

School Improvement Grants

# Application for FY 2014 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2014

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name: UTAH**



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

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

### Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 100 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 required to obtain or retain benefit (authorized under section 1003(g) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA). 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](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed School Improvement Grant application to this address.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

### **Purpose of the Program**

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. The Department published final requirements for the SIG program in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). In 2015, the Department revised the final requirements to implement language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, and the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, that allows LEAs to implement additional interventions, provides flexibility for rural LEAs, and extends the grant period from three to five years. The revisions to the requirements also reflect lessons learned from four years of SIG implementation. Finally, since the final requirements for the SIG program were published in 2010, 44 SEAs received approval to implement ESEA flexibility, pursuant to which they no longer identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. To reflect this change, the revised requirements make an LEA with priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools, and focus schools, which are generally the schools within a State with the largest achievement gaps, eligible to receive SIG funds.

### **Availability of Funds**

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2014.

### **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 2014 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2014 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. The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

## **SUBMISSION INFORMATION**

### **Electronic Submission:**

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2014 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

Each SEA should submit its FY 2014 application to its individual State mailbox address at: [OSS.\[State\]@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.[State]@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:

Jim Butler, Group Leader  
Office of State Support, OESE  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W246  
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 no later than April 15, 2015.

### **For Further Information**

If you have any questions, please contact your OSS State contact or Jim Butler at (202) 260-9737 or by e-mail at [james.butler@ed.gov](mailto:james.butler@ed.gov). Additional technical assistance, including webinars for State staff, will be provided after the SIG final requirements are published in the Federal Register

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant:</p> <p><b>Utah State Office of Education</b></p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p> <p><b>250 East 500 South PO Box 144200 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200</b></p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: <b>Dr. Rebecca S. Donaldson</b></p> <p>Position and Office: <b>ESEA Federal Programs Coordinator</b></p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address:</p> <p><b>Utah State Office of Education 250 East 500 South PO Box 144200 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200</b></p> <p>Telephone: <b>801-538-7869</b></p> <p>Fax: <b>801-538-7804</b></p> <p>Email address: <a href="mailto:Rebecca.donaldson@schools.utah.gov">Rebecca.donaldson@schools.utah.gov</a></p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</p> <p><b>Brad C. Smith State Superintendent of Public Instruction</b></p>	<p>Telephone:</p> <p><b>801-538-7510</b></p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X</p>	<p>Date:</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

The directions below indicate information an SEA must provide in its application for a competitive School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g). Where relevant, these directions distinguish between the information that must be provided by SEAs that have approved requests for ESEA flexibility and those that do not. For any section that is not applicable to a particular SEA, the SEA should write “Not Applicable.”

### A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

**For SEAs not approved for ESEA Flexibility: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools and**

**Eligible Schools:** As part of its FY 2014 application, an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. 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.

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.

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

**EXAMPLE:**

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2014 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup>
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X

**For SEAs approved for ESEA flexibility: Eligible Schools List:** Each SEA should provide a link to the page on its Web site or a link to the specific page(s) in its approved ESEA flexibility request that includes a list of priority and focus schools. That list should clearly indicate which schools are SIG-eligible (*i.e.*, meet the definition of priority or focus school in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*).

Utah's current list of Priority and Focus schools may be found at the following link:

<http://schools.utah.gov/fsp/College-Career/Participating-Schools.aspx>

**For all SEAs: Awards not renewed, or otherwise terminated:**

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 2015-2016 school year. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, reason for nonrenewal or termination, the amount of unused remaining funds, and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds. **If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable ("N/A") in the chart:**

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:</b>					NA

**B. STATE-DETERMINED MODEL (OPTIONAL)**

An SEA may submit one State-determined model for the Secretary's review and approval. Submission of a state-determined model is not required. (*Check applicable box below*)

- SEA is submitting a State-determined model for review and approval. (Please attach to the application.)
- SEA is not submitting a State-determined model.

