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Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.
Purpose of the Program
School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State’s “Tier I” and “Tier II” schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State’s Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State’s other Tier I schools (“newly eligible” Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State’s secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State’s other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years (“newly eligible” Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools (“newly eligible” Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

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

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners
Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers’ unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.
This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name of Applicant:</th>
<th>Applicant’s Mailing Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Pennsylvania Department of Education** | **333 Market Street**  
|                          | **Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: <strong>Susan McCrone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position and Office:</strong> Title I Director, Chief of the Division of Federal Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contact’s Mailing Address:**  
| 333 Market Street, 7th Floor  
| Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 |
| **Telephone:** 717-783-9161 |
| **Fax:** 717-787-8634 |
| **Email address:** **smecrone@pa.gov** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr. Carolyn Dumaresq</strong></td>
<td><strong>717-783-9780</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

See Attached list of eligible schools. Pennsylvania is requesting the Priority school list waiver and plans to use this list as the SIG-eligible list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>LEA NCES ID #</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NCES ID#</th>
<th>PRIORITY (if applicable)</th>
<th>TIER I</th>
<th>TIER II</th>
<th>TIER III</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
<th>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**EXAMPLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>LEA NCES ID #</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NCES ID#</th>
<th>PRIORITY (if applicable)</th>
<th>TIER I</th>
<th>TIER II</th>
<th>TIER III</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
<th>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1 “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.
**Part 3** *(Terminated Awards):* All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Amount of Remaining Funds:**

---

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

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

1. The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

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

3. The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA’s application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

**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 a utilized the
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 (Attachment B). 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

Attachment A (SIG Application) and Attachment B (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 Comprehensive 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 (Attachment A) provides further detail on PDE’s budget expectations for LEAs.

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

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

Response:
Attachment A (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 (Attachment B). 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 (Attachment B) and a determination made regarding level of commitment and need for more information.

PDE will award schools on the 3 point scale 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 (Attachment B) 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.

If external providers are being used by an LEA, the SIG application requires an 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 (Attachment B). The rubric addresses this issue in two separate areas within the rubric: Quality of Reform Plan and Capacity to Serve. 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.

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 (Attachment A). The rubric (Attachment B) 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 (Attachment B) 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:

1. How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period\(^2\) to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

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?

\(^2\) “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

**Response:**

1. The budget tables within the LEA Application for FY12 and FY 13 SIG funds require very specific differentiation among expenditures for pre-implementation, Year 1, 2 and 3 (see Attachment A). 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. Awarded amounts will be no less than $50,000 and will not exceed $2,000,000 per school, per year.

2. The SIG Rubric FY12 and FY13 (Attachment B) 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 Attachment B 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 14-15 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. TIMELINE:** An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2014:</th>
<th>Release SIG applications to LEAs with Priority Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. The eGrant application will include the information provided in Attachment A. During the month of March, PDE will recruit and train at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
least 10 educators that have experience in school reform, effective leadership, coaching, curriculum and administration to participate in the peer review of competitive applications.

April 2014: 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.

May 2014: Completed SIG applications due in the Division of Federal Programs

May 2014: SIG Applications reviewed, scored and ranked by PDE

The peer review process to be implemented will use the attached rubric (Attachment B). Peer reviewers will be brought together for a minimum of 3 days, trained and provided the necessary materials and time to review all 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.

June 2014: 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 2014-15 school year. FY 13 funds will be used to award 3-year grants to schools whose applications have achieved the highest scores.

August/September 2014: Priority Schools 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. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Response:

1. 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. Each SIG school will be required to update leading indicator data yearly. This data will be reviewed and will become part of the monitor review process.

2. Pennsylvania will be using the priority schools list and therefore Tier III does not apply. 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. Increased monitoring will consist of submission by the LEA of a Corrective Action Plan within 30 days of the monitor finding. The monitor will then review the Corrective Action Plan and determine if an additional on-site monitoring must take place or a desk audit will be sufficient to correct the deficiency. Determinations on continued funding will be made on a case-by-case basis based on preliminary PSSA and/or Keystone Exam scores prior to release of subsequent year funding.
3. 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 educators experienced in school turnaround, 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 and desk audits 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 or a desk audit 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 or desk audit will be conducted within 2 weeks to work in assisting with reforms efforts so that funds can begin to flow again.

