

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Pennsylvania



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



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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

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

FY 2010 Application Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Pennsylvania Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Renee Palakovic Position and Office: Title I Director, Chief of the Division of Federal Programs Contact's Mailing Address: 333 Market Street 7 th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 Telephone: 717-783-9161 Fax: 717-787-8634 Email address: rpalakovic@state.pa.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Thomas E. Gluck	Telephone: 717-783-9780
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.

SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)

2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.

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

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

1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.

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

Pennsylvania has developed a definition for Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools.

1. Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that:

- a. Is among the lowest achieving 5% of schools in that group in terms of average proficiency¹ on the 2010 state assessment (PSSA); and
 - b. Has not made progress on the state assessment (PSSA) by failing to increase its average proficiency by at least 10 percentage points since 2007; OR
 - c. Is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, not identified through either of the above methods (a or b), with a graduation rate of less than 60% for at least two of the last three years (2007,2008,2009).²
2. Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive Title I funds that:
- a. Is among the lowest achieving 5% of schools in that group in terms of average proficiency on the 2010 state assessment (PSSA); and
 - b. Has not made progress on the state assessment (PSSA) by failing to increase its average proficiency by at least 10 percentage points since 2007; OR
 - c. Is a secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive Title I funds, not identified through either of the above methods (a or b), with a graduation rate of less than 60% for at least two of the last three years (2007,2008,2009).³

When identifying PLA schools in Pennsylvania, no school-types or groups of schools were excluded from the calculation.

The table below provides a breakdown of the schools in Pennsylvania meeting the PLA criteria described:

¹ “Average Proficiency” is determine by adding the number of students who scored proficient or advanced in the all students mathematics group with the number of students who scored proficient or advanced in the all students reading group. This total is then divided by the sum of the total number of students who took the math assessment with the total number of students who took the reading assessment.

² These criteria, 1(a), (b) and (c), are the criteria applied for SIG in order to identify Tier I schools.

³ These criteria, 2(a), (b) and (c), are the criteria applied for SIG in order to identify Tier II schools.

Criterion/Tier	Number of Schools in Group	Lowest 5% Achievement	Grad Rate Below 60%	Total Number PLA Schools
1	330	16	4	20
2	374	18	0	18

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

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

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ⁴

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

EXAMPLE:

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

⁴ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

EXAMPLE:

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

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

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

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Part 1 Response:

The PDE will review all SIG applications to ensure that all LEAs and schools are prepared to implement reforms that are proven to be effective, appropriate to the needs identified and sustainable. The responses to questions below provide a more in-depth look at the process to be implemented.

Each LEA will be required to provide a detailed description of the needs assessment process completed and the analysis done to select the intervention to be used in the school. (Schools that have utilized the state school improvement planning framework—Getting Results—and have had the plan approved by PDE will not be required to submit additional information. PDE will require the LEA to list the needs of each school identified through the Getting Results process.)

PDE believes that a thorough needs assessment must include the following:

- Data
 - i. Academic data broken down by subject, grade level, subgroup, classroom, standard and anchor.
 - ii. Student data on behavior, graduation rate, attendance, participation in extended learning and remediation.
 - iii. Professional development data regarding topics covered, number of sessions, length of sessions and participation.
 - iv. Parent data regarding the level of involvement, opportunities for involvement and parent feedback.
 - v. Leadership data regarding teacher needs, classroom observations and students needs.
 - vi. Other data regarding reforms already implemented and either abandoned or maintained, leadership and teacher changes made, building configuration changes made and any other relevant data.
- Analysis
 - i. Data must be reviewed by a group of staff to include representatives of all affected parties (leadership, teachers, parents).
 - ii. Data connections must be made in order to determine where serious academic problems exist and identify anomalies that may or may not indicate serious issues.
 - iii. **All** available data must be analyzed and considered important as part of this process.
- Prioritization of Needs
 - i. Leadership must review results of data analysis thoroughly. If necessary, outside experts should be consulted to assist in reviewing data analysis.
 - ii. Prioritize the needs identified and identify the 1-3 areas to be addressed in the next school year.

iii. Develop a plan for year 2 and beyond to ensure that all identified needs can be addressed if they continue to be identified as ongoing needs.