To be approved, a State-determined model must meet the definition of whole-school reform model:

A whole-school reform model is a model that is designed to:

1. Improve student academic achievement or attainment;
2. Be implemented for all students in a school; and
3. Address, at a minimum and in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, each of the following:
  - a. School leadership
  - b. Teaching and learning in at least one full academic content area (including professional learning for educators).
  - c. Student non-academic support.
  - d. Family and community engagement.

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

The actions listed in this section are ones that an LEA must take to receive 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 these criteria.

If applicable, the SEA should attach an LEA application review rubric that it will use to evaluate each of the actions listed below. If a rubric is attached, provide relevant page numbers below and a description if needed. If a rubric is not attached, provide a description of the evaluation criteria to be used.

*Check here if an LEA application review rubric is attached.*

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school that is designed to meet the specific needs of the school, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the school improvement needs identified by families and the community, and takes into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention for each school.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must analyze the needs of each Priority and/or Focus School for which it applies that appears on the State's identified Priority and Focus School list. Included in the analysis of each school, the LEA must consider the following:

- Percent of students scoring proficient in Reading/ Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider both overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Trend data for both Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Demographic information relevant to the school's achievement in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics;
- Contextual data for the school (attendance, graduation and dropout rates, discipline reports, parent and community surveys);
- Teacher information (teacher attendance, turnover rates, teaching assignments aligned with highly qualified teacher status, teacher education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- Administrator information (how long the administrator has been at the building, or the replacement of the principal as required in the Turnaround or Transformation models, administrator education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- Effectiveness of instructional programs that have been implemented;
- Analysis of family and community needs for each identified school; and
- Effectiveness of any prior school reform efforts.

Only those LEA SIG applications that have combined multiple relevant data sources into a thoughtful analysis to specifically and conclusively justify the fit between the needs of the school and the intervention model chosen will be approvable.

Based on a thorough analysis of the data sources listed above, the LEA must:

- Identify the school(s) for which the LEA is making application;
- Identify the intervention model chosen for each school; and
- Provide the rationale for the model chosen for each school.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.*

*Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 1.*

**(2) The LEA has designed and will implement interventions consistent with the SIG requirements.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must include in its SIG application information that describes how it will implement with fidelity each of the requirements associated with the specific intervention model(s) selected for its eligible schools. This information must include the following:

- Describe how the LEA will implement with fidelity each requirement associated with the specific intervention model(s) selected for its eligible schools.
- Provide sufficient information describing how the LEA will successfully implement each of those requirements.
- Describe any steps already taken by the LEA to initiate school improvement efforts that align with SIG intervention models.
- Provide a detailed timeline for implementation of the intervention model chosen for each school the LEA intends to serve.
- Describe annual SMART goals for the state's assessment for reading/language arts.
- Describe annual SMART goals for the state's assessment for mathematics.
- Describe how the LEA will measure progress on the leading indicators.
- Describe how the LEA will consult with all relevant stakeholders, including families and the community, regarding the LEA's application and implementation of the selected SIG intervention model(s) in its selected school(s).

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.*

*Provide page number(s) in rubric: Pages 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20.*

**(3) The LEA has demonstrated it will use the School Improvement Grants funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must include a budget in the SIG application that demonstrates that the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- The LEA provides a budget for each school included in the LEA's SIG application for three full years of implementation of the grant;

- For each school included in the SIG application, the budget includes costs associated with the successful implementation of each requirement of the intervention model selected (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- The LEA must include a budget that includes no more than \$2 million dollars per year multiplied by the number of schools served or no more than \$6 million per school over three years;
- If the LEA plans to apply for SIG funds to support LEA efforts, the budget includes costs associated with LEA leadership and support of the selected school intervention model(s);
- The LEA budget includes costs for purchased professional services to ensure high-quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform;
- The budget detail provides sufficient information to support all budget requests; and
- The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation annually.
- The USOE will annually review each LEA's budget prior to renewal of the grant.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 21.*

- (4) The LEA has demonstrated how it has, or will, recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must include in its SIG application sufficient information describing how it will recruit, screen, select, and contract with proven external providers to support the LEA and the school(s) in the implementation of the selected intervention model(s).

