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: Delaware

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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

Application Deadline
Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Delaware Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 401 Federal Street, Suite #2 Dover, DE 19901

State Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: Susan Haberstroh

Position and Office: Associate Secretary, Education Supports & Innovative Practices

Contact's Mailing Address:

35 Commerce Way, Suite #1
Dover, DE 19904

Telephone: -302-857-3301

Fax: 302-739-1780

Email address: susan.haberstroh@doe.k12.de.us

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Mark T. Murphy	Telephone: 302-735-4000
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: *[signature: Murphy]*	Date: 12/6/2013

The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

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

Delaware is requesting a waiver to allow LEAs to apply for SIG funds to implement SIG models in Focus schools. All Priority Schools from Delaware's original list of schools in its approved ESEA Flexibility application have already received SIG funds and are implementing one of the four models. Therefore, we would like to expand the list of eligible schools to include our Focus Schools. There are 13 Focus Schools from our original application. One of the 13, Warner Elementary School qualified for SIG funds in the 2011-12 school year and is already implementing a Transformation model and it is therefore not eligible for the current funds. However, all other Focus Schools will be eligible to apply. They are listed in Appendix A.

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]
See attached Appendix A									

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
None			
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

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

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.

---

[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.

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

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

Each LEA School Improvement Grant (SIG) application will require an amendment to the LEA Success Plan. The amended plan will include:
- Updated needs assessment information for all schools being served by SIG
- Identification of specific school(s) objectives, formative and summative progress measures and targets, and strategies directly related to Goal 4, "Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with deep support for the lowest-achieving schools", in the Success Plan.

All LEA applications will be reviewed by a team of DDOE staff members including those responsible for Title I, school turnaround, and supports and interventions. Each member will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on each section of the application. The full DDOE Title I, 1003(g) SIG Review checklist is Located in Appendix B. The checklist will be modified as needed for the upcoming competition.

In addition, all LEA applications will be scored using a rubric by the same team of DDOE staff members. The previous LEA Self-assessment Rubric for SIG rubric will be modified and used for this purpose. The LEA Self-assessment Rubric for SIG is Located in Appendix C. A minimum cut-point will be established to receive funding. The rubric will also be used to prioritize schools for funding if there are not sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

The needs assessment section of the success plan and specific needs within the SIG goal will be reviewed using the following criteria:
- Needs must identify each of the academic reasons why each school is low achieving.
- Non-academic needs and associated data must be clearly and logically linked to conditions that impact student achievement. (Examples: attendance, health issues, parent literacy, or behavior problems).

The SIG objective(s) will be reviewed using the following criteria:
- A separate objective for each school
- Each objective must clearly state the model chosen and in which school(s) the model will be implemented. (Example: ABC School District will implement the Turnaround Model in ABC Middle School in order significantly increase student performance)

The strategies section of the success plan will be reviewed using the following criteria:
- Strategies are aligned with the model to be implemented.
- Strategies are aligned to the needs from the needs assessment..

The measures and targets will be reviewed using the following criteria:
- Summative and formative measures are present in the plan that can be used to demonstrate changes in student outcomes, teacher behaviors, etc that reflect improvements in the school.
- Baselines are included for all measures or a timeline for establishing a baseline is included if the it has not yet been determined
- Targets for the measures reflect an aggressive timeline for significant improvements.

(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.

Each DDOE SIG review team member will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on each section of the LEA application. A pdf of the LEA application is attached as Appendix D. The LEA capacity section will be reviewed using the following criteria:
- If the LEA is not serving all eligible Focus schools, the LEA must provide clear and logical rationale for the schools it has chosen to serve and for the schools it has chosen *not* to serve, including LEA staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations.
- The LEA must provide rationale for the model chosen for each school served. Rationale must be clearly and logically linked to the needs for each school.
- The LEA must identify which LEA-level staff members and outside experts will be supporting each school, and each person's expertise that will contribute to successful implementation of the grant.
- If the EMO/CMO model is selected, the LEA must provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including a evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners.
- If the school closure model is selected, the LEA must provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools).
- If the Turnaround model is chosen, the LEA must provide evidence that all required components of the model will be implemented.
- If the Transformation model is chosen, the LEA must provide evidence that all required components of the model will be implemented..
- LEAs with 9 or more schools identified, have chosen to implement the transformation model in no more than 50% of eligible 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 DDOE SIG review team member will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on each section of the application. The budget section will be reviewed using the following criteria:

- Budgeted items must be clearly and directly linked to the strategies/needs in the LEA's SIG objective for each school.
- Budgeted items must be necessary and reasonable for the proper and efficient performance and administration of the grant award.
- Budgeted items must be realistic including:
  - Able to be fully expended during the grant period
  - Of sufficient scope and amount to ensure strategy success (Example: Strategy in plan is to require all ELA teachers to participate in high quality professional development. Budgeted items must clearly show that there are sufficient funds to support all ELA teachers' participation).
- Budgeted items must be allowable under ESEA cost principles and state law and regulation
- Budgeted items for LEAs choosing the school closure model must not be for more than one year in duration and may only be allocated for costs related to school closure including, but not limited to:
  - parent and community outreach efforts related to school closure
  - parent and student transition services to the new school
  - new school orientation activities for parents and students transferring from the closed school
  - administrative and operational costs, only if they are in excess of normal LEA costs and directly related to the school closure (i.e. transportation costs exceeding normal LEA transportation costs for the students in the closed school)
- Budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a)(2)(B) and §1120A(b).

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

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

Processes for LEAs serving Focus schools
Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements
Each LEA will be required to submit a quarterly progress report for each school to the School Turnaround Unit. The report will must cover both implementation progress and update formative

measure data.

Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
The State's Turnaround Office will provide a range of supports to LEAs as they turn around lowest-achieving schools, from the point of SIG approval, to the planning process, to recruitment of leaders and staff, and finally, to the launch and operations of the turnaround school.   Supports will include providing access to turnaround experts and mentors, providing help with recruiting operational partners, and identifying and disseminating best practices. Schools that choose to convert to a charter school will be supported by both the Turnaround Office and the Charter Management Office. The State has established a partnership with Mass Insight to support its turnaround efforts, making it one of a handful of states selected for partnership with this national leader in school reform.

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

Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively
The Turnaround Office will monitor LEAs with SIG schools to ensure all duties are carried out and SIG schools are making significant progress.   If the LEA is experiencing problems or barriers to full SIG implementation, the Turnaround Office will work with the LEA to alleviate those issues and/or to amend plans appropriately.   The Turnaround Office will monitor progress by regularly reviewing, at minimum, LEA quarterly progress reports, progress on formative targets within the LEA Success Plan SIG Goal(s), and LEA requests for assistance.

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

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

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 period[2] to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

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

 (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?

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

[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]

Projected Timeline for LEA applications and grant renewals:

~~January 13-24, 2014~~ – ~~Conduct webinar(s) for eligible LEAs on SIG program and its requirements~~
~~April 7~~January 29, 2014 – open SIG grant to eligible LEAs.
~~April 7-18~~January 29, 2014 – ~~Conduct~~ conduct in-person training session(s) for LEAs on the SIG program, its requirements, the scoring rubric and completion of the application.
~~April 30~~March 31, 2014 – final submission date for all LEA applications.
April 1, 2014 – all DDOE pre-reviews complete by pre-review team, substantially reviewable applications moved to full review team, LEAs with applications that are not substantially reviewable are notified.
~~By May 14~~April 4, 2014 – all DDOE full reviews of substantially reviewable applications are completed by full review team, all LEAs with substantially approvable grants are notified ~~of any minor revisions needed~~and provided feedback to be used for revisions, LEAs with applications that are not substantially approvable are notified. ~~approved applications forwarded for Associate Secretary and Secretary Review, unfunded applications notified~~
~~By May 28~~April 11, 2014 – all resubmissions of revised applications are due.
~~By June 3~~April 17, 2014– final DDOE re-reviews completed, all approvable applications are ranked based on rubric score and funded starting with the highest ranked school and progressing down the ranked list until all schools are funded or funds are exhausted, ~~approved~~ approvable applications forwarded for Associate Secretary and Secretary Review and final approval.
By ~~June~~May 15, 2014– make FY2013 funds available to funded LEAs via the State of Delaware financial system.

By June 15, 2015– compile and review all data regarding progress on school model implementation, leading indicators and student achievement for renewal decisions.

By July 15, 2015– make FY2013 funds available to LEAs via the State of Delaware financial system for schools approved for renewal.

By June 15, 2016– compile and review all data regarding progress on school model implementation, leading indicators and student achievement for renewal decisions.

By July 15, 2016– make FY 2013 funds available to LEAs via the State of Delaware financial system for schools approved for renewal.

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.

An LEA will submit an end of year report for each school receiving School Improvement Grant funds. This report will include each of the identified objectives established for their schools. The LEA will describe the extent to which each objective was achieved along with the supporting data. If an objective was not met, the LEA will discuss modifications that will be established in order to achieve the objective.

The SEA will perform quarterly site visits at each school. The primary function of these site visits is to review and analyze all facets of a school's implementation of the identified intervention model and collaborate with leadership, staff, and other stakeholders pertinent to goal attainment. Summary documentation will be collected from each school site visit and monitoring reports will be provided by the SEA.

Based upon evidence reviewed from the end of year report documenting LEA and school implementation, each school's site visit monitoring reports, and monthly meetings with LEA leadership, the SEA will determine the LEA's capacity to ensure goal attainment, and subsequent renewal of the School Improvement Grant funds.

If the school is making academic progress (as measured by the state assessment), the grant will be renewed. If not, the LEA will need to revise the plan and resubmit for approval before the grant will be renewed. If the revised plan is not approved by DDOE, funds will be terminated.

(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.

N/A

(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.

The Turnaround Office and the Title I Office will work with the LEA to ensure full and effective implementation of the selected school intervention model for their schools they are approved to serve. Turnaround office staff will meet with LEA staff on a monthly basis. As stated in B., Part 2 above, LEAs will submit to the SEA a quarterly summary report of the monitoring/oversight that has been completed and the progress the school has made towards achieving their goals. The SEA will perform quarterly onsite visits at all schools. The primary function of the onsite visits is to review and analyze all facets of a school's implementation of the identified intervention model and collaborate with leadership, staff, and other stakeholders pertinent to goal attainment.

SEA teams will conduct quarterly onsite monitoring visits annually with the school leadership team (parents should be invited) and the district level team (staff responsible for the technical assistance and administrative support).

Schools not making progress on their LEA formative/interim assessments, state assessments, and leading indicators must make adjustments to accelerate their objectives and strategies to meet the pre-established approved targets. The adjustments must be sent, as an addendum to the approved plan, to DDOE for approval. The SEA will work with the LEA and the schools to determine how technical support and monitoring can be strengthened.

Schools making progress on their LEA benchmarks, state assessments, and leading indicators will continue with their plans, monitoring, and support.

At the end of the 2nd year, this process will continue. However, the grant will not be renewed for any school still not making progress.

(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.

The SIG scoring rubric will be used to prioritize schools for funding if there are not sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies. Funding will be provided to the highest scoring school meeting the cut-point first and will proceed to the next highest school etc. until all funds are allocated or no more schools meet the cut-point.

(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.

N/A

(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 SEA does not intend to take over any schools.

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

The Turnaround Unit and Title I Office will provide a range of supports to LEAs as they turn around lowest-achieving schools, from identification as a Persistently Low Achieving School, to the planning process, to recruitment of leaders and staff, and finally, to the launch and operations of the turnaround school.   Supports will include providing access to turnaround experts and mentors, providing help with recruiting operational partners, and identifying and disseminating best practices. The State has established a partnership with US Education Delivery Institute to support its turnaround efforts. LEAs that choose to convert schools to a charter school to be authorized by the SEA, not LEA, will be supported by both the Turnaround Unit and Title I Office and the Charter School Office. Supports would include, but not be limited to, training of charter school staff regarding state and federal operating requirements such as financial management, data management and reporting, program requirements, curricula alignment, success planning, grant application processes, and charter school program requirements.

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

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

[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 or focus 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 or focus 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.

Delaware will reserve 5% of School Improvement Grant allocation for SEA activities.

SEA activities carried out through the state-level reservation funds will include:
- Title I Team costs to provide pre-application workshops including LEA plan and application self-assessment rubric training
- Turnaround Unit and Title I Office costs to provide post-award individualized technical assistance to LEAs
- Turnaround Unit and Title I Office costs to carry out SIG monitoring, evaluation, and reporting duties

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

☒ 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.**

Delaware requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools 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 30.

Assurance

☒ The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its "minimum n." The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in

each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its "minimum n" in its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools." In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver
☐ In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of "priority schools" in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

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

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver
Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver
Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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

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

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

<u>Assurances</u>
☐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.

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

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

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

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

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.

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 awards[2] 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.