▪ Identification of Solutions

- i. Based on data, analysis and prioritization of needs, research reforms, interventions and supports that address the area of need.
- ii. Extensively review data to support the reforms, interventions and supports to identify those that are proven to be effective in addressing the area of need.
- iii. Based on the unique needs of the LEA and school identify the reforms, interventions and supports to be implemented.

▪ Ongoing Evaluation

- i. Determine multiple measures that will be used throughout the implementation process to measure effectiveness.
- ii. Establish benchmark dates, actions to be taken, persons responsible and use of results.
- iii. Establish an on-going implementation review process to review benchmark data and alter plans as necessary.

All components are important in the selection of an intervention model and/or the implementation of reforms. Applications will be reviewed and rated using the attached rubric (Appendix D). Points will be awarded using a 3-point scale. Areas awarded 3 points will indicate no further information is necessary and the LEA has provided sufficient detail. Areas awarded 2 points have provided general information in most areas, but lack critical details necessary for making program determinations. These areas may require the LEA to submit additional information before awards will be made. Areas awarded 1 point are below expectations and must be addressed in further detail by the LEA before any funding will be awarded.

An LEA will be required to demonstrate within their SIG application the capacity to effectively implement reforms and utilize funds awarded to meet the needs identified. In order to demonstrate this, the LEA's application must:

▪ Demonstrate Human Capacity

- i. Expertise of staff is adequate to implement reforms
- ii. Leadership necessary to implement reforms
- iii. Acquisition of expertise in areas where capacity is limited
- iv. Human capital plan to attract and retain effective teachers, limit teacher vacancies, staff hard-to-staff subjects and address the equitable distribution of highly-effective teachers.

▪ Demonstrate Organizational Capacity

- i. Processes in place to allow for open communication and consistent collaboration of staff
- ii. Ability to alter processes and schedules to allow for needed

- communication and reforms
- iii. Shared vision and goals among all involved
- iv. Outside communications with parents, community organizations

- Demonstrate Structural Capacity
 - i. Necessary curriculum, assessments, professional development, hiring policies, etc. in place to effectively implement reforms
 - ii. Proper scaffolding is in place to ensure missing or lacking structural capacity is addressed
- Demonstrate Material Capacity
 - i. Funding necessary (in addition to SIG funding) to implement effective reforms
 - ii. Alignment of state, local and federal resources available to school to support reforms

Appendix C (SIG Application) and Appendix D (Rubric) provides further detail on PDE's expectations for LEAs and the methods to be used to rate and evaluate the applications for capacity.

An LEA will be required to submit separate budgets for each school to be funded with SIG funds. Budgets will be reviewed using the following criteria:

- Intervention selected by each school
 - Appropriate funds for each required action;
 - School closure funding for 1 year only
- Areas of need identified and articulated within the SIG application and/or Getting Results Improvement plan;
- Other optional solutions to be implemented with SIG funds;
- Supports to be provided at the LEA-level;
- Timeframe in which solutions are to be implemented;
- Sustainability beyond life of grant

The attached SIG application (Appendix C) provides further detail on PDE's budget expectations for LEAs.

Part 2 Response:

Appendix C (SIG Application) provides complete details on how PDE will collect information on the actions taken and actions to be taken in preparation for implementing SIG interventions. Applications will be reviewed and rated using the attached rubric (Appendix D). Points will be awarded using a 3-point scale. Areas awarded 3 points will indicate no further information is necessary and the LEA has provided sufficient detail. Areas awarded 2 points have provided general information in most areas, but lack critical details necessary for making program determinations. These areas may require the LEA to submit additional information before awards will be made. Areas awarded 1 point are below expectations and must be addressed in further detail by the LEA before any

funding will be awarded.

