revisions in any deficient sections to bring specific sections up to standard.

April 11, 2014

Scores, feedback (may include rewriting of specific sections) will be released sent to sites.

April 25, 2014

3 Year grant award notification (renewed annually) to approved sites from the Office of Competitive Grants and Awards

May, 2014

Begin implementation of intervention model for the 2014 – 2015 school year.

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

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

In the overarching strategy for supporting dramatic improvement in the state’s lowest-achieving schools, the Colorado Department of Education will develop detailed performance goals and specific timelines for improvement to which all turnaround schools will be held. A Unified Improvement Plan for each individual school site will be monitored and updated annually. The unified plan must include the following components:

- A thorough needs assessment
- Prioritized Performance challenges
- Root Cause analysis of performance challenges
- The schools’ short-term and long-term goals and objectives
- How schools’ program activities will lead to the attainment of objectives.

Goals, timelines and indicators will be encompassed in a each schools Unified Improvement Plan that will include the following:

- *A common, ambitious but achievable goal that every turnaround school will be expected to meet within 3-5 years after beginning its turnaround effort.* The CDE will define a school turnaround a “success” when the school has increased in at least one plan type by the third year of the grant. Schools will be required to meet achievement levels in the core academic subjects that equal or exceed the average level for the state’s non-low-income schools. High schools will also be required to achieve graduation rates, dropout rates, college-going rates and other key high school metrics that are equal to rates among Colorado’s higher-income high schools.
- *School-specific timelines and benchmarks for reaching these goals.* Rather than expecting all schools will follow a simple improvement trajectory from their current achievement to the goals outlined above, in the schools’ Unified Improvement Plan, the CDE will collaborate with districts with participating schools to develop timelines and benchmarks that are individualized based on each school’s current achievement, turnaround strategy, and particular needs. Some schools identified for turnaround are further behind than others, and may require more ambitious targets, as well as

time to meet the state's performance goals. CDE will work with districts to address these unique challenges.

Research shows that successful turnarounds typically involve a focus on a few key goals in the first few weeks and months of the effort. This focus will be reflected in each school's individualized benchmarks. For example, if an elementary school decides to invest heavily in year one in third and fourth grade reading, its first-year benchmarks will reflect that by setting more ambitious targets for growth in reading achievement in third and fourth grade than for other grades and subjects. All schools will be required to show sufficient achievement growth in all grades and subjects by year five, but initial benchmark goals will help foster the intense focus common to successful turnarounds by setting school- and year-specific targets.

A set of leading indicators will be used to inform the district and state whether each school is on-track to meet its benchmarks and ultimate goals for student achievement.

- The CDE will invest in the creation and refinement of a research-based set of leading indicators to measure success or failure in turnaround schools. The CDE has started with three initial sets of indicators (see below), which were developed in mid 2010 and will begin collecting from the first cohort of turnaround schools in early 2011. Mid-year collection and analysis of as many indicators as possible will enable the CDE, local districts and school leaders to initiate mid-course corrections or more dramatic shifts in strategy for the next school year. Consistent with Colorado's overall approach of building and collecting knowledge about what works in improving student outcomes, these indicators and results from the first cohort of turnaround schools will thereafter inform research and analysis to develop more accurate and refined sets of leading indicators for future cohorts of turnaround schools.

Leading indicators to be collected will include:

- a. Title I Section 1003(g) required indicators: the number of minutes within the school year; student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup; dropout rate; student attendance rate; number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes; discipline incidents; truants; distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and teacher attendance rate.
- b. Other quantitative indicators that supplement those required under 1003(g), such as: results on interim assessments of student performance; the percentage of students taught by teachers who, in prior years, achieved above average or exceptional growth with their students; other measures of time allocated to learning; and others likely to be highly-correlated with successful improvement efforts
- c. Qualitative indicators that arise from cross-sector research about successful turnarounds. The extent to which the school leader and staff have prioritized a few key goals that will lead to visible early wins; whether the school leader is engaging staff in regular and transparent sharing of data about student performance; and evidence of positive community involvement in the turnaround effort or the leader's successful efforts to influence those who oppose dramatic change.

Every Priority School will be expected to increase by at least one performance level on the Colorado School Performance Framework by year three. If a school is not on track increase by one performance level based on leading and lagging indicators, CDE will not renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant. Summative

(lagging) performance will be established using Colorado’s School Performance framework pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009 (Article 11 of title 22, Colorado Revised Statutes). Non-summative performance under a turnaround plan will be established using leading indicators. These leading indicators will include: meeting interim performance targets and meeting implementation benchmarks. Interim targets and implementation benchmarks are established as part of Colorado’s unified planning process and reflect both state and local measures and design-specific implementation activities.

CDE expects that all Priority Schools’ annual performance evaluations will show improvement such that following year 1 the school’s performance trajectory is on target to improve by at least one performance level above their benchmark year (the SPF category) by the end of the third year of the grant.

CDE will work collaboratively with LEAs to develop meaningful detailed performance targets and specific timelines. These targets and timelines will be used when making Year 2 and 3 funding determinations. A Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) for each individual school site will be monitored at school and district on-site reviews and updated as necessary, with final revisions annually. The UIP and grant budget expenditures must be aligned to the UIP Quality Criteria and chosen reform model.

For sites moving from year one to year two of their grant, the primary focus will be implementation of the approved plan. Decisions regarding year two funding will be driven largely by the degree to which sites have implemented their Tiered Intervention Grant with fidelity and supporting data suggest the school has created the conditions for success. The School Performance Framework ratings form the basis for the decision to continue funding from year two to year 3 for the Tiered Intervention Grant. Information regarding the leading indicators and additional data such as interim assessments and UIP implementation may also be considered.

The table below details the Parameters for the grant renewal process.

Year 1 to Year 2 Renewal Parameters (Based on 2014 SPF results)			
May - June 2014	August 2014	August 2014	Aug – Sept. 30, 2014
All schools	Full Renewal School made the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned and is “on track”	Conditional Renewal School did not make the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned, but is not declining	Suspend SPF overall percentage of points earned has declined and is below the baseline year or has dropped a performance level
May 30th, 2014 School/District renewal application due May – June 2014 Onsite renewal meeting with district	If the school made the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned, funding for the subsequent year will be approved.	If the school did not make the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned, but is not declining, the magnitude of the trend will be	If the school’s SPF overall percentage of points earned has declined and is below the baseline year (pre-grant year), the school’s funds will be suspended until an

<p>and school leaders to discuss progress toward implementation of the model and academic achievement data. Schools may need to revise their plan based on this collaborative meeting.</p> <p>Early Warning One of the goals of the onsite meeting will be to provide the school and district with preliminary guidance regarding renewal decisions.</p>	<p>Regardless of 2014 SPF results, school/district may need to revise their plan based on the onsite collaborative meeting.</p>	<p>examined. The school may submit additional data (i.e., progress on leading indicators, interim assessment data, UIP implementation data, etc.) to be reviewed before making a final determination regarding subsequent year funding.</p> <p>Schools may need to revise their reform plan to address student performance gaps.</p>	<p>alternative/stronger plan is approved. If the alternative plan is not approved the school will not be funded for a subsequent year.</p>
<p>Year 2 to Year 3 Renewal Parameters (Based on 2014 SPF results)</p>			
<p>May – June 2014</p>	<p>August 2014</p>	<p>Aug. – Sep. 30, 2014</p>	
<p>All schools</p>	<p>Full Renewal School made the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned,</p>	<p>Conditional renewal/possible suspension School did not make the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned, but is not declining OR if the SPF overall percentage of points earned has declined and is below the baseline year or has dropped a performance level.</p>	
<p>May 30th, 2014 School/District renewal application due</p> <p>May – June 2014 Onsite renewal meeting with district and school leaders to discuss progress toward implementation of the model and leading indicator data. Schools may need to revise their plan based on this collaborative meeting.</p>	<p>If the school made the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned, funding for the subsequent year will be approved.</p> <p>Regardless of 2014 SPF results, schools may need to revise their plan based on the onsite collaborative meeting.</p>	<p>Implementation data will be the major emphasis for renewal decisions for schools in moving from year 2 to year 3. If the school is showing limited academic progress, schools will be asked to improve their reform plan before a subsequent year of funding is approved.</p> <p>If the school did not make the SPF target for overall percentage of points earned, <i>but is not declining</i>, the magnitude of the trend will be examined. The school may submit additional data (i.e., progress on leading indicators, interim assessment data, UIP implementation data, etc.) to demonstrate progress toward sustainable improvement.</p> <p>However, if the school's SPF overall percentage of points earned has declined</p>	

<p>Early Warning One of the goals of the onsite meeting will be to provide the school and district with preliminary guidance regarding renewal decisions.</p>		<p><i>and is below the baseline year (pre-grant year), the schools funds will be suspended until an alternative/stronger plan is approved.</i></p> <p>Schools will need to revise their reform plan to address performance challenges.</p> <p>If the alternative plan is not approved the school will not be funded for a subsequent year.</p>
--	--	--

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Because of Colorado’s approved ESEA Waiver request, CDE is not required (or able) to identifying Tier III schools.

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

CDE’s Office of School and District Performance will conduct monthly onsite visits of each turnaround school and will prepare a summary report for the, the building principal and the district superintendent (see attachment B for the onsite visit protocol). Additionally, in cases where schools are using the services of an external provider, CDE will conduct monthly achievement calls for the purpose of reviewing current benchmark and formative assessment data, address current issues and identify next steps.