Appendix A

Delaware List of SIG Eligible Schools, 2013-14

		SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG		
LEA NAME	**LEA NCES ID #**	**SCHOOL NAME**	**SCHOOL NCES ID#**	**PRIORITY (if applicable)**
Red Clay School District	1001300	Baltz (Austin D.) Elementary School	00264	
Red Clay School District	1001300	duPont (Alexis I.) Middle School	00272	
Christina School District	1000200	Oberle (William) Elementary School	00343	
Christina School District	1000200	Bayard Middle School	00232	
Christina School District	1000200	Kirk (George V.) Middle School	00235	
Christina School District	1000200	Newark High School	00238	
Moyer Academy Charter	1000023	Moyer (Maurice J.) Academy	00253	
Capital School District	1000190	Booker T. Washington Elementary School	00057	
Capital School District	1000190	Fairview Elementary School	00052	
Milford School District	1001080	Banneker (Benjamin) Elementary School	00107	
Seaford School District	1001530	West Seaford Elementary School	00160	
Seaford School District	1001530	Frederick Douglass Elementary School	00157	

FUNDS					
FOCUS (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					
X					

Appendix B

District and Charter School Success Plan & 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Approval Checklist
Title I, Part A, 1003(g)

ESEA, Title I, Part A, §1003(g)(1)
Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must "award grants to States to enable the States to provide subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with section 1116." In awarding such subgrants, an SEA must "give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans under section 1116." The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the "greatest need" for SIG funds and the "strongest commitment" to ensuring that such funds are used to raise substantially student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

LEA:_____**Reviewer:** _____

Directions: Use the criteria below to review each *eligible* district and charter school Success Plan and Grant.

Required Components of Title I, 1003(g) District and Charter School Success Plan and Grant	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Eligibility:				
1) LEA is applying for schools eligible under Tier I definition				
2) LEA is applying for schools eligible under Tier II definition				
3) LEA is applying for schools eligible under Tier III definition				
Evaluation – Success Plan:				
1) LEA has identified a mission				
2) LEA has identified a vision				
3) LEA has completed the needs assessment				
4) Needs assessment information is updated for all schools being served by SIG				
5) Needs include each of the academic reasons why each school is in improvement				
6) Needs include non-academic data that are clearly and logically linked to conditions that impact student achievement for each school				
7) LEA has included a goal for turning around the LEA's lowest performing schools				
8) LEA has created a new SIG objective for each intervention chosen under the LEA's Success Plan goal for turning around the LEA's lowest performing schools				
9) LEA has included strategies directly related to each new SIG objective for each intervention chosen				
10) School specific formative measures and targets are added to each new objective created for each SIG intervention chosen				
11) School specific summative measures and targets are added to each new objective created for each SIG intervention chosen				

District and Charter School Success Plan & 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Approval Checklist
Title I, Part A, 1003(g)

Model Specific Evaluation – Restart Model:				
1) LEA demonstrates that the LEA has conducted a thorough search of possible EMOs/CMOs of which have indicated availability, interest and capacity to restart the identified school(s)				
2) LEA demonstrates a rigorous review process of the EMO/CMO's reform plans and strategies				
3) LEA assures that the school will enroll all former students, within the grades the school serves, who wish to attend the school				
4) LEA identifies the grades the school will serve and the grade(s) the EMO/CMO will restart, ensuring that the SIG funds will only be used for the grade(s) under the restart model				
5) LEA assures the EMO/CMO contract will include language to hold the EMO/CMO accountable for complying with final requirements				
Model Specific Evaluation – School Closure:				
1) LEA provides a clear and detailed plan for ensuring students will be enrolled in a higher-achieving school within reasonable proximity to the closed school				
2) LEA assures that funds used to close a school will be used within one year				
3) LEA assures that funds are only allocated for costs related to school closure				
Model Specific Evaluation – Turnaround Model:				
1) LEA describes a process to replace the principal, provides rigorous criteria for new principal selection, and ensures the new principal sufficient operational flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates				
2) LEA assures participation in DPAS II-Revised to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students				
3) LEA describes a process and criteria for screening all existing staff				
4) LEA assures no more than 50% of existing staff will be rehired				
5) LEA includes multiple coordinated strategies to provide incentives and rewards to recruit, place and retain effective staff				

6) LEA includes ongoing professional development opportunities, aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, that meet the state's definition of high quality professional development				
7) LEA describes a new LEA governance structure for the school(s) and describes LEA capacity to carry out additional authority and accountability				
8) LEA describes how the school will identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, and aligned with the State Standards				
9) LEA describes a process for the school staff to use student data on a continuous basis to inform and differentiate instruction				
10) LEA includes strategies to increase learning time				
11) LEA includes strategies to support student social-emotional and community-oriented service needs				
Model Specific Evaluation – Transformation Model:				
1) LEA describes a process to replace the principal and provides rigorous criteria for new principal selection				
2) LEA assures participation in DPAS II-Revised to measure the effectiveness of principal and staff				
3) LEA includes strategies to reward staff who are effective and to remove those who, after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so				
4) LEA includes ongoing professional development opportunities, aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, that meet the state's definition of high quality professional development				
5) LEA includes multiple coordinated strategies to provide incentives and rewards to recruit, place and retain effective staff				
6) LEA describes how the school will identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, and aligned with the State Standards				
7) LEA describes a process for the school staff to use student data on a continuous basis to inform and differentiate instruction				

District and Charter School Success Plan & 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Approval Checklist Title I, Part A, 1003(g)

8) LEA includes strategies to increase learning time				
9) LEA includes strategies to provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement				
10) LEA includes strategies to grant the school sufficient operational flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates				
11) LEA describes how the LEA or other provider(s) will provide the school(s) with ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support				
Evaluation – Capacity:				
1) LEA has identified at least one Tier I or Tier II school to serve (unless there are no Tier I or Tier II schools)				
2) LEA has identified all SIG-eligible state Partnership Zone schools to serve				
3) [Applicable only for LEAs not serving ALL eligible Tier I and Tier II schools] LEA has provided a clear and logical rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve, including staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations				
4) LEA has provided clear and logical rationale linked to the specific school needs for the model chosen for each school served				
5) LEA has identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise in supporting each school				
6) LEA has identified outside experts and their expertise in supporting each school				
Evaluation – Budget:				
1) Budgeted items are clearly and directly linked to the strategies in the LEA's SIG goal				
2) Budgeted items clearly and directly address the reason why the school is in improvement (AYP cells missed and other data-determined needs)				
3) Budgeted items are necessary and reasonable for the proper and efficient performance and administration of the grant award				
4) Budgeted items are able to be fully expended during the grant period				
5) Budgeted items are of sufficient scope and amount to ensure strategy success				

6) Budgeted items are allowable under ESEA cost principles and state law and regulation				
7) [Applicable only for LEA's wishing to carry out pre-implementation activities] Pre-implementation activities are identified as such and are necessary for the LEA to prepare for full model implementation during the next school year				
8) [Applicable only for LEA selecting the school closure model] Budgeted items are not more than one year in duration				
9) [Applicable only for LEA selecting the school closure model] Budgeted items are only allocated for costs related to school closure				
10) Budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a)(2)(B) and §1120A(b)				
Assurances:				
1) The LEA has signed off on all SIG assurances.				

Appendix C

LEA Self-assessment Rubric for SIG

It is recommended that LEAs use this tool to self-evaluate their SIG proposals prior to submitting the application to the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE). .Applications that score "Weak" under any component will *likely* not be approved by the DDOE.

All applications must be substantially approvable at the time of first submission in order to be considered for approval. In order for an application to be considered substantially approvable it must be
- Complete – all sections of the grant must be completed
- Compliant –
  - Meet or exceed ESEA Title I, Part A, §1003(g) program element requirements as described in this rubric
  - Meet or exceed all ESEA cost principles, and state laws, and federal and state fiscal regulatory requirements
  - Meet all supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a)(2)(B) and §1120A(b)

Only applications that require *minor* revisions to show full compliance will be considered eligible for the application revision process.

Section 1 – Abstract and LEA Success Plan - Also See Model-specific Criteria
Evidence that the LEA has determined school(s)'s needs and developed a comprehensive and cohesive plan for improving outcomes in selected schools

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Abstract	The Abstract does not include all required elements.	The Abstract includes all required elements.	The Abstract is brief, yet clear, and includes all required elements.	
Mission Statement	The LEA mission is not included.	The LEA mission is included.		
Vision Statement	The LEA vision is not included.	The LEA vision is included.		
Academic Needs Assessment	The Needs Assessment does not address all academic areas or subpopulations in which the school is underperforming or showing regression.	The Needs Assessment addresses all academic areas or subpopulations in which the school is underperforming or showing regression.	The Needs Assessment is comprehensive, addresses all academic areas or subpopulations in which the school is underperforming or showing regression and addresses underlying conditions and causes for academic performance issues.	
Other Non-Academic Needs Assessment(s)	Non-Academic Needs and associated data are not linked to conditions that impact student achievement.	Non-Academic Needs and associated data are generally linked to conditions that impact student achievement.	Non-Academic Needs and associated data are clearly and logically linked to conditions that impact student achievement.	
Intervention Model Selection	The selected intervention model(s) does not address the needs identified in the school(s)'s needs assessment.	The selected intervention model(s) adequately addresses the needs identified in the school(s)'s needs assessment.	The selected model(s) fully addresses the needs identified in the school(s)'s needs assessment.	
Goals	The goals are generic and do not address intervention models chosen.	There is a goal for each intervention model chosen.	The goals specifically address which intervention model will be implemented at which school(s) and there is a separate goal for each intervention model chosen	

2

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Objectives	The objectives are not directly related to the goal, the selected intervention, or the school(s)'s needs.	The objectives are related to the goal, selected intervention and the school(s)'s needs.	The objectives are directly related to the goal and selected intervention and clearly address each school(s)'s needs.	
Measures	There are no formative and summative measures included in the plan.	There are formative and summative measures related to all academic areas or subpopulations in which the school is underperforming or showing regression.	There are meaningful formative and summative measures representing progress in all academic areas or subpopulations in which the school is underperforming or showing regression.	
Annual Targets	Annual targets are missing for some measures.	Annual targets are related to each measure and annual targets are realistic.	Annual targets are related to each measure, are realistic, and are set to ensure the school meets AYP in a reasonable timeframe.	
Strategies	Strategies are vague or haphazard or are not aligned with school(s)'s needs, goal(s), and objectives.	Strategies are broadly described and address identified school(s)'s needs, goal(s), and objectives.	Strategies are specific and detailed, scientifically research-based, and address identified school(s)'s needs, goal(s), and objectives.	
Ability to Meet Deadlines	The plan will not meet implementation deadlines as required by SIG.	The plan will meet implementation deadlines as required by SIG.	The plan will meet implementation deadlines as required by SIG and includes aggressive implementation timelines.	

Section 2 – General information
Evidence that LEA has provided required grant information

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Team Members	The team does not include all required stakeholders.	All of the required representative stakeholders are included on the team.		
Program Selection	A program is not selected.	A program is selected.		
Coordinator	The LEA Program Coordinator is not identified.	The LEA Program Coordinator is identified.	The LEA Program Coordinator is identified and in place.	
Allocations	The Allocation(s) is not within allowable range.	The Allocation(s) is within allowable range.		

Section 3 – Schools to be served
Evidence that the LEA has met requirements for selecting eligible schools

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Schools Selection	The LEA has not identified at least one Tier I or Tier II school for participation (if LEA has Tier I or Tier II eligible schools).	The LEA has identified at least one Tier I or Tier II school for participation (if LEA has Tier I or Tier II eligible schools).	The LEA has identified at least one Tier I or Tier II school(s) for participation (if LEA has Tier I or Tier II eligible schools) and has chosen which schools will participate in alignment with LEA-wide priorities and state Partnership Zone identification (if the LEA has any school identified for PZ).	
School Tiers	The LEA has not identified the proper Tier for each school.	The LEA has identified the proper Tier for each school.		
Intervention Selection	The LEA has not selected an intervention model for each school.	The LEA has selected an intervention model for each school.		
Transformation Model Selection	The LEA has chosen to implement the transformation model in more than 50% of its schools (if LEA has 9 or more schools identified in Tiers I, II, and III).	The LEA has chosen to implement the transformation model in no more than 50% of its schools (if LEA has 9 or more schools identified in Tiers I, II, and III)		
Allocations Delineated by Year	Allocations for each school are not delineated by year OR the majority of funds are not allocated for use during the first year.	Allocations for each school are delineated by year and the majority of funds are allocated to the first year.		

Section 4 – Descriptive Information – Also See Model-specific Criteria

Evidence that the LEA has reflected on its history and current capacity constraints, and that this application is based on effective use of new resources

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Partnership Zone Schools	Partnership Zone schools are not identified.	Partnership Zone schools are identified		
LEA Capacity	LEA activities are not defined.	LEA activities to support the school(s) are described.	LEA activities to support the needs of the school(s) are clearly and specifically described.	
LEA Staff Capacity	The LEA has not identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise/role in supporting each school.	The LEA has identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise/role in supporting each school.	The LEA has identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise/role in supporting each school; staff expertise is clearly aligned with school needs and each person's role is likely to promote successful implementation of the grant.	
LEA Lack of Capacity	The LEA has not provided a rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve.	The LEA has provided a clear and logical rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve, including staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations.	The LEA has provided a clear and logical rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve, including staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations and provides evidence to support all claims.	
Rationale for Model Selection	The rationale for model selection is unclear or is not logical.	The rationale for model selection is logical.	The rationale for model selection is detailed, strong, and directly links the model to the needs assessment.	
All Model Components	The LEA has not provided sufficient evidence that all components of the model will be implemented.	The LEA has provided confirmation that all components of the model will be implemented.	The LEA has provided clear and detailed evidence that all components of the model will be implemented.	
External Providers – Selection Process	The process for selecting external providers is not clearly defined.	The process for selecting external providers is adequate.	The process for selecting external providers is comprehensive and well defined.	