An LEA's SIG application will identify the intervention(s) selected. Applicants will be required to provide an explanation of the steps taken to ensure that all of the requirements are being addressed and are part of the overall school reform. Each required action will be reviewed using the rubric (Appendix D) and a determination made regarding level of commitment and need for more information.

PDE will award priority points for schools choosing to implement Turnaround and Transformation model depending on the level of implementation of the following key strategies (High Level of Implementation/Planning for Implementation/Not Addressed):

- Implementation of a rigorous research-based curriculum aligned with standards, assessments, curriculum framework, instruction, materials and interventions;
- Implementation of the fair assessments that are aligned with standards;
- Implementation of an early warning system for grades 6 and above that uses real-time student data;
- Implementation and effective use of a student information system;
- Collaboration (at least twice weekly) time for teachers to review real-time student data to drive instruction;
- Implementation of new teacher induction that includes side-by-side mentoring by highly-effective teachers;
- Implementation of a multi-measure evaluation system for teachers and principals that provides at least annual evaluation and timely and constructive feedback;
- Implementation of a comprehensive, coherent approach to professional development that is based on student and teacher needs and includes professional development for IB/AP or dual enrollment;
- Design and implementation of quality early childhood programs;
- Expansion, implementation or maintenance of Reading Recovery or a comparable elementary reading intervention model for all students below grade level in grades 1-3. (Elementary schools only)

The attached rubric (Appendix D) will be used to ensure that all of the final requirements for each of the four reform models are included within the LEA application AND designed and implemented in a manner that will be effective.

Tier III schools choosing NOT to implement one of the four models will be reviewed to ensure that:

- Only eligible schools apply for funding;
- Funds will be used for research-based, effective practices that align with the needs of the school;
- Sufficient capacity exists within the LEA and school to support the Tier III strategies and interventions;
- Appropriate timelines, goals and benchmarks are established for the

implementation of the strategies and interventions;

- Necessary and appropriate professional development plans are developed and implemented to support the strategies and interventions;
- Necessary and appropriate evaluation and benchmarking is planned and implemented to ensure students meet goals established; and
- Funds requested are appropriate and budgeted to support the strategies and interventions to be implemented.

If external providers are being used by an LEA, the SIG application requires and explanation of the selection process, the evidence to indicate the provider can meet the needs of the school and the evaluation process to be used with each external provider.

The methods and processes used by the LEA to recruit, screen and select external providers are evaluated using the rubric (Appendix D). The rubric addresses this issue in two separate areas within the rubric: Quality of Reform Plan and Capacity to Serve Tier I and Tier II Schools. PDE will assess this particular item by looking at schools implementing the Restart Model and determining if adequate recruiting, screening and selection of CMO/EMOs took place (Quality of Reform Plan) AND by reviewing each school's processes for obtaining outside expertise in implementing all other models (Capacity to Serve Tier I and Tier II Schools).

LEAs will be required to commit to align all school-level resources with the intervention selected and LEA-level resources, as needed, to the support of the selected intervention. This information is required within the Material Capacity section of the SIG Applications (Appendix C). The rubric (Appendix D) provides the criteria to be used by the readers to determine the appropriateness of the information provides by the LEA.

This item will be addressed mainly within the capacity portion of the SIG application. LEAs must demonstrate their organizational and structural capacity to fully and effectively implement the interventions selected. This section of the LEA application requires each school to specifically discuss the policies and procedures that will be created, modified or eliminated in order to effectively implement the model. Within other sections of the application, the LEA will provide additional information regarding the actions to be taken, processes and practices to be changed and the timelines for completing.

The attached rubric (Appendix D) will be used to evaluate and assess the commitment of the LEA and school to modify practices and policies as necessary to effectively implement the model selected.