4. Scores will be ranked by z-scores. Priority schools previously awarded SIG funds and whose 3-year projects have been closed, will be permitted to apply for an additional 3-year award. Those schools will be ranked by z-scores and additional ranking tied to PVAAS data showing improvement at the school level. Previously funded schools will be considered with other schools by their z-scores if they made progress based on PSSA and Keystone Exam scores during the previous SIG 3-year term. Those schools that did not make progress will not be considered.

5. Pennsylvania will be using the priority schools list and therefore Tier III does not apply.

6. Since PDE was just granted the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, we are not prepared to take over any schools or provide services directly to an LEA.

7. Since PDE was just granted the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, we are not prepared to take over any schools or provide services directly to an LEA.

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

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

☑ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the
Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.

Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.

Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.

Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.

Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

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

Response:
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 educators experienced in school turnaround for the lowest achieving schools, leadership training for principals, 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 an identification of Priority status.

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.

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

PDE will provide a regionally-assigned Academic Recovery Liaison (ARL) to facilitate and oversee Priority schools' use of the training, technical assistance, and tools available to them. The ARL will develop a working relationship with the IUs within his/her assigned region and ensure that the IU is targeting the Priority schools, and that the Priority schools are accessing the available IU services. The ARLs will receive training from PDE, IU, and PaTTAN staff and national consultants. ARLs will work with the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center (MACC) and Regional Education Lab (REL), and will participate in meetings held by CCSSO and Achieve, for the purpose of improving their services to Priority schools. Each ARL will be assigned to his/her Priority schools for three years. Also, the Priority school principal, along with the Superintendent or CEO, will work with the Academic Recovery Liaison to ensure the various programs and initiatives across the district and school are coordinated within the context of the Comprehensive Plan.

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 educators experienced in school turnaround and PDE staff to assist struggling schools.

Pennsylvania has a set of online assessments called Classroom Diagnostic Tools (CDT) that are divided designed to provide diagnostic information in order to guide instruction and remediation. The CDT assists in identifying student academic strengths and areas in need of improvement through links to classroom resources. The CDT will provide information that will guide instruction by providing support to students and teachers. The CDT reports show how students are performing in relation to the Pennsylvania Assessment Anchors and Keystone Assessment Anchors. It will also show how and why students may be struggling or extending beyond the grade and course Eligible Content. These online assessments have multiple benefits for students such as moving students towards career and college readiness, promoting goal-setting, and providing feedback. The online assessments benefits teachers by allowing them access to detailed diagnostic reports, understanding the strengths and needs of each student, and insight into students' strengths and needs.

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

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

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 or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver
☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than [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.

**Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver**

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

**Assurance**

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

**Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver**

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

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

**WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

**Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver**

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

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

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.
Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

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

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

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>NCES ID #</th>
<th>PRIORITY (if applicable)</th>
<th>TIER I</th>
<th>TIER II</th>
<th>TIER III</th>
<th>INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY ONLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>turnaround restart closure transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

1. For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.

2. The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

3. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
   - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II
school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

(4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.

(5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-

- Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
- Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.

(6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

(7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

(8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA XX BUDGET</th>
<th>Year 1 Budget</th>
<th>Year 1 - Full Implementation</th>
<th>Year 2 Budget</th>
<th>Year 3 Budget</th>
<th>Three-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-implementation</td>
<td>Tier I ES #1 $257,000</td>
<td>Tier I ES #1 $1,156,000</td>
<td>Tier I ES #1 $1,325,000</td>
<td>Tier I ES #1 $1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tier I ES #2 $125,500</td>
<td>Tier I ES #2 $890,500</td>
<td>Tier I ES #2 $846,500</td>
<td>Tier I ES #2 $795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tier I MS #1 $304,250</td>
<td>Tier I MS #1 $1,295,750</td>
<td>Tier I MS #1 $1,600,000</td>
<td>Tier I MS #1 $1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $530,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $1,470,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $1,960,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $1,775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA-level Activities</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $250,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $250,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $250,000</td>
<td>Tier II HS #1 $250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,279,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,981,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,620,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,880,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that
does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.
Continuation Awards Only Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>COHORT #</th>
<th>PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:**

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocation those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction).
School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

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

☐ Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards\(^2\) to its LEAs.

☒ Use the renewal process identified in [State]’s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant.

☒ Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.

☒ Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

☒ If a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.

☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

---

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