CDE will also require that LEAs with schools implementing a SIG model have an LEA representative assigned to the school who will oversee the implementation of the SIG model to ensure that the intervention is being implemented with fidelity and that the 1003(g) SIG model requirements are being met. This representative may be a current employee of the LEA assigned these specific duties.

During the second year of implementation of the SIG model, CDE will conduct a formal monitoring visit to each SIG school using the United States Department of Education (USDE) Monitoring Plan for schools receiving 1003(g) funds. CDE will use these monitoring indicators to determine the fidelity of implementation of SIG model and activities administered by LEAs. The SIG monitoring procedures and protocols concentrate on the following indicator areas: application process, technical assistance, monitoring process, fiscal responsibilities, data collection, and implementation. A formal USDE monitoring report will be provided to

the LEA and LEAs that are out of compliance will be asked to develop a corrective action plan to come into compliance with the model requirements.

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

In the event that the Colorado Department of Education lacks sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA apply, schools will be prioritized from lowest-achieving to highest-achieving . Note that the SEA does not expect to have sufficient funds to fund all schools that are identified on the attached eligibility list. Indicators of demonstrated commitment and readiness include an agreement to implement the selected intervention model with fidelity and demonstration of community and parent engagement in the reform process, Board actions, and a commitment of other federal, state, and local resources to the turnaround effort.

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

Because of Colorado's approved ESEA Waiver request, CDE is not required (or able) to identifying Tier III schools.

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

The State will not take over any Priority Schools in the 2014-2015 school year.

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

The SEA does not intend to provide intervention services directly to Priority Schools.

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

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

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

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

CDE will reserve 5% of the State's School Improvement grant funds in support of administrative services, fiscal services, and support services to school districts and schools as delineated in the following list of activities:

- Data collection and analyses associated with the identification and progress of low performing schools.
- Administration of school improvement grants to LEAs. Develop state and local SIG applications. Release the local RFP, provide training and technical assistance to school districts. Conduct grant reviews. Develop a data base of subgrantees, release funds and track expenditures, collect end of year reports. Maintain programmatic and fiscal records.
- Development and implementation of Diagnostic Reviews. Develop informational materials, protocols and rubrics used for the Diagnostic Reviews. Conduct orientations. Support community stakeholder meetings as necessary. Facilitate de-briefings and reports.
- Technical assistance and support to LEAs and low performing schools in the planning and implementation of intervention models. Ongoing support of partnerships with districts and low performing schools. Ongoing collection of progress data related to the implementation and impact of turnaround strategies. Development

and implementation of performance indicators.

- Facilitation of partnerships between low performing LEA schools and external providers and CMOs. CDE will assign performance managers who will fill that role for districts, schools, and external providers and management companies.
- CDE will evaluate the impact of grant awards and intervention strategies. CDE will also continue to conduct research and evaluations as part of its statewide system of accountability and support.
- Tracking of school progress.
- Meeting all data collection and reporting requirements tied to the funds. Quarterly and end of year reports.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than 20.

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

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

Definition of SIG eligible school:

School improvement grant eligible schools are schools that are either Title I schools that are low performing and/or with low graduation rates or Title I eligible high schools with low graduation rates. CDE used the following rules to determine the SIG eligible list.

SIG Eligible Title I Schools

1. Select 2013-14 Title I schools.
2. Exclude Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following exemption criteria:
 - a. School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
 - b. School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
 - c. School is not a diploma-granting institution
3. Select schools with:
 - a. a 2013 Academic Achievement ratings of *does not meet* in reading and mathematics on the 3-year SPF (must have data for the past 3 years). (This is run at the E, M or H level individually. For a school to be identified, all EMH levels receiving Title I funding need to receive *does not meet* ratings in reading and math), and
 - b. On the 3-year SPF, the Title I schools with the lowest 5% of combined reading and math percentiles for academic achievement, and/or,
 - c. Schools with graduation rates less than 60% for all of the following: 2012 4-year, 2011 5-year, and 2010 6-year rates, and
4. Include only those schools assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC- Priority Improvement) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment).

SIG Eligible Title I Eligible High Schools

1. Select 2013-14 Title I eligible secondary schools (schools with H records, not currently served with Title I funds, with 2013-14 FRL % equal to or greater than 35% or at or above the 2013-14 district average for the H level)
2. Exclude Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following exemption criteria:
 - a. School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
 - b. School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
 - c. School is not a diploma-granting institution

3. Select schools with graduation rates less than 60% for all of the following: 2012 4-year, 2011 5-year, and 2010 6-year rates
4. Include only those schools assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC- Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment).

Additional Criteria:

- Schools that are priority schools could not be focus schools. Focus schools could not be priority schools. (If eligible focus schools apply for and are granted a School Improvement Grant, then they will be removed from the focus school list and a replacement will be found, if necessary).
- Schools that are currently part of a TIG grant would not be eligible for TIG, but would be counted as priority schools.

Definition of Priority School:

Schools that are receiving a School Improvement Grant (1003g funded grant) and implementing one of the 4 reform models.

School Eligibility Criteria

To be included in the eligibility analyses, an educational entity must have been classified as operational with student enrollment data collected during the October 1, 2013 pupil count. Schools identified on Colorado's previous list of Priority Schools were excluded from eligibility. In order to be included in the list of SIG eligible schools based on achievement, the educational entity must have been classified as a Title I school for the 2013-2014 year. However, schools identified for low graduation included Title I and Title I eligible schools.

Assurance

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

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

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

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Colorado requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

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

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already

received a waiver of the requirement in section 1116(b) of the ESEA to identify schools for improvement through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

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

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

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

The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable

opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice. (See attachment D)

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

Colorado’s LEA Application Form is included as a separate attachment.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school

leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.

- (2) The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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

- The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—
- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, it commits to serve;
 - Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools or priority schools; and
 - Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

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

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, or the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

Example:

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

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

- The LEA must assure that it will—
- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
 - (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
 - (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
 - (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
 - (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
 - (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

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

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

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

CDE is not applying for Continuation Awards

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

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

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

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

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

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards² to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]’s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

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

ATTACHMENTS - Table of Contents:

ATTACHMENT A: PLA list

ATTACHMENT B: Progress Monitoring Tool

ATTACHMENT C: Opportunity for Public Comment Regarding 1003(g) Waiver Requests

ATTACHMENT D: Budget Form

Separate Attachments:

2013 SIG Eligibility Instructions (Methodology)

2013 SIG Eligibility List Cohort 5

LEA Application Form

Attachment A: Schools that are Eligible for Cohort 5 of SIGs

District Number	District Name	School Number	School Name	EMH Level Eligible	Eligibility in 2013-2014 based on Original Specs
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	0418	ASHLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	9496	CASTRO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0030	ADAMS COUNTY 14	1426	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	1528	CHELTENHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	1748	COLORADO HIGH SCHOOL	H	Low grad rate - Title I Served
8001	CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	1877	COLORADO PROVOST ACADEMY	H	Low grad rate - Title I Served
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	1846	COLUMBINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	1948	CRAWFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0900	DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	5405	EDCSD: COLORADO CYBER SCHOOL	H	Low grad rate - Title I Eligible
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2789	ESCUELA TLATELOLCO SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2789	ESCUELA TLATELOLCO SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2789	ESCUELA TLATELOLCO SCHOOL	M	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2880	FAIRVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	3426	GILPIN MONTESSORI PUBLIC SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement (Current Priority)
0030	ADAMS COUNTY 14	6534	HANSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement (Current Priority)
0900	DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	3995	HOPE ON-LINE	H	Low grad rate - Title I Eligible
2862	JULESBURG RE-1	4369	INSIGHT SCHOOL OF COLORADO AT JULESBURG	H	Low grad rate - Title I Eligible
1420	JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	4422	JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	4656	KEPNER MIDDLE SCHOOL	M	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	5995	MONTBELLO HIGH SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement (Current Priority)
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	6728	PARIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	7558	SABLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0123	SHERIDAN 2	7842	SHERIDAN HIGH SCHOOL	H	Low grad rate - Title I Served
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	8145	SUMMIT ACADEMY	H	Lowest 5% Achievement / Low grad rate

8001	CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	4699	THE NEW AMERICA SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement / Low grad rate
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	9050	VALVERDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	9514	WHEELING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement

2014-
2014

Attachment B

Progress Monitoring of TIG School Implementation



LEA/Charter Holder Contact Information

LEA Name:	NCES ID#	Entity ID#
------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Mailing Address:	Phone:	Fax:
-------------------------	---------------	-------------

LEA Contact & Position:	Email:
------------------------------------	---------------

LEA Superintendent:	Email:
----------------------------	---------------

LEA Federal Programs Director:	Email:
---------------------------------------	---------------

LEA Fiscal Representative:	Email:
-----------------------------------	---------------

TIG (Priority) School(s)

Name of School & Cohort	School Code	Principal	Email

Monitoring Dates:

Baseline:	Mid Year:	End of Year:
------------------	------------------	---------------------

Monitoring Completed by:

--	--	--

School Background, Performance Data and Context

Instructions. Use this space to provide 1-3 paragraphs about the school context, including school demographics, performance history, and specialized programs. Update this section with leading indicator data after each visit: including average daily attendance, chronic absenteeism, behavior data, and interim assessment data.