LEAs must provide a plan for sustaining interventions beyond the 3-year grant period for SIG funds. Documentation includes other funding sources to be used to maintain salaries & benefits of additional staff; cost savings to occur in other areas once interventions take hold; costs that will not continue beyond the 3-year period; plans to build in-house capacity and therefore sustain interventions with existing staff.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. The budget tables within the LEA Application for FY10 SIG funds require very specific differentiation among expenditures for pre-implementation, Year 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix C). Budgeted amounts for each of the required reform activities must be broken down into one of eleven expenditure categories and each must be assigned to one of four time periods—Pre-Implementation, Year 1, Year 2 or Year 3. The setup of the LEA Application will provide readers/reviewers with specific information on all activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period as well as each year of the reform. Each budget item also requires a budget narrative.
2. The SIG Rubric FY10 (Appendix D) awards either 3 points or 1 point for information provided by the LEA on pre-implementation costs. The minimum required score for this section of the rubric is a “3” (See Appendix D for minimum on this item as well as all other items.). An LEA must demonstrate that costs for pre-implementation are completely aligned with the reform plan and the activities and goals described within the LEA application. As well, the amount of money budgeted for these pre-implementation activities must be an amount that is adequate for the activities, but not an amount that would

negatively impact the reform plan to be carried out in Years 1-3. Readers/reviewers will be considering whether pre-implementation activities must take place prior to the 11-12 school year and awarding less than a “3” if activities could be embedded into Years 1-3. Finally, all pre-implementation activities must be allowable as described within the FY10 SIG guidance.

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

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

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

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

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

Insert response to Section C Capacity here:

Each LEA's SIG application will be reviewed individually and the PDE will consider each LEA's circumstances individually. The basis for our review will be the following:

- Intervention model selected
- Needs of the school(s)
- Availability of outside experts
- Availability of replacement staff
- Buy in of staff
- Current fiscal situation of LEA and school
- Time needed to implement intervention model
- Number of buildings in Tier I and II
- AYP status of all buildings within the LEA
- Union, parent, community and board support

The attached rubric (Appendix D) provides specific evaluative information that will be used to determine if an LEA has the capacity to serve more schools.

If, after review of information submitted, PDE believes an LEA has sufficient capacity to serve more Tier I or II schools than applied for, direct contact will be made with the LEA to discuss concerns. If the LEA cannot satisfy the issues surrounding capacity and it is clear that more Tier I and II schools can and should be served, the application will receive lower priority when funding decisions are made. (i.e. those LEAs willing to serve all Tier I and II schools within their capacity will receive funds before these LEAs.)

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

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

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

- January 2011: Release SIG applications to LEAs with one more Tier I and/or Tier II schools

The online egrant application is currently under development and will be released upon approval of the SEA application. A copy of this SEA application and all of its attachments will be posted on the PDE website within 10 working days of the submission of the application. During the month of December, PDE will recruit and train at least 10 educators that have experience in school reform, effective leadership, coaching, curriculum and administration to participate in the peer review of competitive applications.

- January 2011: Regional, technical assistance workshops

Workshops will be held regionally and any eligible LEA considering applying for SIG funds will be required to attend at least one workshop. The purpose of the workshops will be to thoroughly review the LEA application, rubric and grant requirements.

- February 2011: Completed SIG applications due in the Division of Federal Programs
- February/March 2011: SIG Applications reviewed, scored and ranked by PDE

The peer review process to be implemented will use the attached rubric (Appendix D). Peer reviewers will be brought together for a minimum of 3 days, trained and provided the necessary materials and time to review all Tier I and II competitive applications.

PDE's normal competitive grant reading process requires that grants be read by 4-5 different reviewers and then the results z-scores for reliability. Based on the number of grants received, the number of reviewers and the times read will be adjusted as necessary.

Based on scores and comments, if additional information is required from LEAs in order to make a final determination, it will be collected within a 10-day period and then re-reviewed before a final determination is made.

- April 2011: Tier I and Tier II awards announced

Awardees will be announced via PennLink. Awardees will be brought together and provided in-depth instruction and information regarding the steps to be taken—additional application requirements, reporting requirements, contact names/address, etc. Pre-planning activities can begin as necessary to implement SIG reforms in the 2011-12 school year.