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
External Provider Responsibilities	The responsibilities of the external provider are minimally defined and aligned.	The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are broadly defined and aligned.	The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are clearly defined and aligned.	
External Providers Researched	Available providers have not been researched.	Available providers have been researched.	Available providers have been thoroughly researched.	
External Provider Track Record	The process used to identify the provider does not address a proven track record of success.	The process used to identify the provider generally identifies whether or not the provider has a proven track record of success.	The process used to identify the provider identifies whether or not the provider has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations.	
External Provider Accountability	The LEA has not indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.	The LEA has indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.	The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.	
External Provider Capacity	The capacity of the external provider to service the identified school has not been addressed, or has been minimally addressed.	The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been investigated.	The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been clearly demonstrated.	
Other Resources	Additional resources are not identified.	Adequate resources are dedicated to the model implementation.	Significant resources are dedicated to the model implementation.	
Review of LEA Policies and Practices	No description of LEA policies and practices is included.	The description of LEA policies and practices is adequate.	An in-depth analysis of LEA policies and practices was conducted.	
Changes to LEA Policies and Practices	Inappropriate or a small number of LEA policies and practices will be altered.	Limited LEA policies and practices will be altered.	Multiple LEA policies and practices will be altered to ensure full intervention implementation.	

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Flexibility for Hiring, Retaining or Transferring Staff	Very limited or no flexibility has been provided for hiring, retaining and transferring staff to facilitate the selected model.	Flexibility has been provided for hiring, retaining and/or transferring staff to facilitate the selected model.	Broad flexibility has been provided for hiring, retaining and transferring staff to facilitate the selected model.	
Sustain the Reforms After the Funding Period Ends	The plan for sustainability is inadequate and unrealistic.	The plan for sustainability includes basic information about sustainability and future support by the LEA.	The plan for sustainability is clear, realistic, and provides detailed information about sustainability and future support by the LEA.	
Services for Tier III Schools	LEA activities for Tier III schools are not defined.	LEA activities for Tier III schools support the school(s).	LEA activities for Tier III schools are clearly defined and specifically support the needs of the school.	
Stakeholder Consultation	Collaborative decisions are not evident.	Description of the collaborative decision making process includes input from all required stakeholders.	Description of the collaborative decision making process is clear and specific; there is evidence of broad stakeholder representation and participation in decision making.	

Section 5.0 Budget
The budget must clearly indicate how these funds will be appropriately used to support the project. The budget should demonstrate clear connections to the projects activities and how the district will use the funds over the grant period to fully implement the intervention model.

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Alignment with Plan	Grant funds are not aligned or clearly tied to Success Plan goal(s), objectives, and strategies.	Grant funds are tied to the Success Plan goal(s), objectives, and strategies.	Grant funds are clear and well defined and directly support the Success Plan goal(s), objectives, and strategies.	
Necessary and Reasonable	Budgeted items seem excessive or unnecessary to carry out the Success Plan goal(s), objectives, and strategies.	Budgeted items are aligned with plan components and will likely aid successful plan implementation.	Budgeted items are clearly and logically aligned with plan components, and are clearly necessary and reasonable for successful plan implementation.	
Travel Expenses	Travel expenses cannot be linked to the program.	Travel expenses are related to the program.	Travel expenses are directly linked to the program and clearly part of broader high quality professional development initiative.	
Timely Expenditures	Budgeted items cannot be fully expended during the grant period, OR the majority of funds will not be expended during year one of the grant period.	Budgeted items can be fully expended during the grant period, with the majority of funds to be expended during year one of the grant period.		
Scope and Amount	The budget does not fully support all required components of the intervention model(s) selected.	Budgeted items support all required components of the intervention model(s) selected.	Budgeted items are of sufficient scope and amount to ensure strategy success and full intervention model implementation. (Example: Strategy in plan is to require all ELA teachers to participate in high quality professional development. Budgeted items must clearly show that there are sufficient funds to support all ELA teachers' participation.)	

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Integration with other funding sources	Other state, local and federal funds supporting grant activities are not specified.	Other state, local and federal funds supporting grant activities are specified.	Other state, local and federal funds clearly and logically support the plan.	
Allowable expenditures	Budgeted items are not allowable.	All budgeted items are allowable under ESEA cost principles and state law and regulation.		
Supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA	Budgeted items do not comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA.	All budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a) (2) (B) and §1120A (b).		

Sections 6 & 7 – Waivers, Certifications of Compliance and Assurances

LEA has specified requested waivers

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Waivers	Waivers are not selected, there is no indication this was intentional.	Waivers are selected, and any exceptions for specific schools are noted.		
CSO Certification	The Chief School Officer has not certified compliance OR has not signed the application.	The Chief School Officer has certified compliance and has signed the application.		
CFO Certification	The Chief Finance Officer has not certified compliance OR has not signed the application.	The Chief Finance Officer has certified compliance and has signed the application.		

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

EMO/CMO Restart Model

Evidence that all required model components are included in the Success Plan

EMO/CMO Restart CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Research	Success Plan does not indicate that available EMO/CMO's have not been researched	Success Plan indicates that available EMO/CMO's have been researched	Success Plan indicates available EMO/CMO's have been thoroughly researched	
Track Record	Success Plan or other grant components do not include information about the process or criteria for EMO/CMO selection	Success Plan or other grant components describe the process and criteria used to identify whether or not the EMO/CMO has a proven track record of success	Success Plan or other grant components describe the process and criteria used to identify whether or not the provider has a EMO/CMO track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations	
Accountability	Success Plan does not indicate that the LEA will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards	Success Plan indicates that the LEA will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards	Success Plan includes specific information about how the LEA will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards	
Capacity	Success Plan or other grant components do not include information about EMO/CMO capacity to service the identified school	Success Plan or other grant components describe EMO?CMO capacity to serve the identified school has been explored and	Success Plan or other grant components clearly demonstrate EMO/CMO capacity to serve the identified school	
BONUS: Collaboration with other LEAs	Success Plan does not address collaboration with other LEAs to reach economies of scale	Success Plan addresses intent to collaborate with other LEAs	Success Plan includes well documented intent to collaborate with other LEAs and involves significant, well-specified sharing of resources, personnel, partner relationships and/or models in order to reach economies of scale	

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

School Closure Model
Evidence that all required model components are included in the Success Plan

School Closure CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Student reassignment	Success Plan provides insufficient evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA or LEA of residence in case of charter schools	Success Plan provides sufficient evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA or LEA of residence in case of charter schools	Success Plan provides a clear and detailed plan for ensuring students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA or LEA of residence in case of charter schools	
Budget	Budgeted items for LEAs choosing the school closure model are for multiple years or are allocated to unallowable costs	Budgeted items for LEAs choosing the school closure model are only allocated for Year One of the grant period and are only allocated for costs related to school closure		
BONUS: Collaboration with other LEAs	Success Plan does not address collaboration with other LEAs to reach economies of scale	Success Plan addresses intent to collaborate with other LEAs	Success Plan includes well documented intent to collaborate with other LEAs and involves significant, well-specified sharing of resources, personnel, partner relationships and/or models in order to reach economies of scale	

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Transformation Model

Evidence that all required model components are included in the Success Plan

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Plan to Replace the Principal	The Success Plan does not describe a process or criteria to replace the principal.	The Success Plan describes a process to replace the principal and criteria for new principal selection.	The Success Plan describes a process to replace the principal and rigorous criteria for new principal selection.	
Evaluation Systems	The Success Plan does not indicate participation in DPAS II-revised.	The Success Plan indicates participation in DPAS II-revised.		
Staff Effectiveness	The Success Plan does not describe staff rewards OR does not indicate how staff will be removed if after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so.	The Success Plan includes a strategy(s) to reward staff who are effective and have increased student achievement and to remove those who, after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so.	The Success Plan includes a strategy(s) to reward staff who are effective and have increased student achievement and to remove those who, after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so. The plan incorporates both strategies in a coherent approach to staffing flexibility and support	

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
High Quality Professional Development	The Success plan does not describe professional development, or the plan does not meet the state definition of high quality professional development.	The Success plan describes professional development that meets the state definition of high quality professional development. Professional development is a combination of job-related focused and in-depth, learning, practice, feedback, reflection, and support experiences designed to enhance participant's perspectives, insights and/or attitudes; and which lead to improved professional practice and student performance.		
Strategies to Recruit, Develop, and Retain Staff	The Success Plan does not describe strategies to implement recruitment, development or retention strategies.	The Success Plan incorporates one or more research-based recruitment, development or retention strategies.	Success Plan demonstrates clear alignment among multiple research-based recruitment, development or retention strategies into an overall human capital strategy, including financial incentives and promotions/growth opportunities.	
Instructional Program	The Success Plan does not describe an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, or integrated with DCAS data.	The Success Plan generally describes an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, and integrated with DCAS data.	The Success Plan provides a detailed description to ensure the instructional program is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, and integrated with DCAS and other data sources.	

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Reform Strategies for Instruction	The Success Plan does not describe new instructional and learning supports or the description(s) is vague.	The Success Plan describes new instructional and learning supports for students.	The Success Plan describes multiple new instructional and learning supports for students, and the supports are coherent and aligned with student needs as determined by various data points.	
Operational Flexibility • Staffing • Calendars/time • Budgeting • Other	The Success Plan does not include strategies to grant additional operational flexibility to the principal.	The Success Plan describes strategies to grant additional flexibility(s) to the principal.	The Success Plan describes strategies to grant significant additional flexibility to the principal and clearly demonstrates supporting changes in LEA policy and/or practices.	
Governance (Technical Assistance and Support)	The Success Plan does not describe any new strategies for LEA or other provider supports to the school(s).	The Success Plan describes new strategies for LEA or other provider supports to the school(s).	The Success Plan describes new strategies for LEA or other provider supports to the school(s) and describes capacity to carry out additional supports and accountability.	
Data Driven Instructional Practice	The Success Plan does not describe any new strategies for data driven instructional support.	The Success Plan describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction.	The Success Plan describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction and systematically evolves as determined by changing student data.	
Increased Learning Time	The Success Plan does not describe learning time increases of at least 5%.	The Success Plan includes 5-10% increases to learning time through adjustments to the school schedule, lengthening of the school year, and/or other methods.	The Success Plan includes dramatic increases to learning time (more than 10%) through multiple methods.	

16

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Connections to Learning • Social & Emotional Health • School Climate • Health, nutrition, and Physical Activity	The Success Plan does not address Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement.	The Success Plan addresses some elements of Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement, supports are aligned to needs.	The Success Plan addresses all relevant elements of Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement, supports are aligned to needs, and resources are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.	
Parent and Community Involvement	The Success Plan does not include information about new strategies to engage parents and the community.	The Success Plan includes multiple new strategies to engage parents and the community.	The Success Plan describes how multiple new strategies will inform a coherent plan to integrate family and community partners into school improvement efforts.	
BONUS: Collaboration with other LEAs	The Success Plan does not address collaboration with other LEAs to reach economies of scale.	The Success Plan addresses intent to collaborate with other LEAs.	The Success Plan includes well documented intent to collaborate with other LEAs and involves significant, well-specified sharing of resources, personnel, partner relationships and/or models in order to reach economies of scale.	

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Turnaround Model
Evidence that all required model components are included in the Success Plan

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Plan to Replace the Principal	The Success Plan does not describe a process or criteria to replace the principal.	The Success Plan describes a process to replace the principal and criteria for new principal selection.	The Success Plan describes a process to replace the principal and rigorous criteria for new principal selection; The Plan also indicates system for allowing the principal operational flexibility.	
Evaluation Systems	The Success Plan does not indicate participation in DPAS II-revised.	The Success Plan indicates participation in DPAS II-revised.		
Staff Effectiveness	The Success Plan does not describe how staff will be screened for effectiveness.	The Success Plan describes how staff will be screened for effectiveness.	The Success Plan clearly and specifically describes the process and criteria for staff effectiveness screening.	
Rehiring	The Success Plan does not ensure that no more than 50% of staff will be rehired.	The Success Plan describes how the LEA will ensure that no more than 50% of staff will be rehired.	The Success Plan clearly and specifically describes how the LEA will ensure that no more than 50% of staff will be rehired.	
Staff Incentives and Rewards	The Success Plan does not describe staff incentives and rewards.	The Success Plan includes at least one strategy to provide incentives or rewards to effective staff.	The Success Plan includes multiple coordinated strategies to provide incentives and rewards to effective staff.	
Strategies to Recruit, Develop, and Retain Staff	The Success Plan does not describe strategies to implement recruitment, development or retention of teachers.	The Success Plan incorporates one or more research-based recruitment, development or retention strategies.	The Success Plan demonstrates clear alignment among multiple research-based recruitment, development or retention strategies into an overall human capital strategy.	