LEA and School(s) Implementation of Model requirements and interventions

Schools that participate in the Tiered Intervention Grant and selected the Transformation or Turnaround Model must implement the full model requirements, outlined in the table below. The schools original plan addressed these requirements in order to be approved for this grant. As a part of the Improvement Planning process, schools are encouraged to weave these strategies into their overall school improvement plan. The monitoring tool below will help districts and schools monitor the implementation and effectiveness of school improvement strategies, while also ensuring schools are fully meeting model requirements.

TIG Model Requirement	Description	Notes Regarding Implementation of Model Requirements
Operational Flexibility & Targeted Support	Describe how the LEA has granted the school sufficient operational flexibility in the following areas: Staffing, Calendars/Time, and budgeting.	
	Describe how the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	
Teacher and Leader Effectiveness	Describe the process for replacing the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model (e.g., use of competencies to hire new principal).	
	Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that: (1) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors (e.g., multiple observation-based assessments) and (2) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.	
	Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	
	Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	
	*** Turnaround Model Only. Describe how locally adopted competencies are used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students. Include (a) how all existing staff were screened and not more than 50 percent rehired and (b) how new staff are selected.	
Curriculum and Instruction	Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;	

	Describe the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	
Extended Learning Time	Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time for all students.	
Community-Oriented Schools	Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	

Monitoring Tool

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 1	Summarize Major Improvement Strategy Here
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ... 2. ... 3. ... 4. ...
How are TIG funds used to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •

<p>support this MIS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<p>Evaluate</p>		<p>Plan</p>
<p>Implement</p>		
<p>Implementation Benchmarks</p>	<p>Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps</p>	<p>Next Steps for LEA and School</p>
<p>Beginning of Year</p>		
<p>Mid Year</p>		
<p>End of Year</p>		

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 2	Summarize Major Improvement Strategy Here	
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish robust PD system 2. Establish classroom walkthrough protocol 3. Provide job embedded teacher coaching 	
How are TIG funds used to support this MIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; width: 100%;"> Evaluate Plan Implement </div>		
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps	Next Steps for LEA and School
Beginning of Year		

Mid Year		
End of Year		

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 3	Summarize Major Improvement Strategy Here	
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. ... 3. ... 	
How are TIG funds used to support this MIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
Evaluate	Plan	Implement
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps	Next Steps for LEA and School

Beginning of Year		
Mid Year		
End of Year		

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 4		Describe Strategy Here
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. ... 3. ... 	

Requirements		
How are TIG funds used to support this MIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
	Evaluate	Plan
	Implement	
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps	Next Steps for LEA and School
Beginning of Year		
Mid Year		
End of Year		

Key Takeaways from School Walkthroughs and Next Steps for LEA Support of School

Summary of Classroom Observations

Summary of Classroom Observations	
Beginning of Year	
Mid Year	
End of Year	

LEA Support and Monitoring for School

LEA Support and Monitoring for School	
Beginning of Year	

Mid Year	
End of Year	

ATTACHMENT C: Opportunity for Public Comment Regarding 1003(g) Waiver Requests

Announcement in the Scoop

[View this email in your browser](#)



Wednesday, October 16, 2013

**** Action Item**

This Week in *The Scoop*

- [Accountability & Improvement](#)
- [Data Systems](#)
- [Educator Effectiveness & Licensing](#)
- [Exceptional Student Services](#)
- [Federal Programs](#)
- [Health, Wellness & Nutrition](#)
- [News & Notes](#)
- [Standards & Assessments](#)
- [State Board of Education](#)

Accountability & Improvement

Attend "Going Beyond TCAP Data for Improvement Planning," a Training on the Western Slope

The Going Beyond TCAP Data for Improvement Planning training session is coming to Grand Junction on Wednesday, Oct. 30. This session will focus on how planning teams will use data sources other than TCAP as part of the Unified Improvement Planning process.

Provided by CDE in partnership with the Center for Transforming Learning and Teaching, participants will get a head start on using the K-3 literacy assessment data (currently used to identify students with significant reading deficiencies for the READ Act). Participants will also get support in incorporating additional data related to post-secondary and workforce readiness into data analysis, analyzing ACCESS data and using TELL survey results as part of root cause analysis.

School and district level planning teams can register at <http://svy.mk/15l0sqx>. The deadline to register is Friday, Oct. 25.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Erin Loften

Improvement Planning

Phone: 303-866-6642

Email: loften_e@cde.state.co.us

**** Submit Your Accreditation Category; Submissions are Past Due**

The deadline for districts to submit an accreditation category for each of their schools to CDE was Tuesday, Oct. 15. If districts have not yet accredited their schools this is past due and should be completed as soon as possible. The online accreditation and request to reconsider system is located at <http://bit.ly/1bw9A28>. A username and password are required. The online submission form must also be accompanied by signed approval from the local school board president.

For More Information, Contact:
Jessica Knevals
Accountability and Data Analysis
Phone: 303-866-6778
Email: knevals.j@cde.state.co.us

Data Systems

Attend a Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing Collaborative Training

Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing Collaborative will present three trainings on the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Lourdes M. Rosado, associate director of the Juvenile Law Center in Philadelphia, PA will speak on FERPA and also discuss the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and 42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), rules about substance abuse and confidentiality.

These free trainings will be held on the following dates:

Wednesday, Oct. 23 from 9 a.m. - noon at the Pueblo Convention Center, 320 Central Main Street in Pueblo. Register at <http://conta.cc/1bw8tzo>

Thursday, Oct. 24 from 9 a.m. - noon at the Aurora Summit Conference and Event Center, 411 Sable Blvd in Aurora. Register at <http://conta.cc/15Fy34j>

Thursday, Oct. 24 from 1 – 4 p.m. at the Aurora Summit Conference and Event Center. Register at <http://conta.cc/1hUGLxV>

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Jan Rose Petro

Data Services

Phone: 303-866-6838

Email: petro_j@cde.state.co.us

Educator Effectiveness & Licensing

Register to Attend the Educator Effectiveness Webinar Series

To support districts as they navigate the new evaluation process, the Educator Effectiveness team is offering a series of webinars on timely topics. The next webinar is on Tuesday, Oct. 22 from 3:45-5:15 p.m. and will highlight how to establish a process for using student learning objectives in educator evaluation and how to use the Assessment Review Tool. To register for this webinar and view

upcoming webinar topics, visit the link below.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Tricia Majors

Educator Effectiveness

Phone: 303-866-6678

Email: Majors_T@cde.state.co.us

Exceptional Student Services

Register to Attend the Level 2 Autism Training on Transition

This comprehensive training will focus on Autism Spectrum Disorder specific transition assessments, planning and preparing the individual with Autism Spectrum Disorder for employment and living environments. Writing meaningful and attainable transition plans for secondary students on the autism spectrum will be covered along with individual education programs that meet Indicator 13 transition requirements for Colorado. The training will also cover individual education programs that focus on autism specific best practices and educational programming for school and transition-aged students with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

The trainings are from 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. and registration opens at 8 a.m. There is no cost to attend.

To register for the Tuesday, Nov. 5 training in Denver, visit <http://svy.mk/1cV168w>.

To register for the Thursday, Nov. 7 training in Pueblo, visit <http://svy.mk/17tGptk>.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Shannon Pfeiffer
Exceptional Student Services
Phone: 303-866-6969
Email: pfeiffer_s@cde.state.co.us

Federal Programs

** Attend a Comparability Webinar

No Child Left Behind requires districts that receive Title IA funds to demonstrate that their Title I schools are comparable to non-Title I schools in the same grade span and that Title I funds supplement, but do not supplant, state and local funds.

The online comparability system will open soon, pre-populated with 2011-2012 data. Authorized respondents will need to update the system with 20120-2013 data.

Webinars are scheduled for those involved in comparability data collection and reporting. Pre-registration is not necessary. The dial-in number is the same for all three webinars: 1-866-684-8605.

Wednesday, Oct. 30, 2 p.m., <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r87mmdjiccm/>

Friday, Nov. 1, noon, <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r1yjfeiq29h/>

Monday, Nov. 4, 4 p.m., <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r4kh2q0mkmc/>

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Donna Morganstern

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6209

Email: morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us

**** Comment on State Waiver for 1003g Title I School Improvement Grants**

CDE is requesting public comment regarding four waiver requests it is submitting to the U.S. Department of Education as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The state believes the waivers will increase the quality of instruction and improve academic achievement in Colorado's lowest performing schools.

Summary of Waivers:

1. Extend the period of availability of school improvement funds to Sept. 30, 2016.
2. Permit local education agencies to implement a Title I schoolwide program in a Title I participating school if that school does not meet the requisite 40 percent poverty threshold.
3. Replace its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of "priority schools" that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility.
4. Allow Colorado to utilize a minimum N of 20 or fewer students in the

identification of schools to increase the validity and reliability of the list of lowest performing schools by excluding schools with very small student populations.

Submit comments or concerns by 5 p.m. on Wednesday, Oct. 30.

For More Information, Contact:

Patrick Chapman

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6780

Email: Chapman_P@cde.state.co.us

Attend the 2013-2014 Supplemental Education Services Reallocation of Unrequested Funds Webinar

This Title IA webinar provides information and support to school districts that are required to offer supplemental educational services during 2013-14. The webinar will be held Friday, Oct. 18 from 10 - 11 a.m. and cover the procedure that school districts need to follow to reallocate supplemental education services set-aside funds, once it has met all the requests for this tutoring.

Title IA personnel involved with supplemental education services are encouraged to attend. To join the meeting: <http://bit.ly/H1pvfm>. Dial in: 866-601-0566

Note: The webinar will be recorded and be available on the website within a few days following the event.