- May 2011: LEAs with one or more Tier III schools invited to apply for SIG funds, if funds remain

If funds remain after initial awards are determined, a second round of competition will open so that Tier III schools can be considered. LEAs with Tier III schools will be contacted directly and participate in a webinar to outline requirements and deadlines.

- June 2011: Tier III SIG applications due in the Division of Federal Programs
- July 2011: Tier III awards announced

Awardees will be announced via PennLink. Awardees will be brought together and provided in-depth instruction and information regarding the steps to be taken—additional application requirements, reporting requirements, contact names/address, etc.

- August/September 2011: Tier I and Tier II interventions begin

PDE will begin to implement the process to review school benchmark data, visit schools, monitor progress and provide technical assistance as necessary.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

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

2. PDE will require each LEA to develop, as outlined within the attached SIG application, school-level performance measures and annual goals for each school to

receive SIG funds. Performance measures must include plan milestones, interim performance measures and annual performance goals.

PDE will develop an annual report to be submitted prior to the awarding of 2nd and 3rd year funds that will require each participating school to document its progress toward established annual goals. Schools failing to meet one or more annual goals will be required to provide information to justify why goals were not met, where breakdowns occurred, what corrections were made and/or will be made and assurance that corrective actions will enable the school to meet the next year goals. Schools required to take corrective actions will receive increased monitoring during the following school year to ensure that progress continues and corrections are made. Schools failing to meet the next year's goals will not receive 3rd year funding, unless PDE determines that a school has made significant progress toward meeting goals. Determinations on continued funding when a school fails to meet goals will be made on a case-by-case basis based on data that demonstrates progress.

3. Tier III schools will be handled in the same manner as Tier I and Tier II schools.

4. LEAs and schools receiving SIG funds will be monitored by PDE in many ways. First, a system of monitoring will be developed to review school progress at least three times per year. Under this system, schools will be required to provide progress reports to PDE and for those assessed as "behind" for two consecutive reviews will see their SIG payments withheld. Areas to be reviewed on progress reports will be required actions taken or being planned; fidelity to implementation plan/SIG application; appropriate level of LEA support; outside supports in place; meeting established benchmarks as specified within SIG application; and appropriate implementation of timelines. Second, PDE's state system of support provides on-site assistance through distinguished educators, leadership training, school improvement planning, standards-aligned-systems training and data review and analysis training. All of the members of this support system currently work directly with PDE to ensure proper implementation of initiatives and progress toward improvement. This work will continue throughout the life of the SIG. Finally, staff in the Division of Federal Programs will be conducting on-site visits of schools that indicate problems or obstacles within progress reports. When the first progress report indicates that things are off-track or "behind", an on-site visit will be scheduled within 2 weeks to assist with getting back on track and ensuring the next progress report does not indicate the school is "behind" again. Additionally, once a school's funding is withheld due to two consecutive reviews being "behind", another on-site visit will be conducted within 2 weeks to work in assisting with reforms efforts so that funds can begin to flow again.

5. PDE will hold two separate competitions in order to carry out the initial prioritization as required by the final SIG requirements:

- Tier I and Tier II Schools in first competition
- Tier III Schools in second competition, if funding is available

In both competitions, the following priorities will be used to fund eligible schools:

1. Schools identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving in Tier I;
2. Schools identified as “Additional Tier I Schools”;
3. Schools identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving in Tier II;
4. Schools identified as “Additional Tier II Schools”;

6. All Tier III schools will be prioritized based on the quality of their applications around one or more of the following areas:

- Strengthening and expanding the standards aligned system and developing data systems capable of supporting the reform;
- Developing of a world-class human capital pipeline for teachers and leaders;
- Developing a multi-measure evaluation system;
- Creating and implementing a coherent and sustained approach to professional development;
- Implementing specific strategies to turn around the lowest performing schools:
 - Priority points will be awarded to elementary schools implementing Reading Recovery or a comparable reading intervention model for students below grade level in grades 1-3.

7/8. The PDE does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools and PDE does not intend to provide services directly to any schools, other than technical assistance provided through the State System of Support and/or Race to the Top.