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
High Quality Professional Development	The Success Plan does not describe professional development, or the plan does not meet the state definition of high quality professional development.	The Success Plan describes professional development that meets the state definition of high quality professional development Professional development is a combination of job-related focused and in-depth, learning, practice, feedback, reflection, and support experiences designed to enhance participant's perspectives, insights and/or attitudes; and which lead to improved professional practice and student performance.		
New Governance Structure	The Success Plan does not describe a new LEA governance structure for the school(s).	The Success Plan describes a new LEA governance structure for the school(s).	The Success Plan describes a new LEA governance structure for the school(s) and describes LEA capacity to carry out additional authority and accountability.	
Instructional Program	The Success Plan does not describe an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, or integrated with DCAS.	The Success Plan generally describes an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, and integrated with DCAS data.	The Success Plan provides a detailed description to ensure the instructional program is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, and integrated with DCAS and other data sources. The Success Plan provides a detailed description to ensure the instructional program is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, or integrated with DCAS	

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
Increased Learning Time	The Success Plan does not describe learning time increases of at least 5%.	The Success Plan includes 5-10% increases to learning time through adjustments to the school schedule, lengthening of the school year, and/or other methods.	The Success Plan includes dramatic increases to learning time (more than 10%) through multiple methods.	
Data Driven Instructional Practice	The success Plan does not describe any new strategies for data driven instructional support.	The Success Plan describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction.	The Success Plan describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction and systematically evolves as determined by changing student data.	
Connections to Learning • Social & Emotional Health • School Climate • Health, nutrition, and Physical Activity	The Success Plan does not address Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement.	The Success Plan addresses some elements of Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement, supports are aligned to needs.	The Success Plan addresses all relevant elements of Connections to Learning domain of continuous improvement, supports are aligned to needs, and resources are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.	
Parent and Community Involvement	The Success Plan does not include information about new strategies to engage parents and the community.	The Success Plan includes multiple new strategies to engage parents and the community.	The Success Plan describes how multiple new strategies will inform a coherent plan to integrate family and community partners into school improvement efforts.	

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK	**AVERAGE**	**STRONG**	
BONUS: Collaboration with other LEAs	The Success Plan does not address collaboration with other LEAs to reach economies of scale.	The Success Plan addresses intent to collaborate with other LEAs.	The Success Plan includes well documented intent to collaborate with other LEAs and involves significant, well-specified sharing of resources, personnel, partner relationships and/or models in order to reach economies of scale.	

Delaware Department of Education (DDOE)
Title 1 - 1003g School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

Mark T. Murphy, Secretary of Education
David Blowman., Deputy Secretary of Education
Susan Keene Haberstroh, Associate Secretary, Education Supports and Innovative Practices Branch
Karen Field Rogers, Associate Secretary, Financial Reform & Resource Management

John G. Townsend Building
401 Federal Street, Ste 2
Dover, DE 19901-3639

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Abstract is a brief, precise narrative summary of how this grant will impact the schools' plans for continuous improvement, and should include:
• Major program outcomes, • The name(s) of school reform models, local innovations, and/or external supports, • A brief description of activities supported by these funds, • Time frames for implementation of these grant activities, • The total amount of allocations, and • The amount of funds requested, which must be equal to the total of funds requested on the summary budget page.

Here is my abstract

Success Plan for: ESPES Test School

Years: 2012-2013 to 2013-2014

Mission Statement :   Mission Statement here. test

Vision Statement :   Vision Statement here.

Needs Assessment

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

Group Name:	3rd Grade Teachers
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) Currently 40% of the teachers are using summarizing in classroom lessons. We are expecting 100% of the teachers to use summarizing.
Root Cause:	Only 15% of the teachers have completed the full professional development on summarizing. Also, we currently do not have a coaching process in place to assist teachers in improving their use of summarizing.
Data Source:	Principal Walkthrough Data, Comprehensive Success Review
Group Name:	Principal and Assistant Principal
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) The Principal and Assistant Principal have each completed 5 walkthroughs for week to look for the use of summarizing be teachers in lessons. They need increase the number to 10 per week so that more teachers are receiving feedback more often.
Root Cause:	The Principal and Assistant Principal have received additional paperwork assignments from district office that have reduced their time available for walkthroughs.
Data Source:	Principal weekly reports to district office
Group Name:	School Counselor
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) The school counselor has been able to meet with 60% of the students with social/emotional needs in the last 6 months.
Root Cause:	The counselor's case load has increased 45% over the past two years to the point where she no longer has sufficient time to meet with all students in need.
Data Source:	Counselor referral data, Counselor monthly reports to principal

Staff & Community Needs Assessment

Group Name:	Parents

Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) Only 40% of parents report that they are informed about how their student is performing in ELA and Math. We need the number to 100%.
Root Cause:	There is no uniform set of expectations for teachers to make regular contacts with parents regarding their student's performance.
Data Source:	Parent Survey Data, Survey of Teaching Staff

Student Needs Assessment

Group Name:	Special Education Students
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) Only 25% of special education students reached proficiency on DCAS mathematics in the Spring 2013 assessment. We need to bring that percent up to at least 55% in the next year.
Root Cause:	Teachers have been differentiating instruction for special education students (e.g., small groups, etc.) in about 30% of the classrooms.
Data Source:	DCAS Data, Principal Walkthrough Data, Comprehensive Success Review
Group Name:	African American Males
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) Only 40% of African American males reached proficiency in DCAS ELA in Spring 2013 assessment. We need the number to be at least 65% in the next year.
Root Cause:	The students need extend learning time in reading but the current district required schedule prescribes that instruction will be limited to a 90 minute block daily.
Data Source:	DCAS Data, District Policy Documentation
Group Name:	Tardy Students
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) 10% of students are missing the opportunity for universal breakfast 3 or more days per week due to being tardy. We need 100% of students to have the opportunity for universal breakfast.
Root Cause:	The structure of the current breakfast program does not allow for students to have breakfast when they arrive after 8:15 am.
Data Source:	School Attendance Data, School Breakfast Data
Group Name:	All Students
Need:	(ESPES A-B-C School) Only 57% of students reached proficiency in ELA in Spring 2013 assessment. We need the number to be at least 75% in the next year.
Root Cause:	The current curriculum is only about 35% aligned with Common Core Standards.
Data Source:	DCAS Data, District Office Curriculum Alignment Study, Comprehensive Success Review

Goals & Objectives

Goal 1: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with rigorous standards, curriculum, and assessments

Objective 1.1: Implement college and career ready standards and assessments

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	*Staff & Community Need*	(3rd Grade Teachers) (ESPES A-B-C School) Currently 40% of the teachers are using summarizing in classroom lessons. We are expecting 100% of the teachers to use summarizing.
2	*Staff & Community Need*	(Principal and Assistant Principal) (ESPES A-B-C School) The Principal and Assistant Principal have each completed 5 walkthroughs for week to look for the use of summarizing be teachers in lessons. They need increase the number to 10 per week so that more teachers are receiving feedback more often.
3	*Staff & Community Need*	(School Counselor) (ESPES A-B-C School) The school counselor has been able to meet with 60% of the students with social/emotional needs in the last 6 months.

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Support the development of new standards, align curriculum, and conduct assessments (SoW 1)

1. Ensure curriculum aligns with standards and is implemented with fidelity (SoW 1 req.)   04/10/2011 - 04/10/2012

2. Provide PD in PLC for MS Teachers   07/01/2011 - 06/30/2012

Strategy 2: Build a culture of college- and career-readiness in schools (SoW 2)

1. Provide rigorous advanced coursework (SoW 2 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

2. Target high-need or low-achieving students for enrollment in advanced coursework (SoW 2 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

3. Proactively support students in advanced coursework (SoW 2 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

Measure(s):

Measure:	[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)	Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
		6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	n/a
Start Year: 2008	Baseline: 87	6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	n/a
DOE Indicator:	[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)	6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	n/a
Perspective:	Student Achievement/Student Performance	6/15/2011	84	6/15/2011	n/a
Period:	Yearly	6/15/2012	89	6/15/2012	n/a
		6/15/2013	95	6/15/2013	n/a
		6/15/2014	100	6/15/2014	n/a

Goal 2: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with sophisticated data systems and practices

Objective 2.1: Improve access to and use of data systems

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Implement and support improvement of the state longitudinal data system (SoW 3)

No activities for this strategy.

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 2.2: Build the capacity to use data

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Ensure implementation of instructional improvement systems (SoW 4)

1. Provide 90 minutes of weekly collaborative time (SoW 4 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900	
2. Implement (or enhance) an instructional improvement system (SoW 4 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900	
3. Use State data coaches to facilitate collaborative time (SoW 4 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900	

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Goal 3: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with effective teachers and leaders

Objective 3.1: Improve the effectiveness of educators based on performance

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Use evaluations as a primary factor in educator development, promotion, advancement, retention, and removal (SoW 5)

1.	Integrate development coaches into the evaluation process (SoW 5 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900
2.	Deliver professional development offerings that are aligned with improvement plans (SoW 5 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

Strategy 2: Establish new educator career paths linked to evaluation (SoW 6)

1.	Define the career ladders already in place (SoW 6 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900
2.	Establish and staff a teacher leader position in each high-need school (SoW 6 req.)	01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 3.2: Ensure equitable distribution of effective educators (SoW 7)

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Increase the concentration of highly-effective teachers and leaders in high need schools (SoW 7 req.)

1. Use the central website for applications (SoW 7 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

2. Forecast hiring needs and use succession planning to identify high-potential candidates (SoW 7 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 3.3: Ensure that educators are effectively prepared (SoW 9)

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Target recruiting and hiring to the most effective preparation programs (SoW 9 req.)

No activities for this strategy.

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Objective 3.4: Provide effective support to educators

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Adopt a coherent approach to professional development (SoW 10)

1. Link professional development to specific skill and role expectations (SoW 10 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

2. Review existing professional development to determine if it is high-impact (SoW 10 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

3. Prioritize participation in high-impact professional development offerings (SoW 10 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

Strategy 2: Accelerate the development of instructional leaders (SoW 11)

1. Ensure novice and high-need school principals participate in State instructional leadership training (SoW 11 req.)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

2. Distribute leadership in schools through the integrated use of time studies and coaching (SoW 11)   01/01/1900 - 01/01/1900

Measure(s):

Measure:	[CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)	Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
		6/15/2008	100	(none)	
Start Year: 2008 Baseline: 75.4		6/15/2009	100	(none)	
DOE Indicator:	[CM] Percent of classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)	6/15/2010	100	(none)	
Perspective:	Student Achievement/Student Performance	6/15/2011	100	(none)	
Period:	Yearly	6/15/2012	100	(none)	
		6/15/2013	100	(none)	
		6/15/2014	100	(none)	

Goal 4: Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with deep support for the lowest-achieving schools

Objective 4.1: Provide deep support to the lowest-achieving schools

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Follow the process for turning around schools selected for the Partnership Zone (SoW 12)

No activities for this strategy.

Measure(s):

Measure:	[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Math on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)	Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
		7/2/2013	100	7/2/2013	80
Start Year:	2013 Baseline: 70				
DOE Indicator:	[CM-R2T] % Meets Standard in Math on the DCAS (All Students - All Grades)				
Perspective:	Teaching and Learning				
Period:	Yearly				

Objective 4.2: Dramatically increase student achievement in ESPES A-B-C School by implementing a Turnaround model.

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	*Staff & Community Need*	(3rd Grade Teachers) (ESPES A-B-C School) Currently 40% of the teachers are using summarizing in classroom lessons. We are expecting 100% of the teachers to use summarizing.
2	*Staff & Community Need*	(Principal and Assistant Principal) (ESPES A-B-C School) The Principal and Assistant Principal have each completed 5 walkthroughs for week to look for the use of summarizing be teachers in lessons. They need increase the number to 10 per week so that more teachers are receiving feedback more often.
3	*Staff & Community Need*	(School Counselor) (ESPES A-B-C School) The school counselor has been able to meet with 60% of the students with social/emotional needs in the last 6 months.
4	*Staff & Community Need*	(Parents) (ESPES A-B-C School) Only 40% of parents report that they are informed about how their student is performing in ELA and Math. We need the number to 100%.
5	*Student Need*	(Special Education Students) (ESPES A-B-C School) Only 25% of special education students reached proficiency on DCAS mathematics in the Spring 2013 assessment. We need to bring that percent up to at least 55% in the next year.
6	*Student Need*	(African American Males) (ESPES A-B-C School) Only 40% of African American males reached proficiency in DCAS ELA in Spring 2013 assessment. We need the number to be at least 65% in the next year.
7	*Student Need*	(Tardy Students) (ESPES A-B-C School) 10% of students are missing the opportunity for universal breakfast 3 or more days per week due to being tardy. We need 100% of students to have the opportunity for universal breakfast.
8	*Student Need*	(All Students) (ESPES A-B-C School) Only 57% of students reached proficiency in ELA in Spring 2013 assessment. We need the number to be at least 75% in the next year.