For More Information, Contact:

Kathryn Smukler

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6842
Email: smukler_k@cde.state.co.us

Attend a 2014-2015 E-rate Training

CDE is offering beginner and advanced training sessions for the 2014-15 E-rate funding year. Training is available for all E-rate applicants and service providers.

The beginning training session is designed to introduce new applicants to the E-rate process. This training will go over the history of E-rate, application process, and form completion. Applicants are encouraged to bring forms completed in previous years and documentation to complete the form 470.

The advanced session will cover new proposed forms 470 & 471 in addition to eligible services, contracts, funding issues, appeals and Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA). If there is a specific topic of interest, be sure to add that topic when completing the registration form.

Training dates and locations:

Colorado Springs - Pikes Peak BOCES

Wednesday, Oct. 30 - beginners

Thursday, Oct. 31 – advanced

Greeley - High Plains Library

Thursday, Dec. 12 – beginners

Friday, Dec. 13 – advanced

Metro - Mile High United Way

Founders Room

Monday, Dec. 16 – beginners

Tuesday, Dec. 17 - advanced

Grand Junction-Basil T. Knight Building

Tuesday, Jan. 28 – beginner

Wednesday, Jan. 29 – advanced

To register for a training, visit <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/72G7X2H>.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

DeLilah Collins

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6850

Email: collins_d@cde.state.co.us

Health, Wellness & Nutrition

Receive Guidance on Ensuring Accuracy of School Employee School Meal Applications

Recently, there have been incidents in some areas of the U.S. where school

district employees allegedly misrepresented their incomes in order to receive free or reduced price school meals for their children. In order to assist state and local school officials with addressing this problem, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and CDE are offering guidance on ways to ensure the accuracy of the income information provided by school district employees.

In the school meals programs, local educational agencies are required to verify any questionable application on a case-by-case basis via a household submitting proof of the information they provided on the application. This is known as “verification for cause.” LEAs can use verification for cause to review approved meal benefit applications when known or available information indicates school district employees may have misrepresented their incomes on their applications.

Verification for cause must not be used automatically in this situation, but school employee applications can be included among the list of questionable applications.

The USDA recommends that an LEA consult with legal counsel and the state agency in establishing the parameters of verification for cause for school district employees.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Jennifer Otey

School Nutrition

Phone: 303-866-6450

Email: Otey_J@cde.state.co.us

News & Notes

Participate in Family and School Partnership in Education Month

Gov. John Hickenlooper designated October as Family and School Partnership in Education Month. The goal of this special month is to actively share information and support families and educators working together to ensure learning success for every student, from pre-school to postsecondary and workforce readiness and including higher education.

During the month, the State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education highlights partnering resources to support stakeholders as they work together. This week's highlighted resource is the Family, School and Community Partnering Network Bulletin from the Office of Learning Supports and Exceptional Student Services.

Available at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/rti/family>, the bulletin lists trainings and resources to support effective partnering practices focused on student success. This edition describes S.B. 13-193, concerning increasing parent engagement in public schools, and invites interested stakeholders to participate in a monthly Community of Practice. Interested persons may subscribe to the bulletin by contacting Kim Watchorn at watchorn_k@cde.state.co.us.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Cindy Dascher

Exceptional Student Services and CDE SACPIE Representative

Phone: 303-866-6876

Standards & Assessments

Provide Feedback on School Readiness Assessment Recommendation

CDE seeks feedback on a recommendation to extend the implementation timeline for the school readiness provisions of Colorado's Achievement Plan for Kids (CAP4K) in advance of the Nov. 13 state board of education meeting. The board voted at their December 2012 meeting to offer districts a menu of school readiness assessments and approved Teaching Strategies GOLD as the first assessment tool for the menu. Over the past year, CDE guided districts in implementing the initiative in either the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school year. This summer, the state solicited additional assessments for consideration for the menu. The School Readiness Assessment subcommittee met to review submissions and found no assessments that met the criteria established in CAP4K for a school readiness assessment.

CDE plans to recommend to the state board of education extending the implementation timeline by one year to allow for more assessment options to be available to districts. This would give districts additional time to support kindergarten teachers with implementation of the new standards and the READ Act while thoughtfully planning for the school readiness work in advance of full implementation in the 2015-16 school year.

Please send your feedback to Suzanne Rougier at rougier_s@cde.state.co.us by
Friday, Nov. 1.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Melissa Colman
Teaching and Learning
Phone: 303-866-6737
Email: colsmam@cde.state.co.us

State Board of Education **State Board Meeting December Date Change Impacts DPF/SPF** **Release**

The board voted to approve moving their December 2013 meeting dates from Dec. 4 & 5 to Dec. 11 & 12. As a result of the meeting change, the 2013 School and District Performance Frameworks will be approved and released on Dec. 11, instead of the previously reported Dec. 4 date. The board also approved the 2014 proposed board meeting dates.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Office of the State Board of Education
Phone: (303) 866-6817
Email: state.board@cde.state.co.us



COLORADO DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION

View previous issues of The Scoop at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/scripts/thescooparchive/TheScoopArchive.asp>

For more information, contact the CDE Communications Division, 303-866-4247.

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Communications/index.html>.



Facebook



Twitter



Website

Copyright © 2013 Colorado Department of Education, All rights reserved.

You received this message because you signed up to receive The Scoop from the Colorado Department of

Education.

Our mailing address is:

Colorado Department of Education

201 E Colfax Ave

Denver, CO 80203

[Add us to your address book](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

Link to Scoop Announcement: <http://www2.cde.state.co.us/scripts/thescooparchive/TheScoopArchive.asp>

See the Wednesday, October 16, 2013 issue

Document sent to the Colorado Committee of Practitioners

To: Colorado Committee of Practitioners

From: Brad Bylsma

Re: FY 2013 1003g School Improvement Grant Application Waiver Request

CDE is asking for comment from the Colorado Committee of Practitioners regarding four waiver requests it plans to submit to the U.S. Department of Education as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The state

believes the waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Colorado's lowest performing schools.

CoP members will have an opportunity to provide comments during the CoP meeting on November 14th, 2013. Otherwise, please submit comments or concerns via email to Brad Bylsma at bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us by 5 p.m. on November 14th, 2013. The four waivers are summarized below:

N-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Priority schools list waiver

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

Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

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

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

Schoolwide poverty threshold waiver

Waiver to permit local education agencies to implement a Title I schoolwide program in a Title I participating school if that school does not meet the requisite 40 percent poverty threshold.

Stakeholder comments received regarding the Waiver Requests:

No written comments or concerns were received by CDE.

The Colorado NCLB Committee of Practitioners reviewed the waiver requests at the November 14, 2013 meeting and after discussing the purpose and benefits of each waiver, the committee voted unanimously in support of these requests.

ATTACHMENT D: Budget Form

**TIERED INTERVENTION GRANT
FY2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16**

District number:
 School District Name:
 School Name:
 Budget Report:
 Revision number:
 Date:

Model

Please Check the year(s) you are applying for:

Year 1
 Year 2
 Year 3

Name of person completing this information

Name:
 Phone No.:
 E-mail:

Submit this excel file to : electronic_budget@cde.state.co.us; petrov_m@cde.state.co.us

Grants Fiscal Contact : Martin Petrov: (303) 866-6389, petrov_m@cde.state.co.us

Program Contact : Brad Byslma: (303) 866-6937, bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us

CDE use only

Funding Summary

School/District	Request-Year 1	Request-Year 2	Request-Year 3	Approved-Year 1	Approved-Year 2	Approved-Year 3
#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Indirects	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -



COLORADO DEPARTMENT *of* EDUCATION

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Proposals due: Friday, March 14, 2014 by 4 p.m.

Application Webinar: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 from x:00 – x:00 p.m.

Required Intent to Apply (Attachment D) due: Friday, February 28, 2014 by 4 p.m.

Tiered Intervention Grant 2014

Pursuant to: Title I, Section 1003 (g) of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act of 1965

For program questions contact:

Brad Bylsma (bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us or 303-866-6937)

For fiscal/budget questions contact:

Martin Petrov (petrov_m@cde.state.co.us or 303-866-6389)

For RFP specific questions contact:

Lynn Bamberry (bamberry_l@cde.state.co.us or 303-866-6813)

**2014 Tiered Intervention Grant – Overview
Request For Proposal**

Proposals Due: Friday, March 14, 2014

Introduction	<p>The intent of this grant is to provide funding for districts (on behalf of eligible schools) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partner with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) in the implementation of one of the school intervention models provided in the draft guidance for the use of Federal Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds (To view the most recent final requirements/program guidance, please visit: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf); ▪ Increase the academic achievement of all students attending chronically low performing schools as measured by the state’s assessment system; and ▪ Utilize the support and services of an external provider in their efforts to accomplish the above.
Purpose	<p>The Office of Federal Program Administration at the Colorado Department of Education has Title I 1003 (g) funds to support schools identified as chronically low performing schools as indicated by state assessments.</p>
Available Funds	<p>Approximately \$6 million is available for distribution to LEAs An LEA may request no less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year over the three year grant period for each participating school. Subsequent years funding (except in the case of closure) is contingent upon CDE approval and continued 1003(g) allocations from the USDE. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen and SEA guidelines. CDE expects to fund approximately 6 applications.</p>
Eligible Applicants	<p>Eligible schools are listed in Attachment A. The eligible schools were identified as either Title I Schools that are low performing and/or have a low graduation rate <u>OR</u> Title I Eligible High Schools with low graduation rates. The following rules were used to identify TIG eligible schools:</p> <p>TIG Eligible Title I Schools were identified if,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools were on the 2013-2014 Title I Schools List; and • Had 2013 Academic Achievement ratings of <i>does not meet</i> in reading and mathematics on the 3-year SPF (must have had data for the past 3 years). (This is run at the E, M or H level individually. For a school to be identified, all EMH levels receiving Title I funding need to receive <i>does not meet</i> ratings in reading and math); and • Were schools with the lowest 5% of combined reading and math percentiles for academic achievement on the 3-year SPF; and/or • Were schools with graduation rates less than 60% for all of the following: 2012 4-year, 2011 5-year, and 2010 6-year rates; and • Were assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC-Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment). <p>TIG Eligible Title I Eligible High Schools were identified if,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools were Title I eligible high schools for 2013-2014 not currently served with Title I funds, with 2013-14 Free and Reduced Lunch percentage equal to or greater than 35% or at or above the 2013-14 district average for the High School level); and • Were schools with graduation rates less than 60% for all of the following: 2012 4-year, 2011 5-year, and 2010 6-year rates (schools must meet the minimum count each individual year to be included in the analyses); and • Were assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC-Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment).