E. ASSURANCES

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

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

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

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

Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:

PDE will set aside 5% of our award as permitted. PDE will use the state-level funds to continue the state-wide system of support for schools. This support system provides distinguished educators for the lowest achieving schools, leadership training for principals, distinguished school leaders for specific sub-group needs, direct assistance for school improvement planning and implementation and support for Reading and Math coaches.

The criteria for inclusion in these state-wide initiatives centers around identification for school improvement or corrective action, district improvement, persistently lowest achieving and SIG. Schools identified for any of these categories are given priority over those schools making AYP and meeting the academic needs of their students.

The Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership Initiative is a state-wide, standards-based leadership development and support system for school leaders. The cohort-based program is delivered through a regional collaboration of Intermediate Units and other partners.

There are two program components: “GROW” for principals and assistant principals with three years or less of experience; and “SUPPORT” for experienced school leaders.

Both the GROW and the SUPPORT program components of the PA Inspired Leadership Initiative have been designed to address the following three “core” leadership standards:

- The leader has the knowledge and skills to think and plan strategically, creating an organizational vision around personalized student success.
- The leader is grounded in standards-based systems theory and design and is able to transfer that knowledge to his/her job as the architect of standards-based reform in the school.
- The leader knows how to access and use appropriate data to inform decision-making at all levels of the system.

In addition, the SUPPORT Program of the Initiative also focuses on six “corollary” standards. The curriculum and delivery of these six standards are regionally determined:

- The leader creates a culture of teaching and learning with an emphasis on learning.
- The leader manages resources for effective results.

- The leader collaborates, communicates, engages, and empowers others inside and outside of the organization to pursue excellence in learning.
- The leader operates in a fair and equitable manner with personal and professional dignity.
- The leader advocates for children and public education in the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
- The leader supports professional growth of self and others through practice and inquiry.

Each PA Inspired Leadership Initiative Region has a full-time Site Coordinator who assists with program delivery and support (see list of Project Team members and Regional Site Coordinators). In addition, each region has an Advisory Committee to assist in the design, implementation and evaluation of the regional leadership initiative.

Distinguished Educators will work with struggling districts and schools as part of a team to build capacity and to provide assistance aimed at improving student achievement. DE's can be current or retired administrators, teachers, specialists and consultants with a wide range of experience and expertise, and are selected following a multiple-step application process.

Distinguished Educators serve as full-time members of a core team focused on instructional leadership and providing specific assistance based on targeted needs. The Distinguished Educator initiative requires a two-year commitment.

Distinguished School Leaders are provided to schools and districts struggling to close the achievement gaps between subgroups of students, but specifically the IEP subgroups. These leaders work directly with school leaders and teachers to understand the data and determine solutions. Assistance is available to schools as needed can be requested at any time.

Each of the 29 Intermediate Units (IUs) in the Commonwealth is a partner with the PDE to provide support and professional development to those school districts and schools they serve. This support can be in the form of data analysis, root cause analysis, school improvement planning, training and on-site assistance. Schools identified for improvement work with their IUs to review data, determine root cases, identify solutions and implement strategies to effect change. IU staff work directly with Distinguished Educators, Distinguished School Leaders and PDE staff to assist struggling schools.

Pennsylvania currently consolidates its federal administrative funds to support the administration of Title I, Title IIA, Title IID and Title III. A majority of monitoring activities will be conducted by current staff in the Division of Federal Programs and current monitors utilized by the Division of Federal Programs. No additional staff will be hired with SIG funds at the state level. A portion of the state-level SIG funds will be used to pay for the peer review of SIG applications and any monitoring or technical assistance that may be required over and above the current support provided by the PDE.

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

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

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

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

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including

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

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

Assurance

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

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

Assurances

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

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

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

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

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

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

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

Assurances

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

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

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

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

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

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

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

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

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

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

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

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

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

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

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

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

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

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

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

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

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

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

LEA Budgets

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

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

SEA Allocations to LEAs

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B

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

^{††} “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

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

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

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

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

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

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