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Continue professional development for teachers on use of summarizing in classroom lessons.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 2: Work with the building leadership team to establish a coaching process to assist teachers in improving their use of summarizing.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 3: Conduct are review a district policy to ensure principals have sufficient time to conduct the required number of walkthroughs.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 4: Contract with Ajax Student Counseling Services to provide additional services to students with social/emotional needs.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 5: Work with the building Leadership team to establish expectations for frequent (e.g., weekly contacts with parents to inform them of their child's performance in ELA and Math.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 6: Conduct more weekly walkthroughs of classrooms looking for differentiation of instruction for special education students and share feedback to teachers.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 7: Work with the building leadership team to establish a coaching process to assist teachers in improving their use of differentiated instruction for special education students.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 8: Work with the district office and building leadership team to establish flexible reading learning blocks for students 1 or more grades below reading level.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 9: Work with the school nutrition staff and building leadership team to provide "bag" breakfasts that tardy students can pick up in the office and take to class when they arrive.

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 10: District Office will work with the building leadership team to identify new curriculum materials that are aligned with Common Core Standards.

No activities for this strategy.

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Goal 5: This is a new Goal

Objective 5.1: This is a new Objective

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	*Staff & Community Need*	(3rd Grade Teachers) (ESPES A-B-C School) Currently 40% of the teachers are using summarizing in classroom lessons. We are expecting 100% of the teachers to use summarizing.
2	*Staff & Community Need*	(Principal and Assistant Principal) (ESPES A-B-C School) The Principal and Assistant Principal have each completed 5 walkthroughs for week to look for the use of summarizing be teachers in lessons. They need increase the number to 10 per week so that more teachers are receiving feedback more often.
3	*Staff & Community Need*	(School Counselor) (ESPES A-B-C School) The school counselor has been able to meet with 60% of the students with social/emotional needs in the last 6 months.

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Continue implementation of Reading First in Elementary schools

   1. This is a test activity   11/20/2012 - 11/20/2012

     Deliverable 1. Distribute meeting notes   01/17/2014

Strategy 2: Continue support of teachers to become HQT

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 3: Continue HQT hiring practices

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 4: Strategy add on Test Server

No activities for this strategy.

Measure(s):

Measure:	% of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in Elementary Schools		Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
			7/1/2008	99	7/1/2008	99
Start Year:	2008	Baseline: 95	12/13/2012	100	12/7/2012	99
DOE Indicator:	(none)		12/13/2012	100	12/18/2012	100
Perspective:	Teaching and Learning					
Period:	Yearly					

Measure:	[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)		Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
			6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	n/a
Start Year:	2008	Baseline: 87	6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	n/a
DOE Indicator:	[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)		6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	n/a
			6/15/2011	84	6/15/2011	n/a
Perspective:	Student Achievement/Student Performance		6/15/2012	89	6/15/2012	n/a
Period:	Yearly		6/15/2013	95	6/15/2013	n/a
			6/15/2014	100	6/15/2014	n/a

Measure:	This is a new Reading Measure		Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
Start Year:	2009	Baseline: 50	11/3/2009	53	11/6/2009	55
DOE Indicator:	(none)		1/27/2010	57	(none)	56
Perspective:	Student Achievement/Student Performance					
Period:	Quarterly					

Measure:	Test1		Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
Start Year:	2002	Baseline: 50	11/20/2011	5	1/1/0001	
DOE Indicator:	(none)		11/20/2012	10	11/20/2012	9
Perspective:	Teaching and Learning		11/20/2013	20	1/1/0001	
Period:	Quarterly					

Measure:	New Measure 1		Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
Start Year:	2013	Baseline: 80	6/26/2014	90	1/1/0001	
DOE Indicator:	(none)					
Perspective:	Teaching and Learning					
Period:	Yearly					

Measure:	This is a new test measure		Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
Start Year:	2014	Baseline: 60	7/2/2013	90	7/3/2013	75
DOE Indicator:	(none)					
Perspective:	Teaching and Learning					
Period:	Semi-Yearly					

Objective 5.2: This is another new Objective

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

1	*Staff & Community Need*	(School Counselor) (ESPES A-B-C School) The school counselor has been able to meet with 60% of the students with social/emotional needs in the last 6 months.

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Continue HQT hiring practices

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 2: Continue support of teachers to become HQT

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 3: School Improvement Grant Strategy 1

No activities for this strategy.

Strategy 4: New Strategy

No activities for this strategy.

Measure(s):

Measure:	[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)	Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
		6/15/2008	68	6/15/2008	n/a
Start Year:	2008 Baseline: 87	6/15/2009	73	6/15/2009	n/a
DOE Indicator:	[CM] % Proficient in Reading on the DSTP (All Students - All Grades)	6/15/2010	79	6/15/2010	n/a
		6/15/2011	84	6/15/2011	n/a
Perspective:	Student Achievement/Student Performance	6/15/2012	89	6/15/2012	n/a
Period:	Yearly	6/15/2013	95	6/15/2013	n/a
		6/15/2014	100	6/15/2014	n/a
Measure:	% Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - Grade 2)	Target Date	Target	Actual Date	Actual
Start Year:	2008 Baseline: 75	6/15/2008	50	(none)	
DOE Indicator:	% Proficient in Math on the DSTP (Low Income - Grade 2)	6/15/2009	58	(none)	
Perspective:	Student Achievement/Student Performance	6/15/2010	67	(none)	
Period:	Yearly	6/15/2011	75	(none)	
		6/15/2012	83	(none)	
		6/15/2013	92	(none)	
		6/15/2014	100	(none)	

Objective 5.3: This is the newest objective

Objective Narrative:

Need(s) Influenced by this Objective:

Strategy(s):

Strategy 1: Tutors will work with ID students 3 hours a day on following items

1. start work on time   07/02/2013 - 07/02/2013

Measure(s):

There are no measures associated with this objective.

Success Plan Team Members

Name	Title	Phone	Email
Jarrell, Ted	Ed Associate	857-3320	tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us
Hodges, Amelia	Contractor	857-3320	ahodges@doe.k12.de.us
Kough, Theresa Vendryk	Director	857-3320	tkough@doe.k12.de.us
Wells, Kim	Ed Associate, Title I	857-3320	kwells@doe.k12.de.us
Wells, Kim	Ed Associate, Title I	857-3320	kwells@doe.k12.de.us
Stoner, Lisa			
Wells, Kim	Education Associate		kwells@doe.k12.de.us
Stoner, Lisa	Education Associate	302-857-3326	lstoner@doe.k12.de.us
Rozumalski, Dennis	Education Associate		
Mouse, Mickey	Disney Executve	800-DIS-NEY1	Mickey@disney.com
Jarrell, Ted	Ed Associate	857-3320	tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us
test, test	Mr	1234567890	abc@abc.com
Test, Test	Test		
Jarrell, Ted	Ed Associate	857-3320	tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us
Wells, Kim	Ed Associate, Title I	857-3320	kwells@doe.k12.de.us

2.1   Team Members

List the LEA-level staff members and outside experts who will be supporting each school, and each person's expertise that will contibute to successful implementation of the grant.

First Name	Last Name	Title	Email Address	Constituency	Programs	Perkins
Kim	Wells	Ed Associate, Title I	kwells@doe.k12.de.us	Community Member		
Ted	Jarrell	Ed Associate	tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us	Administrator		

2.2   Program Selection

Select the years for which the LEA intends to apply for funding.

Federal	
✗	Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 1
✗	Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 2
✗	Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 3

2.3   Coordinators and Allocations

For each funding year, enter the program coordinator and the amount of funds for which the LEA is applying across all schools to be served. Note: LEAs must apply for at least $50,000 per school served and may apply for up to $2,000,000 per year per school served.

Federal Programs

Program	Coordinator	Allocation	Liquidation Date
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 1	Jarrell, Ted tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us	$300,000.00	6/30/2014
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 2	Jarrell, Ted tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us	$300,000.00	6/30/2014
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 3	Jarrell, Ted tjarrell@doe.k12.de.us	$300,000.00	6/30/2014

3.0   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 the model that it will use in each school. (Tier/Category Codes: 1=Tier I, 2=Tier II, 3=Tier III, 4=Focus School)

Federal Public School Distribution

School	NCES ID	Tier/Category	Intervention
ESPES A-B-C School	12345	4	Turnaround
ESPES Middle School	23456	4	Transformation
ESPES High School	34567	4	Transformation

Question A

A.1 If the LEA is not applying to serve all eligible schools, provide clear and logical rationale for the schools it has chosen to serve and for the schools it has chosen not to serve. Include LEA staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations (capacity constraints) for schools not served.

N/A

A.2 Describe the LEA capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model(s) it has selected. Identify the specific staff members, their role and expertise to support each school.

Test

Question B

B.1 Describe how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

Test

B.2 Describe how the LEA has reviewed and will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

Test

B.3 Describe how the LEA will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Test

Question C

C.1 Describe how the LEA has, as appropriate, consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in the schools to be served by this application.

Test

C.2 Describe how the LEA will monitor each school that receives school improvement funds including by
     1) Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts   and mathematics; and,
     2) Measuring progress on the leading indicators

Test

Question D

D.1 Will the LEA be utilizing any 1003(g) SIG funds to carry out pre-implementation activities during the current school year?

✕	Yes
⭕	No

D.2 If yes, list those activities below and explain how each activity:
- is directly related to the selected model;
- is reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;
- is designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA's needs assessment;
- represents a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years;
- is research-based; and
- represents a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.

Test

Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA analyzed the needs of the first school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions that are aligned to the needs.

Test

A.2 Provide a timeline delineating the specific steps the LEA has taken, or will take, in the first school to design and implement the chosen model and to meet all federal SIG intervention model requirements. Include the rationale for the model selected and address all required components of the the selected model.
    Please note:
        *If the Education Management Organization (EMO)/Charter Management Organization (CMO) management model is selected, provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including any evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners.
        *If the school closure model is selected, provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools).

Test

A.3 Provide a description of how the already approved use of 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds for the 2014-15 school year and any carryover funds from the first school's Focus School plan support the implementation of the selected SIG model or how some or all of the funds will be re-purposed to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.

Test

Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA analyzed the needs of the second school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions that are aligned to the needs.

Test

A.2 Provide a timeline delineating the specific steps the LEA has taken, or will take, in the second school to design and implement the chosen model and to meet all federal SIG intervention model requirements. Include the rationale for the model selected and address all required components of the the selected model.
    Please note:
        *If the Education Management Organization (EMO)/Charter Management Organization (CMO) management model is selected, provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including any evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners.
        *If the school closure model is selected, provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools).

Test

A.3 Provide a description of how the already approved use of 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds for the 2014-15 school year and any carryover funds from the second school's Focus School plan support the implementation of the selected SIG model or how some or all of the funds will be re-purposed to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.

Test

Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA analyzed the needs of the third school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions that are aligned to the needs.

Test

A.2 Provide a timeline delineating the specific steps the LEA has taken, or will take, in the third school to design and implement the chosen model and to meet all federal SIG intervention model requirements. Include the rationale for the model selected and address all required components of the the selected model.
　　Please note:
　　　　*If the Education Management Organization (EMO)/Charter Management Organization (CMO) management model is selected, provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including any evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners.
　　　　*If the school closure model is selected, provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools).

Test

A.3 Provide a description of how the already approved use of 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds for the 2014-15 school year and any carryover funds from the third school's Focus School plan support the implementation of the selected SIG model or how some or all of the funds will be re-purposed to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.

Test

Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA analyzed the needs of the fourth school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions that are aligned to the needs.

Test

A.2 Provide a timeline delineating the specific steps the LEA has taken, or will take, in the fourth school to design and implement the chosen model and to meet all federal SIG intervention model requirements. Include the rationale for the model selected and address all required components of the the selected model.
    Please note:
        *If the Education Management Organization (EMO)/Charter Management Organization (CMO) management model is selected, provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including any evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners.
        *If the school closure model is selected, provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools).

Test

A.3 Provide a description of how the already approved use of 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds for the 2014-15 school year and any carryover funds from the fourth school's Focus School plan support the implementation of the selected SIG model or how some or all of the funds will be re-purposed to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.

Test

Question A

A.1 Describe how the LEA analyzed the needs of the fifth school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions that are aligned to the needs.

Test

A.2 Provide a timeline delineating the specific steps the LEA has taken, or will take, in the fifth school to design and implement the chosen model and to meet all federal SIG intervention model requirements. Include the rationale for the model selected and address all required components of the the selected model.
    Please note:
        *If the Education Management Organization (EMO)/Charter Management Organization (CMO) management model is selected, provide evidence of the availability and quality of each EMO or CMO under consideration, including any evidence of interest from potential EMO or CMO partners.
        *If the school closure model is selected, provide evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA (or LEA of residence in the case of charter schools).

Test

A.3 Provide a description of how the already approved use of 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds for the 2014-15 school year and any carryover funds from the fifth school's Focus School plan support the implementation of the selected SIG model or how some or all of the funds will be re-purposed to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.