<p>Eligible Applicants (Continued)</p>	<p>Please Note: Currently funded-TIG schools were excluded from the analyses. Priority schools may not be focus schools. Focus schools that apply for and are awarded a TIG will become priority schools and will be removed from the Colorado list of Focus Schools— Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following criteria were exempted and not included in the SIG eligible schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery • School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school or • School is not a diploma-granting institution.
<p>Evaluation</p>	<p>In the overarching strategy for supporting dramatic improvement in the state’s lowest-achieving schools, CDE will work collaboratively with LEAs to develop meaningful detailed performance targets and specific timelines. These targets and timelines will be used when making Year 2 funding determinations. A Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) for each individual school site will be monitored at school and district on-site reviews and updated as necessary, with final revisions annually. The UIP and grant budget expenditures must be aligned to the UIP Quality Criteria and chosen reform model.</p> <p>Awardees will be expected to collect the following leading indicators, report them to CDE and include them in the data analysis portion of the UIP (where possible):</p> <p>a. Title I Section 1003(g) required indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of minutes within the school year; • Student participation rate on State assessments in reading, writing, math, and science, by student subgroup; • Dropout rate; • Student attendance rate; • Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), • Early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes; • Discipline incidents; • Truants; • Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and • Teacher attendance rate. <p>b. Quantitative indicators that supplement those required under 1003(g):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficiency results on interim assessments of student performance in reading, writing, math, and science; • The percentage of students taught by teachers who, in prior years, achieved above average or exceptional growth with their students; • Other measures of time allocated to learning and intervention; • Annual collection data and improvement in catch up, keep up, and moving up categories in reading, writing, and math; • Annual collection data and improvement in all proficiency and growth data in reading, writing, math, and science; and • Others likely to be highly-correlated with successful improvement efforts. <p><u>Additional Considerations</u> Other qualitative indicators that arise from cross-sector research about successful reform models (not required). For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused and prioritized improvement strategies that will lead to visible early wins.

<p>Evaluation (Continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the school leader is engaging staff in regular and transparent data dialogues surrounding student performance. • Evidence of positive community involvement in the reform effort. • The leader’s successful efforts to influence those who oppose dramatic change. • Evidence of district leadership and support. • Additional resources on successful reform models can be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/TurnaroundSupport.asp. <p>United States Department of Education (USDE) Monitoring Plan for School Improvement Grants. Tools can be found at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/ti/sitig.asp <p>Tiered Intervention Grants are intended to yield rapid increases in student achievement; therefore, funded sites that have a flat or declining performance framework profile over the life of the grant are unlikely to be funded for a third year.</p> <p>For continuation of funding into Year 2, CDE will consider achievement data, with a strong emphasis on implementation data including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indication that the district and school desire to continue Tiered Intervention Grant funding in the school and have a willingness and readiness to revisit the strategies necessary to significantly improve the school’s performance • An indication of the willingness of the district and school to create an implementation plan that is consistent with Title I, section 1003(g) requirements. <p>For continuation of funding into Year 3, emphasis will be placed on school achievement gains, as well as implementation data.</p>
<p>Allowable Use of Funds</p>	<p>Awarded funds may be used for the following purposes: Pre-Implementation costs and implementation of the chosen model (identified costs that are absolutely necessary to implement the model fully and effectively) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family and community engagement; ▪ Rigorous review of external providers; ▪ Staffing; ▪ Instructional programs; ▪ Professional development and support; ▪ Preparation for accountability measures (see attachment B for additional guidance on pre-implementation funds); ▪ Implementation of any of the school intervention models provided in the USDE guidance for the use of Federal Title I 1003(g) funds (see Attachment C for additional detail); and/or ▪ Evaluation of implementation and/or external providers. <p>Note: Administrative costs may be no more than 5% of the funded amount.</p>
<p>Commitments</p>	<p>For information regarding commitments required by LEAs and by CDE, see the Certification and Assurance form (pages 10 – 12).</p>

Duration of Grant	<p>Funds must be expended by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1: September 30, 2015 (May 30, 2014-September 30, 2015) <p>Years 2 and 3 contingent upon CDE approval and continued 1003(g) funding from the USDE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 2: September 30, 2016 (July 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) • Year 3: September 30, 2017 (July 1, 2016-September 30, 2017)
Technical Assistance	<p>An application training webinar will be held on Wednesday, February 19, 2014 from x:00 – x:00 p.m. To register for this technical assistance opportunity, please email: CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us.</p> <p>Note: If interested in applying for this grant opportunity, please complete the Letter of Intent (Attachment D) and submit by Friday, February 28, 2014 to CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us.</p>
Review	<p>Applications will be reviewed based on the rubric to ensure they contain all required components. The review of the Tiered Intervention Grants will be a standards based process. LEAs will not be funded unless they meet each of the criteria in each section of the application. This approach will prevent a proposal that has strengths in one section of the plan from compensating for deficits in other sections. In this way, the review process will ensure that funded Tiered Intervention Grants address all the critical components necessary for a comprehensive plan. LEAs may be asked to submit revisions in any sections to more fully meet the standards.</p> <p>Each district/school identified for possible funding may be visited following the review of applications, the week of April 25th 2014. The purpose of the site visit will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm the information provided in the application; • Verify readiness; • Ensure capacity needed to successfully implement the proposed project; • Determine any technical assistance and/or support needs of each district/school; • Make final funding determinations. <p>If district/school staff are not able to verify the information provided in the application, or fail to demonstrate an understanding of the program the recommendation to fund will be withdrawn. Applicants will receive final notification of application status by April 25, 2014.</p>

Submission Process

The **original plus three copies** of the application must be received by **Friday, March 14, 2014** at 4:00 p.m. In addition to the four hard copies, **a copy of the proposal narrative must be submitted to:** CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us and **a copy of the electronic budget must be submitted via the CDE Tracker System for each school.** Please e-mail all required pieces of the narrative as one document with the Excel budget workbook. Faxes will not be accepted. Incomplete or late proposals will not be considered. Application materials and budget are available for download on the CDE Web site at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tieredinterventiongrantresources>.

Submit Proposals to:

Competitive Grants & Awards
Colorado Department of Education
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450
Denver, CO 80202
&
Submit an electronic copy of the proposal narrative and excel budget to:
CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us

Also upload an electronic copy of the budget to:
The CDE Tracker System
(<https://tracker.cde.state.co.us/Security/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=/Default.aspx>)

Required Elements

The format outlined below **must be followed** in order to assure consistent application of the review criteria (see evaluation rubric for specific details needed in sections I –IV).

- Part I:** **Proposal Introduction (not scored)**
Cover Page
Schools to be Served
LEA/School Information and Signature Page
Assurance and Certification Form
Waivers
Executive Summary

- Part II:** **Narrative**
Section I: LEA Readiness
Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity
Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan
Section IV: Budget Narrative

Application Format:

- Applications should only include the required elements.
- The total narrative (Part II) of the application cannot exceed 15 pages.
- All pages must be standard letter size, 8-1/2” x 11” using no smaller than 12 point type.
- Use a document footer with the name of the applying entity and page numbers.
- Use 1-inch margins.
- Staple the pages of all copies including the original. Please do not use tabs, paperclips, rubber bands, binders or report covers.

2014 TIERED INTERVENTION GRANT

PART I: COVER PAGE *(Complete and attach as the first page of proposal)*

Name of Lead Local Education Agency (LEA)/Organization:			
Mailing Address:			
District Code:		DUNS #:	
District Turnaround Project Manager:			
Mailing Address:			
Telephone:		E-mail:	
Signature:			
Program Contact Person (if different):			
Mailing Address:			
Telephone:		E-mail:	
Signature:			
Fiscal Manager:			
Telephone:		E-mail:	
Signature:			
Region: <i>Indicate the region(s) this proposal will directly impact</i>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Metro <input type="checkbox"/> Pikes Peak <input type="checkbox"/> North Central <input type="checkbox"/> Northwest <input type="checkbox"/> West Central <input type="checkbox"/> Southwest <input type="checkbox"/> Southeast <input type="checkbox"/> Northeast			
Total LEA Request: <i>Indicate the total amount of funding you are requesting. Please note: An individual budget will be required for each school site totaling to the amount listed below.</i>			
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
(May 30, 2014 – September 30, 2015)	(July 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016)	(July 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017)	
\$	\$	\$	\$

Please note: If the grant is approved, funding will not awarded until all signatures are in place. Please attempt to obtain all signatures before submitting the application.