Only those LEA SIG applications that meet the criteria described below will be approvable:

- Detailed and relevant criteria for determining the need for external provider contract(s);
- Description of the reasonable and timely steps the LEA will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year;
- Selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the school(s) to be served by external providers. These criteria must include, but are not limited to:
  1. Analysis of the LEA's capacity and operational needs;
  2. Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school;
  3. Contact with other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience with the external provider and level of effectiveness;
  4. Screening external providers to ensure that the provider has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the targeted school;
  5. The provider identified has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations. For example, success in working with comprehensive high schools or with schools that serve English learners;
  6. Requiring a potential external provider to demonstrate its competencies through interviews and documentation;
  7. Requiring the provider to demonstrate that its strategies are evidence-based;
  8. Requiring the provider to demonstrate it has the capacity to assist the school in fully implementing the strategies it is proposing;
  9. Alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services;
  10. The individual responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are clearly defined and aligned;

11. The LEA specifies how it will initiate a contract with the provider;
12. The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards; and
13. The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school by the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year has been clearly demonstrated.
14. If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success working with schools with similar demographics;
15. A narrative description and budget to support external provider contracts; and
16. The LEA is required to use an experienced School Support Team Leader who is external to the LEA. An SST Leader could assist the school in the implementation of the intervention model and will be responsible to document progress in implementation on at least a quarterly basis. A list of USOE-approved School Support Team Leaders is available upon request of USOE school improvement staff and/or at the following link:  
<https://dmi.schools.utah.gov/Tracker/LEA/Application/SstApplicationSearch.aspx>

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
 Provide page number(s) in rubric: Pages 5 and 6*

**(5) The LEA has demonstrated how it will align other resources with the selected intervention.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) demonstrate that the LEA has committed other local, state, and federal resources to support successful implementation of the selected intervention model(s). A competitive LEA SIG application must include the following information:

- A list of the financial resources that will support the intervention model (e.g. local, state, federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate);
- A description of how each of the financial resources listed above will support the goals of the school reform effort in the improvement plan; and
- A description of how LEA program personnel will collaborate to support student achievement and school reform (i.e., curriculum coordinators responsible for reading/language arts and mathematics, assessment, ESL/Title III services, Title I, special education, Indian Education, early childhood, counseling, professional development, gifted/talented, migrant, human resources, and any other program personnel deemed necessary to meet the specific needs of each school included in the LEA's SIG application).

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
 Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 7.*

**(6) The LEA has demonstrated how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must demonstrate that the LEA has identified potential practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation of intervention strategies. Only those LEA SIG applications that provide a thorough description of how the LEA will both identify and address potential barriers will be approved.

Approvable applications must include the following:

- A list of practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation of the selected intervention model(s) have been identified and clearly defined;
- Proposed steps to modify identified practices and/or policies to minimize barriers are clearly defined;
- Description of how the LEA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement necessary changes (e.g. teacher associations, human resources, administrators, local board of education);
- The LEA description demonstrates sufficient commitment to work with key stakeholder groups (i.e. an analysis of charter laws, an LEA's negotiations/agreements with the teacher associations, or an LEA's partnership(s) with outside entities) to modify practices and policies, as necessary; and
- A procedure is in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 8.*

- (7) The LEA has demonstrated how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school that it proposes to serve, such as by creating an LEA turnaround office.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that the LEA has identified how it will provide oversight and support to each eligible school identified in the LEA's application. The description must include the following information on how the LEA will successfully implement the school intervention model:

- Identify the specific LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model;
- Identify the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts;
- Describe how the LEA will monitor annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics;
- Describe how the LEA will monitor student achievement by individual teacher/classrooms;
- Describe how the LEA will measure progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements;
- Describe the frequency of LEA monitoring;
- Describe the monitoring strategies the LEA will use to monitor the implementation of each requirement of the selected intervention model (e.g. Use the model checklists provided as a guide for the monitoring strategies needed);
- If student achievement results do not meet expected goals, describe how the LEA will assist in making necessary plan revisions;
- Describe how the LEA will provide ongoing technical assistance to make sure each school is successful;
- Describe how the LEA will ensure ongoing meaningful involvement of the school/community;
- Describe how the local school board will be engaged to ensure successful implementation (including the prioritization or revision of appropriate board policies and allocation of resources);
- Describe how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of the reform strategies, including: deadlines, benchmarks, and goals.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 9.*

**(8) The LEA has demonstrated how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must include a thorough description detailing how it will provide multiple opportunities for meaningful family and community engagement in the implementation of the selected intervention model throughout the grant period. Consistent with Title III and OCR compliance, every effort should be made to communicate with the parents and the community in the top 5 languages of the school(s) as counted from the Home Language Survey. The description must include information on how the LEA will conduct the following types of family and community engagement activities on an ongoing basis:

- Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected;
- Survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community;
- Communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail;
- Assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or
- Hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for parents and students attending a new school in the top two primary languages identified on the Home Language Survey.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.*

*Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 10.*

**(9) The LEA has described how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must demonstrate that the LEA has a plan to sustain the improvements achieved through the SIG process when the funding period ends. Competitive applications include the following:

- A list of the ongoing supports needed to sustain school improvement after the funding period ends;
- A description of the anticipated local, state, and/or federal resources that will be committed to meet the needs identified above to support continued implementation of the model(s) chosen;
- The written assurance from the district superintendent or charter school leader that s/he will continue to support the implementation and refinement of the intervention model(s) described in the LEA application beyond the period of the grant funding; and
- The written assurance from the local school board that they will continue to support the implementation and refinement of the intervention model(s) described in the LEA application beyond the period of the grant funding.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.*

*Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 11.*

**(10) The LEA has demonstrated how, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), it will implement one or more evidence-based strategies.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that LEAs that propose to use SIG 1003(g) funds to implement one or more evidence-based strategies in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s) in its selected school(s) ensure that the evidence-based strategy chosen has evidence of effectiveness that includes at least one acceptable research study. USOE will evaluate evidence-based strategies proposed by LEAs based on the following criteria:

- Specific research cited by the LEA showing the evidence-based strategy meets What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards with or without reservations (i.e., are qualifying experimental or quasi-experimental studies);
- Results found a statistically significant favorable impact on a student academic achievement or attainment outcome, with no statistically significant and overriding unfavorable impacts on that outcome for relevant populations in the study or in other studies of the intervention reviewed by and reported on by the What Works Clearinghouse; and
- If meeting What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards with reservations, includes a large sample and a multi-site sample as defined in 34 CFR 77.1 (Note: multiple studies can cumulatively meet the large and multi-site sample requirements so long as each study meets the other requirements listed here).

In researching and prioritizing evidence-based strategies, the LEA must take into account:

- Specific needs of the Priority and Focus School(s) to be served as identified through a comprehensive school appraisal conducted by an external School Support Team;
- Student performance data on the State's assessments in English language arts and mathematics, disaggregated by subgroups, to determine specific factors that have resulted in the school being identified as a Priority or Focus school; and
- The evidence-based strategies identified must have evidence of success when implemented with schools that have similar demographic settings and student populations to the school(s) to be served by the LEA's SIG application.