Test

5.0 Budget

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds from this grant the LEA will use each year to-

  * Implement the selected model in each school it commits to serve; and
  * Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's schools to be served.
Note: LEAs must apply for at least $50,000 per school served and may apply for up to $2,000,000 per year per school served.

Budgeted Item Detail

Federal Budget Summary

Classification	Account	Activity	1003(g) Year 1	1003(g) Year 2	1003(g) Year 3	Total
Salaries	Professional: Administration	Instructional Coach (1 FTE per school for each year)	$229,990.80	$229,990.80	$229,990.80	$689,972.40
		Account Total	$229,990.80	$229,990.80	$229,990.80	$689,972.40
	Professional: Instruction		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Pension Exempt Positions (including Substitutes and others)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Support Staff		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Students (with WC and UI)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Extra Pay for Extra Responsibility (EPER)		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	OEC	Total OECs	$70,009.20	$70,009.20	$70,009.20	$210,027.60
		Account Total	$70,009.20	$70,009.20	$70,009.20	$210,027.60
	Classification Total		$300,000.00	$300,000.00	$300,000.00	$900,000.00
Contracted Services	Fixed Charges/ Indirect Costs		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Professional: Instruction		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Professional: Administration		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

			1003(g) Year 1	1003(g) Year 2	1003(g) Year 3	Total
Contracted Services	Professional: Administration	**Account Total**	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Travel	Professional: Instruction		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Professional: Administration		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Supplies and Materials	Professional: Instruction		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Professional: Administration		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Capital Outlay	Maintenance of Plant		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Capital Outlay		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Indirect Costs	Indirect Costs		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Audit Fees	Audit Fees		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		Account Total	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Classification Total		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Federal *** - Allow Indirect Cost Total**		$300,000.00	$300,000.00	$300,000.00	$900,000.00

OEC Summary

Program	FICA	Medicare	Pension	Workman's Comp	Unemployment	Health Ins. \ Non Taxed Benefits	Total OEC Cost
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 1	$14,259.42	$3,334.86	$48,344.07	$3,679.86	$390.99	$0.00	$70,009.20
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 2	$14,259.42	$3,334.86	$48,344.07	$3,679.86	$390.99	$0.00	$70,009.20
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 3	$14,259.42	$3,334.86	$48,344.07	$3,679.86	$390.99	$0.00	$70,009.20
Totals	$42,778.26	$10,004.58	$145,032.21	$11,039.58	$1,172.97	$0.00	$210,027.60

Note: 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.

STATE OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUDGET SUMMARY

Federal: Beginning date: Obligation date: 8/1/2015   Liquidation Date: 11/1/2015

School Name: ESPES A-B-C School   School Code: 951

ApprNo	Activity	Type	Account Code 5100 Salaries	Account Code 5120 OECs	Total
41076	1003(g) Year 1	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
	1003(g) Year 2	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
	1003(g) Year 3	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
		Total	$229,990.80	$70,009.20	$300,000.00

School Name: ESPES Middle School   School Code: 954

ApprNo	Activity	Type	Account Code 5100 Salaries	Account Code 5120 OECs	Total
41076	1003(g) Year 1	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
	1003(g) Year 2	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
	1003(g) Year 3	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
		Total	$229,990.80	$70,009.20	$300,000.00

School Name: ESPES High School   School Code: 955

ApprNo	Activity	Type	Account Code 5100 Salaries	Account Code 5120 OECs	Total
41076	1003(g) Year 1	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
	1003(g) Year 2	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
	1003(g) Year 3	Federal	$76,663.60	$23,336.40	$100,000.00
		Total	$229,990.80	$70,009.20	$300,000.00

District: ESPES test District

Chief School Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I am the chief school officer of the LEA. I am authorized to apply for the funds identified in this Consolidated Application. I am also authorized to obligate the LEA to conduct any program or activity approved under this Consolidated Application in accordance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, program assurances, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application.

2. I have read this Consolidated Application. The information contained in it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. The LEA is applying for funding under the programs indicated in Section 1 of this Consolidated Application.

3. I have also read the attached Assurances for FY09. I understand that those Assurances are incorporated into and made a part of this Consolidated Application as though they were fully set out in this Consolidated Application with regard to those programs for which funding is sought.

4. The LEA and each of its schools, programs, and other administrative units, will conduct the programs and activities for which funding is sought in this Consolidated Application as represented in this Consolidated Application. Further, the LEA and each of its schools, programs and other administrative units, will comply with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for FY09, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application.

5. I understand that compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements, including statutory and regulatory requirements, attached Assurances for FY09 and any conditions imposed as part of the approval of this Consolidated Application, is a condition of receipt of federal and state funding. I understand that such compliance continues through the duration of the funding period, including any extensions to that period.

6. I understand that state and federal funding may be withheld, terminated and recovered, and future funding denied, if the LEA fails to comply with applicable federal and state requirements as promised in this Certification.

Chief School Officer: , _____   **Approval Date:** _____

Signature:

_____

Chief Financial Officer Certification of Compliance

I certify that:

1. I am the chief financial officer of the LEA and I am authorized to submit the budget and financial information contained in this Consolidated Application on its behalf.

2. I have read this Consolidated Application and specifically read and reviewed the budget and financial information contained in or made part of the Consolidated Application. The information contained in the Consolidated Application it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

3. The LEA is applying for funding under the following programs:

Federal Programs   **State Programs**

Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 1
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 2
Title I-1003(g) SIG - Year 3

4. I have reviewed and approved the submission of the budgets for each of these programs.

Chief Financial Officer: , _____   **Approval Date:** _____

Signature:

_____

Assurances

General

A   It is assured that the LEA will 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.

B   It is assured that the LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on Delaware's assessment, both in reading 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.

C   It is assured that the LEA will, if it implements a restart model in a 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.

D   It is assured that the LEA will report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E   It is assured that the LEA will ensure that all schools it commits to serve receive 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.

F   It is assured that the LEA will 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.

G   It is assured that the LEA will 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.

Delaware Department of Education Signatures

<u>Finance</u>

<u>Secretaries</u>

Secretary	**Title**	**Approval Date**
	Secretary	(none)

Delaware Department of Education SIG Application Checklist and Scoring Rubric

This tool will be used by Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) as a combination checklist and scoring rubric to determine the completeness and quality of LEA submitted SIG applications.   Below is a description of how the tool will be used.

Substantially Reviewable
All applications must be substantially reviewable at the time of first submission in order to be fully reviewed further for potential approval. A small team of DDOE staff will review the application to ensure all items, at a minimum, have been completed and pre-score Section 1 of the rubric. In order for an application to be considered substantially reviewable, all sections of the grant must be completed and all criteria in Section 1 of rubric must have score of 2 or higher. If the application is not substantially reviewable, no further action will be taken and the LEA will be notified.

Substantially Approvable
If an application is substantially reviewable, a full team of DDOE staff will review and score the entire application. In order for an application to be considered substantially approvable, the entire Success Plan and grant must have at least 70% of all rubric items scored a "2" among items that have a maximum attainable score of "Average", the LEA must have received at least 70% of all possible points on the LEA rubric criteria that have a maximum attainable score of "Strong", and the school must have at least 70% of all possible points on the school rubric criteria that have a maximum attainable score of "Strong". Only grants meeting these criteria will be sent back to the LEA for revisions. LEAs will be informed if their application is not substantially approvable.

Approvable
Any LEA with a substantially approvable grant will be given one opportunity to revise and resubmit its grant to respond to reviewer comments. After resubmission, a full team of DDOE staff will re-review and re-score the entire application. In order for a resubmitted application to be considered approvable, the entire Success Plan and grant must have 100% of all rubric items scored at least a "2", the LEA must have received at least 83% of all possible points on the LEA rubric criteria that have a maximum attainable score of "Strong", and the school must have at least 83% of all possible points on the school rubric criteria that have a maximum attainable score of "Strong". LEAs will be informed if their application is not approvable.

Fundable
For purposes of funding, each school will receive a final score based on the percent of all possible points on the combined LEA and school rubric criteria that have a maximum attainable score of "Strong". The DDOE will fund approvable grants for the entire three-year period beginning with the school with the highest score and progress until all funds are allocated. If one or more schools have been funded and the amount of remaining funds is less than the amount requested for the school with the next highest score, DDOE will explore additional options to fund the school. If there are still not sufficient funds for the school to implement its approved SIG model, the school will not be funded and the funds will be made available to LEAs with qualifying schools for the competition in the following year. LEAs will be informed if their application is not fundable.

Note: Rubric criteria shown in **bold green** are used for evaluation of the LEA and its support of plan and model implementation whereas criteria in **bold blue** are used for evaluation of the school needs assessment, plan and model implementation.

Section 1 – LEA Success Plan - **Also See Model-specific Criteria**
Evidence that the LEA has determined school(s)'s needs and developed a comprehensive and cohesive plan for improving outcomes in selected schools

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Needs Assessment (Need Type)	The needs assessment for the school includes identified needs in none or one of the three categories: student, staff and parent/community.	The needs assessment for the school includes identified needs in two of the three categories: student, staff and parent/community.	The needs assessment for the school includes identified needs in all three categories: student, staff and parent/community.	Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Subgroups)	The needs assessment <u>does not</u> include needs that identify specific low-performing subgroups of students (e.g., race/ethnicity, special education, low income, grade-level, gender, etc.)	The needs assessment includes needs that identify some but not all low-performing subgroups of students (e.g., race/ethnicity, special education, low income, grade-level, gender, etc.)	The needs assessment includes needs that identify all low-performing subgroups of students (e.g., race/ethnicity, special education, low income, grade-level, gender, etc.)	Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Need Description)	The description <u>does not</u> indicate the discrepancy between the desired outcome and the current results for any needs.	The description for some but not all needs indicates the discrepancy between the desired outcome and the current results.	The description for all needs indicates the discrepancy between the desired outcome and the current results.	Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Need Description – School Identified)	The description does not start with the name or abbreviation for the school in parentheses.	The description starts with the name or abbreviation for the school in parentheses [e.g., (ESPES A-B-C School)].		Required Success Plan

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Needs Assessment (Root Cause)	The root cause does not describe the reason for the discrepancy between the desired outcome and the current results for any needs.	The root cause for some but not all needs describes the reason for the discrepancy between the desired outcome and the current results.	The root cause for all needs describes the reason for the discrepancy between the desired outcome and the current results. (Note that a well written root cause provides the basis for strategies to address the cause and reduce or eliminate the need.)	Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Data Sources)	There is not a data source for each need or the data source does not align with the need.	There is one or more data source for each need that aligns with the need.		Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Academic Areas)	The needs assessment does not include any student needs in academic areas where the school is underperforming.	The needs assessment includes student needs in some but not all academic areas where the school is underperforming.	The needs assessment includes student needs in all academic areas where the school is underperforming.	Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Non-academic Areas)	The needs assessment does not include student needs in non-academic areas that impact student achievement.	The needs assessment includes student needs in non-academic areas that impact student achievement.		Required Success Plan
Needs Assessment (Types of Staff)	The needs assessment includes staff needs for one or no types of staff.	The needs assessment includes staff needs for two types of staff.	The needs assessment includes staff needs for three or more types of staff (e.g., administrators, teachers, counselors, nurses, paraprofessionals, etc.)	Required Success Plan

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Objectives	There is <u>not</u> an objective under the Goal "Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with deep support for the lowest-achieving schools" for the school that specifies the model to be implemented.	There is an objective under the Goal "Accelerate achievement and improve outcomes for all students with deep support for the lowest-achieving schools" for the school that specifies the model to be implemented.		Required Success Plan
School Needs	All needs identified for the school are <u>not</u> included under the objective.	All needs identified for the school are included under the objective.		Required Success Plan
Strategies	Strategies do <u>not</u> address the school's identified needs.	Strategies are broadly described but address the school's identified needs.	Strategies are specific and detailed, scientifically research-based (where appropriate), and directly address all the school's identified needs.	Required Success Plan
Measures (Leading Indicators)	Data for all SIG-required leading indicators are <u>not</u> included in the supplemental EXCEL measure template for the school.	Data for all SIG-required leading indicators are included in the supplemental EXCEL measure template for the school.	Data for all SIG-required leading indicators are included in the supplemental EXCEL measure template for the school and the LEA has identified one or more additional leading indicators that are directly related to the school's identified needs.	Required Success Plan Guidance p. 65
Targets (Leading Indicators)	Baselines and aggressive but realistic targets for improvement have <u>not</u> been established for all the SIG-required leading indicators.	Baselines and aggressive but realistic targets for improvement have been established for all the SIG-required leading indicators.	Baselines and aggressive but realistic targets for improvement have been established for all the SIG-required leading indicators and the LEA identified additional leading indicators over the next three years.	Required Success Plan