In Addition: The Year 1 grant period may include pre-implementation costs from May 30, 2014 to June 30, 2014 (see Attachment B). The duration of Year 1 will be May 30, 2014 to September 30, 2015.

PART IA: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Complete the following information with respect to the schools that will be served with a Tiered Intervention Grant and attach as the second page of proposal.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	INTERVENTION Model			
		Include requested amount per school			
		Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation

PART IB: LEA/School Information and Signature Page

(Complete and attach as the third page of proposal. If there are more than 3 participating schools the district may duplicate this page and attach it after page 3.)

District Signatures

District Name:	District Code:
-----------------------	-----------------------

School Board President Signature:

Superintendent Signature:

School Information

School #1 Name:	School Code:
------------------------	---------------------

Principal Name:

Telephone:	E-mail:
------------	---------

Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--	--

School #2 Name:	School Code:
------------------------	---------------------

Principal Name:

Telephone:	E-mail:
------------	---------

Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--	--

School #3 Name:	School Code:
------------------------	---------------------

Principal Name:

Telephone:	E-mail:
------------	---------

Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--	--

PART IC: Certification and Assurance Form
(Complete and attach as the fourth and fifth pages of proposal)

The School Board President and Board-Appointed Authorized Representative must sign below to indicate their approval of the contents of the application, and the receipt of program funds.

On _____ (date) , 2014 the Board of _____ (district) _____ hereby applies for and, if awarded, accepts the state funds requested in this application. In consideration of the receipt of these grant funds, the Board agrees that the General Assurances form for all state funds and the terms therein are specifically incorporated by reference in this application. The Board also certifies that all program and pertinent administrative requirements will be met. These include the Office of Management and Budget Accounting Circulars, and the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) requirement. In addition, the Board certifies that the district is in compliance with the requirements of the federal Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA), and that no policy of the local educational agency prevents or otherwise denies participation in constitutionally protected prayer in public schools. In addition, school districts that accept 1003(g) School Improvement funding for the **Tiered Intervention Grant** agree to the following assurances:

Federal Assurances:

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- Establish annual targets 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 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;
- If the applicant implements a restart model in a priority school, Include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved School Improvement Grant application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken as outlined in the approved School Improvement Grant application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of School Improvement Grant funding; and
- Report to the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements (program guidance can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf>).

State Assurances:

- Provide the Colorado Department of Education such information as may be required to determine if the grantee is making satisfactory progress toward achieving the goals of the grant (e.g., CSAP/TCAP by State Assigned Student IDs, school level non-performance data). The district will report to CDE, at least quarterly, the school level interim measures of student learning required under section III of the final requirements (program guidance can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf>);
- Align current and future funding sources in support of improvement goals, including commitment to identify and reallocate existing local funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after federal funds expire;
- Participate in ongoing professional learning opportunities focused on school and district improvement;

- Commit to working with CDE to monitor progress on the UIP and make adjustments to the plan accordingly;
- Provide data on attainment of performance targets to CDE to inform decision around the continuation of funding;
- Participate fully in on-site visits conducted by CDE to every funded school during the grant cycle;
- Work collaboratively with CDE, as appropriate, in the selection of a strong school leader or partner, such as a Charter Management Organization (CMO), Education Management Organization (EMO) or other provider;
- Work cooperatively with CDE and provider(s), if applicable, in waiving district policies, procedures or practices that are deemed to be impediments to improvement, such as scheduling of the school day and year; staffing decisions; budgeting; and/or to obtain innovation school status for identified schools;
- Commit to engaging in significant mid-course corrections in the school if the data do not indicate attainment of or significant progress toward achievement benchmarks within the first year of implementation, such as replacing key staff, leadership or external providers;
- Maintain sole responsibility for the project even though subcontractors may be used to perform certain services;
- Notify the community of the intent to submit an application and that any waiver request will be made available for public review prior to submission of the application;
- Participate in the development and submission of any reports necessary to meet statutory requirements (e.g., EdFacts, CSPR) within the time frames specified;
- Maintain appropriate fiscal and program records. Fiscal audits of funds under this program are to be conducted by the recipient agencies annually as a part of their regular audit;
- Submit budget revision(s), if applicable, to CDE on a **quarterly** basis for review and approval;
- Submit Annual Financial Reports as part of their annual review with CDE. CDE will utilize the information as a measure of performance and leading indicator of performance in subsequent year(s);
- Contracts with education providers must include a performance guarantee to increase student achievement based on services provided.

IF ANY FINDINGS OF MISUSE OF FUNDS ARE DISCOVERED, PROJECT FUNDS MUST BE RETURNED TO THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. The Colorado Department of Education may terminate a grant award with thirty (30) days notice if it is deemed by CDE that the applicant is not fulfilling the requirements of the funded program as specified in the approved project application, or if the program is generating less than satisfactory results.

Name of Board President

Signature of Board President

Name of District Superintendent

Signature of District Superintendent

Name of Program Contact

Signature of Program Contact

State Education Agency assurances

As a partner in the Tiered Intervention Grant, CDE agrees to provide the LEA with support and tools to foster successful implementation of the School Improvement Grant program. Specifically, CDE will:

- Provide the LEA with guidance about the specific types of changes and interventions each of the models require;
- Provide the LEA with descriptions and examples of special district governance structures that will ensure necessary freedom and support for interventions in identified schools;
- Provide the LEA with a description of the changes in policy or practice that may be required to ensure necessary flexibility for dramatic improvement in identified schools;
- Periodically review school and district UIPs and provide feedback;
- Meet regularly with School/District to review performance data and implementation of improvement efforts, as defined in the UIP.
- Provide the LEA with a model budget and/or set of principles to guide allocation of 1003(g) and other funds in support of dramatic improvement of achievement in the school(s)
- Provide support for quarterly budget revisions;
- Provide ongoing technical assistance; and
- Define a set of leading indicators and overall performance targets that the identified school(s) and external providers, if applicable, will be required to demonstrate during the course of the reform effort; additionally interim measures and implementation benchmarks that the LEA may use to hold school(s) and provider(s) accountable.

PART ID: WAIVERS *(Complete and attach as the sixth page of proposal)*

_____ (District) requests a waiver of the requirements it has selected below.
Please note: If the district does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each participating school, then it must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Budget Instructions and Budget Form

Complete the proposed budget and budget narrative at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tieredinterventiongrantresources>

When the applications have been reviewed, final grant amounts will be determined and a more detailed budget may be required. Please remember that no grant funds can be obligated or spent until a final budget has been received and approved by CDE.

Examples of the types of expenses that may be included in each object category are listed below for guidance only. Your budget narrative should provide enough detail so that the appropriate object category can be confirmed.

Instructional Program. Instruction includes the activities dealing directly with the interactions between staff and students. Teaching may be provided for students in a school classroom, in another location such as a home or hospital, or in other locations such as those involving co-curricular activities. Instruction also may be provided through some other approved media such as television, radio, telephone or correspondence. Included are the activities of paraprofessionals (aides) or classroom assistants of any type who assist teachers in the instructional process.

Support Program. Support service programs are those activities which facilitate and enhance instruction. Support services include school-based and general administrative functions and centralized operations for the benefit of students, instructional staff, other staff, and the community.

(100) Salaries - Amounts paid for personal services for both permanent and temporary employees, including personnel substituting for those in permanent positions. This includes gross salary for personal services rendered while on the payroll of the school district/agency/organization.

(200) Employee Benefits - Amounts paid on behalf of employees; generally those amounts are not included in the gross salary, but are in addition to that amount. Such payments are fringe benefit payments and, while not paid directly to employees, never-the-less are part of the cost of personal services. Workers' compensation premiums should not be charged here, but rather to other purchased services (500).

(300) Purchased Professional and Technical Services – Services which by their nature can be performed only by persons or firms with specialized skills or knowledge. While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided. Included are the services of auditors, consultants, teachers, etc.

(500) Other Purchased Services – Amounts paid for services rendered by organizations or personnel not on the payroll of the district (separate from Professional and Technical Services or Property Services). While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided.

(600) Supplies – Amounts paid for items that are consumed, worn out, or deteriorated through use; or items that lose their identity through fabrication or incorporation into different or more complex

units or substances. Items that do not contribute to a district's fixed assets, as evaluated by the district's fixed assets policy, may be coded as supply items, or may be coded as Non-Capital Equipment. Items that contribute to a district's fixed assets must be coded as equipment. All computers must be entered as equipment. Include all supplies, food, books and periodicals, and electronic media materials here.

(800) Other Expenses – Amounts paid for goods and services not otherwise classified above. Some expenditures may cross object category lines. For example, professional development and evaluation may include salaries, purchased services (printing) and supplies/materials. The budget narrative should identify these elements so that a total cost of the activity can be determined.

Indirect Costs – Indirect costs are those costs - necessary in the provision of a service - that cannot be readily or accurately attributed to a specific grant program.

School Districts Only: School districts may budget indirect costs only if they are designated as the fiscal agent. The indirect cost rate used varies by district. Your district budget office should provide this rate to you, or you may access it by going to CDE's web page and linking to School Finance.

Tiered Intervention Grant 2014 Grant Review Rubric

Part I:	Proposal Introduction	No Points
Part II:	Narrative	
	Section I: LEA Readiness	/31
	Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity	/54
	Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan	/56
	Section IV: Budget Narrative	/23
	Electronic Budget	No Points
	Total	/164

GENERAL COMMENTS: *Reviewers, please indicate support for scoring by including overall strengths and weaknesses. These comments are used on feedback forms to applicants.*

Strengths:

-
-

Weaknesses:

-
-

Required Changes:

-
-

Recommendation:

Fund _____

Fund w/ Changes _____

Do Not Fund _____

Part I: Proposal Introduction

No Points

✓ **Cover Page, Schools to be Served Page, LEA/School Information and Signature Page, Certification and Assurance Form and Waiver Form**

Complete the Cover Page, Schools to be Served Page, LEA/School Information and Signature Page, Certification and Assurance Form and Waiver Form and attach as the first six pages of the proposal.

✓ **Executive Summary**

Provide a brief description (no more than 1 paragraph) of the district and schools and the overall needs of the purposes of this grant. Use a separate sheet of paper and insert after the first six pages.

Part II: Narrative

164 Points

The following criteria will be used by reviewers to evaluate the application as a whole. In order for the application to be recommended for funding, it must receive at least 131 of the total possible 164 points and all required parts must be addressed. An application that receives a score of 0 on any required parts within the narrative will not be funded.

The format outlined below **must be followed** in order to assure consistent application of the review criteria (see evaluation rubric for specific details needed in sections I –IV).

Part II: Narrative

Section I: LEA Readiness

Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity

Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan

Section IV: Budget Narrative

Please organize your narrative by using the headings and subheadings provided in the following rubrics to organize your responses. Note that the total narrative (Part II) of the application cannot exceed **15 pages**.

Scoring Rubric

Section I: LEA Readiness	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
a) Clearly articulate what need this grant would fulfill within your school(s) and district.	0	1	3	5
b) Describe the role of the district leadership in communicating the importance of achieving dramatic gains, compelling action and being available to strategically support the reform effort.	0	1	2	3

c) How is the district able to demonstrate readiness for the Tiered Intervention grant and what steps have been taken that demonstrate commitment to the specific requirements of this grant (e.g., SST Review, school board commitment, previous staffing changes)?	0	1	3	5
d) Describe how you have made the community (SAC parents, business, foundations, etc.), aware of the performance of the school(s) for which you are applying.	0	1	3	5
e) Describe how your community and school board has been involved in improvement planning to date.	0	1	3	5
f) Describe how this grant opportunity fits into the district/schools overall improvement plan.	0	1	2	3
g) Describe what makes your district/school(s) ready and capable of dramatic change at this point in time.	0	1	3	5
Reviewer Comments:				
TOTAL POINTS				/31

Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
a) What methods did the district use to consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school intervention models in its schools (e.g., stakeholder meetings (PTA, teacher unions, school board), print/web-based communication, and/or surveys)?	0	1	3	5
b) Detail how the community was given notice of intent to submit an application and how any waiver requests will be made available for public review after submission of the application (e.g., newspaper/news releases, posted on the school and/or district website).	0	1	2	3
c) What specific actions has the district taken (or will take) to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements? To view the final requirements/program guidance, please visit: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf .	0	1	3	5
d) Describe the specific actions the district has taken or will take to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality (e.g., interviews, screening tools created)?	0	1	3	5

e) What specific actions has the district taken or will the district take to align other resources with the proposed interventions (e.g., Title I, local grants)?	0	1	2	3
f) What <i>specific</i> actions has the district taken (or will take) to ensure flexibility, modify its practices, policies or oversight structures, outside of normal district constraints, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively (e.g., flexible scheduling, principal autonomy over staff hiring/firing and placement, budget autonomy, obtaining innovation school/zone status, teacher/union agreements)?	0	1	3	5
g) For schools that are selected, how will the district demonstrate capacity to carry out the proposed interventions (e.g., leadership, detailed strategic or dissolution plans, capacity to administer and track progress monitoring assessments, capacity to engage in significant mid-course connections)? If there are schools in the district that will not be served through this grant, please provide a detailed explanation for why the district lacks the capacity to serve them (e.g., lack of administrative or support staff to adequately support the implementation, improve academic achievement by focus on fewer schools).	0	3	5	7
h) What specific actions has the district taken (or will take) to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends (e.g., professional development, trainer of trainer models, district commitment of continuation resources)?	0	1	2	3
i) Set feasible, attainable, and measurable objectives for each project goal. Identify how progress will be monitored towards each objective. Identify the timeline by which progress targets should be met.	0	1	3	5
j) Discuss how data will be disaggregated by subgroups on a regular basis (e.g., specific evaluation methods that are feasible and appropriate to the goals and objectives of the proposed project, data reports generated monthly and reviewed at both district and school levels, assessments administered on a specific assessment schedule).	0	1	3	5
k) Who will monitor and evaluate the progress of the program? Who will be responsible for sharing those results (i.e., leading indicators, quantitative indicators, student performance data) with CDE on a monthly basis (e.g., name of specific company or person with expertise noted)?	0	1	2	3

l) How will the project strategies be modified if the progress monitoring data does not show that targets have been met?	0	1	3	5
--	---	---	---	---

Reviewer Comments:

TOTAL POINTS	__/54
---------------------	--------------

Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
a) Submit the Unified Improvement Plan Addendum (Attachment E) for each proposed site. Use the template making sure to clearly address the needs assessment. Additional narrative detail may be added if there is not enough clarity within the Plan itself. <i>Please note:</i> To ensure success, it is imperative that specific needs are clearly delineated before an intervention model is chosen, before the plan is prepared and (if applicable) before a provider is chosen.	0	3	5	7
b) Analyze the current conditions in the proposed school(s) by providing student performance and other relevant data in relation to intervention selected for each school site.	0	3	5	7
c) Analyze the current conditions in the proposed school(s) by identifying root causes. What is preventing the school from increased academic performance? To what does the district attribute the failure of student academic growth over time?	0	3	5	7
d) Analyze the current conditions in the district by demonstrating that the LEA has the capacity to ensure that the school(s) implements the required activities of the selected school intervention model fully and effectively. (Attach relevant data: external evaluation, relevant student achievement, school performance and relevant school culture data as an appendix.)	0	3	5	7
e) Provide evidence to demonstrate that overall goals and performance targets are included by year. Annual math and reading/language arts academic goals are set for each school site the grant will serve. Expectations for growth after one year must be clear.	0	3	5	7
f) Provide evidence to demonstrate interventions are consistent with the final requirements. To view the final requirements/program guidance, please visit: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf .	0	3	5	7
g) Provide evidence to demonstrate proposed plan is aligned with the district Unified Improvement Plan.	0	3	5	7
h) Provide evidence to demonstrate sustainability after the implementation of the changes.	0	3	5	7
Reviewer Comments:				

TOTAL POINTS	/56
---------------------	------------

Section IV: Budget Narrative	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
-------------------------------------	---	---	--	--

For each school, provide a 3-year electronic budget (http://www.cde.state.co.us/turnaround/cde_turnaroundplan_home.htm) in compliance with CDE’s standard fiscal rules including a budget narrative that contains the following criteria:

a) All expenditures contained in the budget are described in the budget narrative and justified in connection to project goals, activities and specific model. The costs of the proposed project (as presented in the budget and budget narrative) are reasonable and the budget sufficient in relation to the objectives, design, and scope of project activities.	0	3	5	7
b) Amount of school improvement funds to be used for both pre-implementation (those activities which are absolutely necessary to implement the model fully and effectively) and implementation of the selected model and activities in each school the LEA commits to serve is clearly delineated.	0	1	3	5
c) Amount of school improvement dollars used by the LEA to support implementation of the selected school intervention model and activities are clearly detailed.	0	1	3	5
d) Demonstrates how district will align current and future funding in support of improvement goals and sustainability (e.g., specific funds identified, how will existing funds be reallocated to sustain grant after federal funding ends).	0	1	2	3
e) Details any portion of the plan that will be paid for by grant funds.	0	1	2	3

Note: A final budget and budget narrative will be required after actual allocations are determined. Upon approval of a final budget and budget narrative, funds will be released to the grantees. An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each school the LEA commits to serve.

Reviewer Comments:

TOTAL POINTS	__/23
---------------------	--------------

2013 Tiered Intervention Grant Eligible Schools

Note: Shaded rows indicate schools already participating in the Tiered Intervention Grant and therefore, are not eligible to apply.

Allowable Use of Funds – Pre-Implementation

Section J from the FY 2009 Guidance, “SIG, Race to the Top, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund,” has been removed and replaced with this new Section J for FY 2010.

J. PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

J-1. May an LEA use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds for “pre-implementation”?

Yes. Carrying out SIG-related activities during a “pre-implementation” period 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. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

J-2. What are examples of SIG-related activities that may be carried out in the 2010–2011 school year in preparation for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year?

This section of the guidance identifies possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation. The activities noted should not be seen as exhaustive or as required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities, depending on the needs of particular SIG schools:

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- **Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model (see H-19a).
- **Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs

with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional plan and the school’s intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional plan and the school’s intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

As discussed in F-4, in general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

J-3. When may an LEA begin using FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds to prepare for full implementation of an intervention model in the 2011–2012 school year?

An LEA may begin using FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds after the SEA has awarded the LEA a SIG grant based on the LEA’s having met all requirements for having a fully approvable SIG application, including conducting a needs assessment and identifying the model that will be implemented in each school the LEA will serve with SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

J-4. Is there a limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during the pre-implementation period that begins when it receives FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds?