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Measures (Lagging Indicators)	Data for all DDOE-required lagging indicators (all-students whole school percent proficient in ELA and Math and all-students graduation rate, if applicable) are <u>not</u> included in the supplemental EXCEL measure template for the school.	Data for all DDOE-required lagging indicators (all-students whole school percent proficient in DCAS ELA and Math and all-students graduation rate, if applicable) are included in the supplemental EXCEL measure template for the school.	Data for all DDOE-required lagging indicators (all-students whole school percent proficient in ELA and Math and all-students graduation rate, if applicable) are included in the supplemental EXCEL measure template for the school and the LEA has identified one or more additional lagging indicators that are directly related to the school's needs assessment.	Required Success Plan
Targets (Lagging Indicators)	Baselines and aggressive but realistic targets for improvement have <u>not</u> been established for all the DDOE-required lagging indicators.	Baselines and aggressive but realistic targets for improvement have been established for all the DDOE-required lagging indicators.	Baselines and aggressive but realistic targets for improvement have been established for all the DDOE-required lagging indicators and the LEA identified additional lagging indicators over the next three years.	Required Success Plan

Section 2 – General information

Evidence that LEA has provided required grant information

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Team Members	Team members include two or fewer types of staff and at least one parent representative or one community representative or team members do <u>not</u> include either a parent representative or a community representative.	Team members include three or more types of staff and at least one parent representative or one community representative.	Team members include four or more types of staff (e.g., district administrators, school administrators, teachers, counselors, nurses, paraprofessionals, and other district/school staff) and at least one parent representative and one community representative.	Required Grant Section 2.1
Program Selection	The appropriate number of programs is <u>not</u> selected based on the number of years for which the LEA is requesting funding.	The appropriate number of programs is selected based on the number of years for which the LEA is requesting funding.		Required Grant Section 2.2
Coordinator	The LEA Program Coordinator is <u>not</u> identified.	The LEA Program Coordinator is identified.		Required Grant Section 2.3
Allocations	The allocation is <u>not</u> within allowable range for each year that the LEA is requesting funds.	The allocation is within allowable range for each year that the LEA is requesting funds.		Required Grant Section 2.3

Section 3 – Schools to be served
Evidence that the LEA has met requirements for selecting eligible schools

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Schools to be Served	The LEA has identified at least one Focus School for participation.	The LEA has identified at least one Focus School for participation by selecting one of the four intervention models for the school.		Required Grant Section 3.0 Application p. 18

Section 4 – Descriptive Information – Also See Model-specific Criteria

Evidence that the LEA has reflected on its history and current capacity constraints, and that this application is based on effective use of new resources

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
LEA Lack of Capacity	The LEA has not provided a rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve.	The LEA has provided a rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve, including staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations.	The LEA has provided a clear and logical rationale for selecting the schools they will and will not serve, including staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations and provides evidence to support all claims.	Optional Grant Section 4.1, A1 Guidance pp. 55-57
LEA Capacity (Commitment of Resources)	The LEA does not describe a plan to commit the staff time and other resources to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected	The LEA describes a plan to commit the staff time and other resources to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.	The LEA describes clear a plan with specific activities and timelines to commit the staff time and other resources to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.	Required Grant Section 4.1, A2 Guidance p. 61
LEA Capacity (Staff Expertise)	The LEA has not identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise/role in supporting each school.	The LEA has identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise/role in supporting each school.	The LEA has identified LEA-level staff members and their expertise/role in supporting each school; staff expertise is clearly aligned with school needs and each person's role is likely to promote successful implementation of the grant.	Required Grant Section 4.1, A2 Guidance p. 61
External Providers (Researched)	The LEA does not describe how each external provider has been researched.	The LEA describes how each external provider has been researched.	The LEA describes how each external provider has been thoroughly researched to determine that the provider has a plan that will contribute to meaningful changes in the school.	Optional Grant Section 4.1, B1 Guidance pp. 61-62 Addendum pp. 2-3
External Providers (Research-based Strategies)	The LEA does not describe how it required each external provider to demonstrate its strategies are research-based.	The LEA describes how it required each external provider to demonstrate its strategies are research-based.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, B1 Guidance pp. 61-62 Addendum pp. 2-3

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
External Provider (Capacity)	The LEA does not describe how the capacity of each external provider to implement the proposed strategies in the identified school has been investigated.	The LEA describes how the capacity of each external provider to implement the proposed strategies in the identified school has been investigated.	The LEA describes how the capacity of each external provider to implement the proposed strategies in the identified school has been clearly investigated and demonstrated.	Optional Grant Section 4.1, B1 Guidance pp. 61-62 Addendum pp. 2-3
External Provider (Track Record)	The LEA does not describe the process used to identify that each external provider has a proven track record of success.	The LEA describes the process used to identify that each external provider has a proven track record of success.	The LEA describes the process used to identify that each external provider has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations.	Optional Grant Section 4.1, B1 Guidance pp. 61-62 Addendum pp. 2-3
External Provider (Responsibilities)	The LEA does not describe the relationship of its own responsibilities and the responsibilities of each external provider.	The LEA describes the relationship of its own responsibilities and the responsibilities of each external provider.	The LEA clearly describes the relationship of its own responsibilities and the responsibilities of each external provider and how they are aligned to contribute to meaningful changes in the school.	Optional Grant Section 4.1, B1 Guidance pp. 61-62 Addendum pp. 2-3
External Provider (Accountability)	The LEA does not describe how it will hold each external provider accountable to high performance standards.	The LEA describes how it will hold each external provider accountable to high performance standards.	The LEA specifically describes how it will hold each external provider accountable to high performance standards by establishing performance measures and targets for those measures, consequences of not meeting those targets and requirements for periodic reporting to the LEA on progress by the external provider in achieving the outcomes for which it was hired.	Optional Grant Section 4.1, B1 Guidance pp. 61-62 Addendum pp. 2-3
LEA Policies and Practices (Review)	The LEA does not describe any review of LEA policies and practices.	The LEA describes how a review of LEA policies and practices was conducted.	The LEA describes how an in-depth analysis of LEA policies and practices was conducted.	Required Grant Section 4.1, B2 Guidance p. 56

School: _____

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	AVERAGE (2)	STRONG (3)	
LEA Policies and Practices (Changes)	The LEA does not describe how LEA policies and practices will be altered.	The LEA describes how LEA policies and practices will be altered.	The LEA describes specific examples of how LEA policies and practices will be altered to ensure full and effective intervention implementation.	Required Grant Section 4.1, B2 Guidance p. 56
Sustain the Reforms After the Funding Period Ends	The LEA does not describe a plan or the LEA describes a plan for sustainability that is unrealistic.	The LEA describes a plan for sustainability that includes basic information about sustainability and future support by the LEA.	The LEA describes a plan for sustainability that is clear, realistic, and provides detailed information about sustainability and future support by the LEA.	Required Grant Section 4.1, B3 Guidance p. 56
Stakeholder Consultation	Collaborative decisions are not evident.	The LEA's description of the collaborative decision making process includes input from stakeholders.	The LEA's description of the collaborative decision making process is clear and specific; there is evidence of broad stakeholder representation and participation in decision making.	Required Grant Section 4.1, C1 Guidance pp. 56-57
LEA Monitoring (Lagging Indicators)	The LEA does not describe a plan for how it will monitor each school's progress toward meeting lagging indicator targets in ELA and Math.	The LEA established lagging indicator targets for each school in ELA and Math and describes a plan for how it will monitor each school's progress toward meeting those targets.	The LEA established aggressive but realistic lagging indicator targets for each school in ELA and Math and clearly describes a plan for how it will monitor each school's progress toward meeting those targets including review of leading indicators of ELA and Math performance throughout the year.	Required Grant Section 4.1, C2 Guidance p. 64
LEA Monitoring (Leading Indicators)	The LEA does not describe a plan for how it will monitor each school's progress toward meeting leading indicator targets for the SIG-required indicators.	The LEA established leading indicator targets for each school for the SIG-required indicators and describes a plan for how it will monitor each school's progress toward meeting those targets.	The LEA established aggressive but realistic leading indicator targets for each school for the SIG-required indicators and clearly describes a plan for how it will monitor each school's progress toward meeting those targets including review of leading data indicators throughout the year.	Required Grant Section 4.1, C2 Guidance p. 64

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Check Box)	The LEA <u>did not</u> check "yes or no" for use of SIG funds for pre-implementation activities.	The LEA checked "yes or no" for use of SIG funds for pre-implementation activities.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D1 Guidance pp. 79-81
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Related to Model)	The LEA <u>does not</u> clearly describe how pre-implementation activities are directly related to the selected model.	The LEA clearly describes how pre-implementation activities are directly related to the selected model.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D2 Guidance pp. 79-81
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Reasonable and Necessary)	The LEA <u>does not</u> clearly describe how pre-implementation activities are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model.	The LEA clearly describes how pre-implementation activities are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D2 Guidance pp. 79-81
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Related to Needs)	The LEA <u>does not</u> clearly describe how pre-implementation activities are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA's needs assessment.	The LEA clearly describes how pre-implementation activities are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA's needs assessment.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D2 Guidance pp. 79-81
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Meaningful Change)	The LEA <u>does not</u> clearly describe how pre-implementation activities will lead to meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years.	The LEA clearly describes how pre-implementation activities will lead to meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D2 Guidance pp. 79-81

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Research-based)	The LEA <u>does not</u> clearly describe how pre-implementation activities are research-based.	The LEA clearly describes how pre-implementation activities are research-based.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D2 Guidance pp. 79-81
Pre-Implementation Activities using SIG Funds (Significant Reform)	The LEA <u>does not</u> clearly describe how pre-implementation activities represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.	The LEA clearly describes how pre-implementation activities represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.		Optional Grant Section 4.1, D2 Guidance pp. 79-81
Needs Assessment Process (Identification of Needs)	The LEA describes the process that was used to analyze needs in areas such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure using data from one source or <u>does not</u> describe a process.	The LEA describes the process that was used to analyze needs in areas such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure using data from two sources.	The LEA describes the process that was used to analyze needs in areas such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure using data from three or more sources.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A1 Application p. 18
Needs Assessment Process (Selected Interventions)	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe the process that was used to select interventions to address identified needs or <u>does not</u> describe how the interventions will address those needs.	The LEA describes the process that was used to select interventions to address identified needs and describes how the interventions will address those needs.	The LEA describes the process that was used to select interventions to address identified needs and describes the research basis for how the interventions will address those needs.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A1 Application p. 18

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Rationale for Model Selection	The LEA <u>does not</u> provide a rationale for the model selection.	The LEA provides a rationale for the model selection.	The LEA provides a clear rationale for the model selection and indicates how the model directly addresses the needs of the school.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2
Timeline for Model Design and Implementation	The LEA <u>does not</u> provide a timeline for implementation of the model.	The LEA provides a timeline for implementation of the model.	The LEA provides a timeline with specific steps for implementation of the model.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance p. 62
All SIG Model Components	Please see rubric items for specific requirements for each SIG model below.			Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2
Use of 1003(a) funds	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe how 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds will be used to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.	The LEA describes how 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds will be used to support the implementation of the selected SIG model.	The LEA describes how 1003(a) and State School Improvement funds will be used to support the implementation of the selected SIG model and will be aligned to the needs assessment.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A3 Guidance p. 62

Section 5.0 Budget
The budget must clearly indicate how these funds will be appropriately used to support the project. The budget should demonstrate clear connections to the projects activities and how the district will use the funds over the grant period to fully implement the intervention model.

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Meaningful Change	The use of funds, taken as a whole, does not support researched-based strategies that represent significant reform beyond the basic educational program, and represent meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years.	The use of funds, taken as a whole, supports researched-based strategies that represent significant reform beyond the basic educational program, and represent meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79
Alignment of Funds to Selected Model	Not all uses of 1003(g) support the strategies necessary to implement the selected model.	All uses of 1003(g) support the strategies necessary to implement the selected model.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79
Alignment of Funds to Needs Assessment	Not all uses of 1003(g) funds are aligned to the needs assessment.	All uses of 1003(g) funds are aligned to the needs assessment.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79
Necessary and Reasonable	Not all budgeted items are necessary and reasonable.	All budgeted items are necessary and reasonable.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79
Timely Expenditures	Not all budgeted items can be fully expended during the grant period.	All budgeted items can be fully expended during the grant period.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79
Size and Scope	Budgeted items are not of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention.	Budgeted items are of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Application p. 19

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Allowable expenditures	<u>Not all</u> budgeted items are allowable under OMB A-87 cost principles and state law and regulation.	All budgeted items are allowable under OMB A-87 cost principles and state law and regulation.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79
Supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA	<u>Not all</u> budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a) (2) (B) and §1120A (b).	All budgeted items comply with supplement, not supplant, provisions of ESEA, including Title I, Part A, §1114(a) (2) (B) and §1120A (b).		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 76-77, 79

Sections 6 & 7 – Abstract and Certifications of Compliance and Assurances

LEA has completed the abstract and certifications sections

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Abstract	The Abstract does not include all required elements.	The Abstract includes all required elements.		Required Grant Section 6.0
CSO Certification	The Chief School Officer has not certified compliance OR has not signed the application.	The Chief School Officer has certified compliance and has signed the application.		Required Grant Section 7.0
CFO Certification	The Chief Finance Officer has not certified compliance OR has not signed the application.	The Chief Finance Officer has certified compliance and has signed the application.		Required Grant Section 7.0

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

EMO/CMO Restart Model
Evidence that all required model components are included in the Grant Section

EMO/CMO Restart CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Research	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe how available EMO/CMOs have been thoroughly researched through a rigorous review process to ensure that the EMO/CMO will make meaningful changes in the school.	The LEA describes how available EMO/CMOs have been thoroughly researched through a rigorous review process to ensure that the EMO/CMO will make meaningful changes in the school.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 31-34
Track Record	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe the process and criteria used to identify whether the EMO/CMO has a track record of success.	The LEA describes the process and criteria used to identify whether the EMO/CMO has a track record of success.	The LEA describes the process and criteria used to identify whether the EMO/CMO has a track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 31-34
Accountability	The LEA <u>does not</u> indicate that the LEA will hold the EMO/CMO accountable to high performance standards.	The LEA indicates that it will hold the EMO/CMO accountable to high performance standards.	The LEA describes the specific process it will use to hold the EMO/CMO accountable to high performance standards by establishing performance measures and targets for those measures, consequences of not meeting those targets and requirements for periodic reporting to the LEA on progress by the external provider in achieving the outcomes for which it was hired.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 31-34

EMO/CMO Restart CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Capacity	The capacity of the EMO/CMO to implement the proposed strategies in the identified school has <u>not</u> been addressed, or has been minimally addressed.	The capacity of the EMO/CMO to implement the proposed strategies in the identified school has been investigated.	The capacity of the EMO/CMO to implement the proposed strategies in the identified school has been clearly investigated and demonstrated.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 31-34
Grades to be Served	The LEA <u>does not</u> indicate the grades to be served by the EMO/CMO if it will not serve all grades in the school or <u>does not</u> assure it will only use 1003(g) SIG funds in the served grade(s).	The LEA indicates the grades to be served by the EMO/CMO if it will not serve all grades in the school and assures it will only use 1003(g) SIG funds in the served grade(s).		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 31-34 Addendum p. 1
Enroll All Former Students	The LEA <u>does not</u> indicate that it will ensure that all former students who attended the school will be allowed to enroll if they wish to attend based on the grades to be served by the restarted school.	The LEA indicates that it will ensure that all former students who attended the school will be allowed to enroll if they wish to attend based on the grades to be served by the restarted school.	The LEA clearly describes how it will ensure that all former students who attended the school will be allowed to enroll if they wish to attend based on the grades to be served by the restarted school.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 31-34

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

School Closure Model

Evidence that all required model components are included in the Grant Section

School Closure CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Student Reassignment	The LEA <u>does not</u> provide sufficient evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA or LEA of residence in case of charter schools.	The LEA provides sufficient evidence that students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA or LEA of residence in case of charter schools.	The LEA provides a clear and detailed plan for ensuring students will be enrolled in higher performing schools in the LEA or LEA of residence in case of charter schools.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 34-36
Reasonable Proximity	The LEA <u>does not</u> provide sufficient evidence that the higher performing school to which students who previously attended a closed school are sent will be located "within reasonable proximity" to the closed school.	The LEA provides sufficient evidence that the higher performing school to which students who previously attended a closed school are sent will be located "within reasonable proximity" to the closed school.	The LEA provides a clear and detailed plan for ensuring that the higher performing school to which students who previously attended a closed school are sent will be located "within reasonable proximity" to the closed school.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 34-36
Family and Community Engagement	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe how it engaged in an open dialogue with families and the school community early in the closure process.	The LEA describes how it engaged 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.	The LEA describes in detail with timelines how it engaged 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.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 34-36

School Closure CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Budget	The LEA's budgeted items are for multiple years or are allocated to unallowable costs	The LEA's budgeted items are only allocated for Year One of the grant period and are only allocated for costs related to school closure.		Required Grant Section 5.0 Guidance pp. 34-36

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Transformation Model
Evidence that all required model components are included in the Grant Section

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Plan to Replace the Principal	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a process to replace the principal.	The LEA describes a process to replace the principal.	The LEA describes a process to replace the principal including the rigorous criteria used for new principal selection to ensure that he/she has the experience and skills to successfully implement the selected model.	Required, if hiring a new principal Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42
Justification for Retaining a Recently Hired Principal	The LEA <u>does not</u> provide sufficient justification to retain the recently hired principal.	The LEA describes how the school began implementation of the selected model in whole or in part with the last two years (no earlier than 2011-12), that the principal of the school was replaced as part of this broader reform effort, and that the process used to hire the new principal included rigorous criteria to ensure that he/she has the experience and skills to successfully implement the selected model.		Required, if retaining current principal Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 48-49
Operational Flexibility • **Staffing** • **Calendars/time** • **Budgeting** • **Other**	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe strategies to grant additional operational flexibility(s) to the school.	The LEA describes strategies to grant additional operational flexibility(s) to the school.	The LEA describes strategies to grant significant additional operational flexibility(s) to the school and clearly demonstrates supporting changes in LEA policy and/or practices.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Evaluation Systems	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe how it is implementing DPAS II in the school.	The LEA describes how it is implementing DPAS II in the school.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42 Addendum pp. 1-2
Staff Effectiveness	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe how it will identify or reward staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates OR <u>does not</u> indicate how staff will be removed if after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so.	The LEA describes its process to identify reward staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and to remove those who, after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so.	The LEA describes its process to identify reward staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and to remove those who, after receiving ample support and opportunity to improve, have not done so. The process represents a coherent approach to staffing flexibility and support.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42
High Quality Professional Development	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe how it will provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.	The LEA describes how it will provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.	The LEA describes how it will 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.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Strategies to Recruit, Place, and Retain Staff	The LEA does not describe strategies such 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.	The LEA describes strategies such 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.	The LEA describes strategies such 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 into an overall human capital strategy, including financial incentives and promotions/growth opportunities.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42
Governance (Technical Assistance and Support)	The LEA does not describe new strategies for LEA staff or designated external lead partner organization(s) to provide ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support.	The LEA describes new strategies for LEA staff or designated external lead partner organization(s) to provide ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42
Instructional Program	The LEA does not describe an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, or integrated with DCAS data.	The LEA describes a research-based instructional program that is vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, and integrated with the state assessment and other data sources.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42
Data Driven Instructional Practice	The LEA does not describe a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction.	The LEA describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction.	The LEA describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction and systematically evolves as determined by changing student data.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Increased Learning Time (Areas)	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a plan to increase learning time in all three areas.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time for (1) instruction in core academic subjects, (2) additional time for instruction in other subjects and for provision of enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, and (3) additional time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time for (1) instruction in core academic subjects, (2) additional time for instruction in other subjects and for provision of enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, and (3) additional time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development. The plan prioritizes core instruction and teacher collaboration planning and professional development.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 23-31, 36-42
Increased Learning Time (Hours)	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a plan or describes a plan to increase learning time by <u>less than 150 hours per year</u> by use of a longer school day, week or year.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time by 150 hours or more per year by use of a longer school day, week or year.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time by 300 hours or more per year by use of a longer school day, week or year. The plan also includes increases in learning time during the school day.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 23-31, 36-42
Social-emotional Services and Supports	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a plan to provide social-emotional services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment.	The LEA describes a plan to provide social-emotional services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment.	The LEA describes a plan to provide social-emotional services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment and are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42

Transformation CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Parent and Community Services and Supports	The LEA <u>does not</u> describes a plan to integrate parent and community services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment	The LEA describes a plan to integrate parent and community services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment.	The LEA describes a plan to integrate parent and community services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment and are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 36-42

MODEL-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Turnaround Model
Evidence that all required model components are included in the Grant Section

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Plan to Replace the Principal	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a process to replace the principal.	The LEA describes a process to replace the principal.	The LEA describes a process to replace the principal including the rigorous criteria used for new principal selection to ensure that he/she has the experience and skills to successfully implement the selected model.	Required, if hiring a new principal Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Justification for Retaining a Recently Hired Principal	The LEA <u>does not</u> provide sufficient justification to retain the recently hired principal.	The LEA describes how the school began implementation of the selected model in whole or in part with the last two years (no earlier than 2011-12), that the principal of the school was replaced as part of this broader reform effort, and that the process used to hire the new principal included rigorous criteria to ensure that he/she has the experience and skills to successfully implement the selected model.		Required, if retaining current principal Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 48-49
Operational Flexibility • **Staffing** • **Calendars/time** • **Budgeting** • **Other**	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe strategies to grant additional operational flexibility(s) to the principal.	The LEA describes strategies to grant additional operational flexibility(s) to the principal.	The LEA describes strategies to grant significant additional operational flexibility(s) to the principal and clearly demonstrates supporting changes in LEA policy and/or practices.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Evaluation Systems	The LEA does not describe how it is implementing DPAS II in the school.	The LEA describes how it is implementing DPAS II in the school.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Staff Effectiveness	The LEA does not describe the process and criteria to measure staff effectiveness to screen existing staff and select new staff.	The LEA describes the process and criteria to measure staff effectiveness to screen existing staff and select new staff.	The LEA clearly and specifically describes the process and criteria to measure staff effectiveness to screen existing staff and select new staff.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Rehiring	The LEA does not ensure that no more than 50% of staff will be rehired.	The LEA describes how the LEA will ensure that no more than 50% of staff will be rehired.	The LEA clearly and specifically describes how the LEA will ensure that no more than 50% of staff will be rehired and the criteria for decision making.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31, 49
Staff Incentives and Rewards	The LEA does not describe staff incentives and rewards.	The LEA includes at least one strategy to provide incentives or rewards to effective staff.	The LEA includes multiple, coordinated strategies to provide incentives and rewards to effective staff.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Strategies to Recruit, Place, and Retain Staff	The LEA does not describe strategies such 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.	The LEA describes strategies such 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.	The LEA describes strategies such 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 into an overall human capital strategy, including financial incentives and promotions/growth opportunities.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
High Quality Professional Development	The LEA does not describe how it will provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.	The LEA describes how it will provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.	The LEA describes how it will 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.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Governance (Technical Assistance and Support)	The LEA does not describe new strategies for LEA staff or designated external lead partner organization(s) to provide ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support.	The LEA describes new strategies for LEA staff or designated external lead partner organization(s) to provide ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Instructional Program	The LEA does not describe an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, or integrated with DCAS data.	The LEA describes a research-based instructional program that is vertically aligned, aligned to state standards, and integrated with the state assessment and other data sources.		Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31
Data Driven Instructional Practice	The LEA does not describe a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction.	The LEA describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction.	The LEA describes a system that continuously uses student data to inform and differentiate instruction and systematically evolves as determined by changing student data.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Increased Learning Time (Areas)	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a plan to increase learning time in all three areas.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time for (1) instruction in core academic subjects, (2) additional time for instruction in other subjects and for provision of enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, and (3) additional time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time for (1) instruction in core academic subjects, (2) additional time for instruction in other subjects and for provision of enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, and (3) additional time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development. The plan prioritizes core instruction and teacher collaboration planning and professional development.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 23-31
Increased Learning Time (Hours)	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a plan or describes a plan to increase learning time by <u>less than 150 hours per year</u> by use of a longer school day, week or year.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time by 150 hours or more per year by use of a longer school day, week or year.	The LEA describes a plan to increase learning time by 300 hours or more per year by use of a longer school day, week or year. The plan also includes increases in learning time during the school day.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 23-31
Social-emotional Services and Supports	The LEA <u>does not</u> describe a plan to provide social-emotional services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment.	The LEA describes a plan to provide social-emotional services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment.	The LEA describes a plan to provide social-emotional services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment and are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31

Turnaround CRITERIA	STANDARDS			COMMENTS
	WEAK (1)	**AVERAGE (2)**	**STRONG (3)**	
Parent and Community Services and Supports	The LEA <u>does not</u> describes a plan to integrate parent and community services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment	The LEA describes a plan to integrate parent and community services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment.	The LEA describes a plan to integrate parent and community services and supports that address all relevant needs identified in the needs assessment and are integrated into a comprehensive learning support system.	Required Grant Section 4.2-4.6, A2 Guidance pp. 27-31

SIG-Required Leading Indicators

School Name --------------------------------->

SIG- Required

Number of minutes within the school year		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Dropout Rate		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Student Attendance Rate		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Teacher Attendance Rate		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Number of Discipline Incidents		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Number of Truants		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Target					
	Actual					

Distribution of teachers by performance level DPAS-II		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Highly Effective -	**Target**					
	Actual					
Effective -	**Target**					
	Actual					
Needs Improvement -	**Target**					

Actual

Ineffective - Target
Actual

All Students		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

American Indian		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

Asian		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

African American		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

Hawaiian		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

Hispanic		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

White		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

Multi-Race		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

ELL		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					
	Actual					

Special Ed		**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
	Target					

Actual

Low SES   2012-13   2013-14   2014-15   2015-16   2016-17
Target
Actual

Student participation rate on State assessment in Math

All Students		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

American Indian		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

Asian		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

African American		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

Hawaiian		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

Hispanic		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

White		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

Multi-Race		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

ELL		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				
	Actual				

Special Ed		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
	Target				

Actual

Low SES | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16

Target
Actual

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17

2016-17