There is no specific limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during pre-implementation. However, funds for activities that are designed to prepare for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year come from the LEA’s first-year SIG grant, which may be no more than \$2 million per school being served with SIG funds. Therefore, the LEA needs to be thoughtful and deliberate when developing its budget and should consider, at a minimum, the following:

- SIG funds awarded for the first year must cover full and effective implementation through the duration of the 2011–2012 school year, in addition to preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period.

- All activities funded with SIG funds must be reasonable and necessary, directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, address the needs identified by the LEA, and advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools (see also I-30).

Examples of Allowable Use of Funds

Please note: A comprehensive list of allowable activities can be found in “Guidance on School Improvement Grants” issued by the U.S. Department of Education on February 23, 2011.

Turnaround Model

- On-going, high quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program;
- Training in data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction;
- Financial incentives to recruit, place and retain staff with skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the turnaround school;
- Appropriate social-emotional and community oriented services and supports for students;
- Stipends that provide additional time for data meetings, Review of curriculum to make sure it is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State Academic standards, establishing schedules that will provide increased learning time;
- Costs associated with developing local competencies;
- Costs associated with implementing a new school model;

Restart Model

Please Note: Any of the allowable activities in the turnaround or transformation model are allowable in the restart model.

- Services from an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process or a charter school operator (CMO).

School Closure

Please Note: The funds allocated for a school closure are not subject to renewal since it is limited to the time necessary to close the school (usually one year or less)

- Costs that are associated with general responsibilities IF the costs are directly attributable to the school closure and exceed the costs the LEA would have incurred in the absence of the closure.
- Necessary and reasonable costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school , such as costs related to parent and community outreach, including , but not limited to, press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, hotlines, direct mail notices, or meeting regarding the school closures; services to help parents and students transition to a new school; or orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students attending a new school after their prior school closes.

Transformation Model

- Costs associated with the development of a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation system for teacher and principals that take into account student growth data, and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.
- Rewards for school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation.
- Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.
- Financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.
- Additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school.
- Costs associated with implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model.
- Additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content.
- Technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- Enrollment in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers.
- Summer transition programs or freshman academies.
- Costs associated with credit recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills.
- Stipends for additional time to create early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.
- Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff.
- Positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment.
- Costs associated with full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
- On-going, intensive support for school site(s) from LEA or external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

2014 Tiered Intervention Grant Intent-to-Apply

Name of LEA:	
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE (LEA)	
Name:	Title:
Address:	Phone:
Fax:	E-mail:
PROGRAM CONTACT PERSON	
Name:	Title:
Address:	Phone:
Fax:	E-mail:
Eligible School(s):	
School Name(s):	
Signatures	
Superintendent Name: _____	
Superintendent Signature: _____	
Date: _____	

<p>Letters of Intent will be due by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, February 28, 2014 to:</p> <p>CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us</p>



Section V: Supporting Addenda Forms

For Schools with a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) that Selected a Turnaround Model

Schools that participate in the Tiered Intervention Grant and selected the Turnaround Model must use this form to document grant requirements. As a part of the improvement planning process, schools are strongly encouraged to weave appropriate requirements into earlier sections of the UIP. This form provides a way to ensure all components of the program are met through descriptions of the requirements or a cross-walk of the grant program elements in the UIP.

Description of TIG (Turnaround Model) Program Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Describe how the LEA has granted the principal sufficient operational flexibility in the following areas: Staffing, Calendars/Time, and budgeting.	Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the new governance structure that was adopted. This structure may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a turnaround office in the LEA, hiring a turnaround leader who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or entering into a multi-year contract with the LEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the process for replacing the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the turnaround model (e.g., use of competencies to hire new principal).	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Describe how locally adopted competencies are used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students. Include (a) how all existing staff were screened and not more than 50 percent rehired and (b) how new staff are selected.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	

Description of TIG (Turnaround Model) Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;	Section III: Data Narrative (p. 7) and Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Describe the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	Section IV: Interim Measures on Target Setting Form (p. 9) and Action Plan (p. 10)	
Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	

Section V: Supporting Addenda Forms

For Schools with a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) that Selected a Transformation Model

Schools that participate in the Tiered Intervention Grant and selected the Transformation Model must use this form to document grant requirements. As a part of the improvement planning process, schools are strongly encouraged to weave appropriate requirements into earlier sections of the UIP. This form provides a way to ensure all components of the program are met through descriptions of the requirements or a cross-walk of the grant program elements in the UIP.

Description of TIG (Transformation Model) Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Describe how the LEA has granted the school sufficient operational flexibility in the following areas: Staffing, Calendars/Time, and budgeting.	Required TIG Addendum	
Describe how the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the process for replacing the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model (e.g., use of competencies to hire new principal).	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that: (1) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors (e.g., multiple observation-based assessments) and (2) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the process for Identifying and rewarding school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates. Include how staff who have not improved their professional practice, after ample opportunities have been provided, are identified and removed.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	

Description of TIG (Transformation Model) Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;	Section III: Data Narrative (p. 7) and Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Describe the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	Section IV: Interim Measures on Target Setting Form (p. 9) and Action Plan (p. 10)	
Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	

Major Improvement Strategy : Adopt Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) *Restart* Model

Summary of Root Cause(s) this Strategy will Address (from existing UIP):

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Steps* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school					

Major Improvement Strategy : Adopt Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) Closure Model

Summary of Root Cause(s) this Strategy will Address (from existing UIP):

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Steps* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.					
LEA officials will engage in an open dialogue with families and the school community early in the closure process to ensure that they understand the data and reasons supporting the decision to close, have a voice in exploring quality options, and help plan a smooth transition for students and their families at the receiving schools.					

USED TO IDENTIFY ELIGIBILITY FOR COHORT 5

2013 SIG Eligibility Proposal

SIG Eligible Title I Schools

1. Exclude Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following exemption criteria:
 - a. School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
 - b. School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
 - c. School is not a diploma-granting institution
2. Exclude closed schools
3. Exclude current TIG schools
4. Select schools receiving "SW" or "TA" Title I assistance for 2013-14.
5. Find the total remaining number of Title I eligible schools, calculate how many schools would make 5% (664 with TBD TIG = 33; 652 without all TIG = 33)
6. Add together the percentile rank values for reading and math into a new percentile index
7. Exclude schools with fewer than 3 full years of data
8. Select schools with a 2013 Academic Achievement ratings of *does not meet* in reading and mathematics
9. Exclude schools where all EMH levels do NOT receive *does not meet* ratings in reading and math (include levels in the count that are not Title 1 recipients as long as all levels receive *does not meet* ratings)
10. Sort remaining cases by summed percentile index from smallest to largest
11. Flag the total number of schools identified in Step 5. TIG schools have already been removed but include Focus schools as eligible
12. Select schools assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC-Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment for the school's "A" record) and flag as "SIG eligible- lowest 5%"
13. If schools are tied with the same percentile rank for the final eligibility slot, take all of them
14. Start over again with the data from Step 7
15. Select schools assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC-Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignment
16. Flag as "SIG eligible- low grad" schools with less than 60% for all of the above: 2012 4-year, 2011 5-year, and 2010 6-year grad rate– (must meet minimum N each individual year)- do not look at the 7-year rate

SIG Eligible Title I Eligible Schools

17. Start again from raw data
18. Exclude Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following exemption criteria:
 - d. School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
 - e. School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
 - f. School is not a diploma-granting institution
19. Exclude closed school
20. Exclude current TIG schools
21. Select only High schools
22. Exclude schools with fewer than 3 full years of data

23. Select 2013-14 Title I eligible secondary schools (schools not currently served with Title I funds, with 2012-13 FRL % equal to or greater than 35% or at or above the 2012-13 district average for H level)
24. Select schools assigned a 2013 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC-Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignment
25. Flag as "SIG Tier 2- low grad" schools with less than 60% for all of the above: 2012 4-year, 2011 5-year, and 2010 6-year grad rate– (must meet minimum N each individual year)- do not look at the 7-year rate

Action Planning Form for 2014-15 and 2015-16

Directions: Identify the major improvement strategy(s) for 2014-15 and 2015-16 that will address the root causes determined in Section III. For each major improvement strategy, identify the root cause(s) that the action steps will help to dissolve. Then, indicate which accountability provision or grant opportunity it will address. In the chart below, provide details about key action steps necessary to implement the major improvement strategy. Details should include the action steps that will be taken to implement the major improvement strategy, a general timeline, resources that will be used to implement the actions, and implementation benchmarks. Additional rows for action steps may be added. While the template provides space for three major improvement strategies, additional major improvement strategies may also be added. To keep the work manageable, however, it is recommended that schools focus on no more than 3 to 5 major improvement strategies.

Major Improvement Strategy #1: _____ **Root Cause(s) Addressed:** _____

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation
 Title I Focus School
 Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)
 Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)
 Other: _____

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline		Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
	2014-15	2015-16				

* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

Major Improvement Strategy #2: _____

Root Cause(s) Addressed: _____

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation
 Title I Focus School
 Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)
 Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)
 Other: _____

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline		Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
	2013-14	2014-15				

* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

Major Improvement Strategy #3: _____

Root Cause(s) Addressed: _____

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation
 Title I Focus School
 Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)
 Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)
 Other: _____

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline		Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
	2013-14	2014-15				

* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

Section V: Appendices

Some schools will need to provide additional forms to document accountability or grant requirements:

- Additional Requirements for Turnaround Status Under State Accountability (Required)
- Tiered Intervention Grantee (TIG) (Required)