Thus, LEAs that propose to use SIG funds to implement an evidence-based strategy must conduct due diligence to ensure that the supporting research evidence for a proposed strategy (see a. above) includes studies of successful implementation resulting in improved outcomes with a sample student population (e.g., economically disadvantaged students, English learners, same age/grade-level span, and other subgroups) served by the school for which the LEA is applying in a school setting (e.g., urban, rural, American Indian reservation) that is similar to those of the school to be served. The LEA must include detailed information in its SIG application that indicates the proposed strategy has been effectively implemented in a similar school(s) in the past by citing results from specific research studies in which the strategy was successfully implemented in a similar demographic setting with a similar school population and resulted in improved outcomes.

For example, if student performance data indicates that students in grades 3-6 are underperforming in mathematics an evidence-based strategy should be selected that has evidence of improving student outcomes in mathematics for students within that grade span in a school(s) that serve similar student populations. If an identified need at the school is providing equitable access to grade-level core content in English language arts for students who are English learners the strategy chosen should be one that has been successfully implemented and resulted in better outcomes for English learners in schools with similar demographics. Or, the strategy has worked successfully with large urban high schools that serve students in grades 9-12 or in

small rural high schools that may predominantly serve American Indian students in grades 7-12. The strategy must have evidence that successful implementation assisted similar schools in closing achievement gaps for specific student groups within schools with similar student populations including students who are English learners, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

In addition to ensuring that students are receiving high-quality Tier I instruction in both English language arts and mathematics based on Utah Core Standards, it is expected that LEAs have begun implementation of strategies that are meant to address other needs as seen specifically at individual school sites. The Utah State Office of Education requires that LEA applications must describe, at a minimum, the use of the following evidence-based strategies:

- Sheltered Instruction as a part of Tier I instruction; and
- English Language Proficiency standards to help meet individual student needs.

It is with this intention that the following list tries to value the attempts of meeting student/parent/community needs in addition to the requirements stated above. Possible examples of evidence-based strategies may be found through research and the following resources:

- What Works Clearing House studies of evidence-based practices in language arts and/or mathematics
- Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides (IES)
- Harvard Family and Community Engagement Research
- Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) research from WestEd
- Strategies with effect sizes of .40 or higher as described in *Visible Learning* (Hattie, 2012)
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)
- WiDA English Language Proficiency Standards
- Schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)
- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
- Extended or full-day kindergarten
- High-quality Pre-K programs

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number in rubric: Page 12.*

- (11) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority and Focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention model in each of those schools.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) must identify how it will provide leadership and support to each Priority School identified in the LEA's application. Only those LEA SIG applications that provide thorough and specific descriptions of ALL of the LEA capacity criteria listed above will be approvable. The description must include the following information on how the LEA will successfully implement the school intervention model:

- Identify how the LEA will provide leadership and support to each eligible school identified in the application;

- Identify the specific LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model;
- Identify the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts;
- Identify the fiscal resources (local, state, and federal) that the LEA will commit to implementation;
- Assurance from the local school board and LEA leadership to fully support the implementation of the intervention model chosen by the LEA.
- If the LEA is not applying to serve each Priority School, an explanation is provided regarding why it lacks capacity to serve each Priority School.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.*

*Provide page number(s) in rubric: Pages 4 and 9.*

- (12) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that proposes to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA has described how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA Rural Education Assistance Program (REAP) that proposes to modify one element of the Turnaround or Transformation model, the LEA has described how it will still be able to meet the intent and purpose of that element in order to successfully implement the selected school intervention model. The description must include the following information:

- Identification of the specific element of either the Turnaround or Transformation model that the LEA proposes to modify;
- The LEA's rationale for the need to modify the element identified;
- How the LEA will still be able to meet the intent and purpose of the modified element and successfully implement the selected SIG intervention model.

NOTE: If an LEA that is eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA Rural Education Assistance Program (REAP) selects the Early Learning Model, it cannot modify the requirement that the principal who led the school prior to the implementation of the model must be replaced.

A list of LEAs that are eligible for services under the Rural Education Assistance Program (REAP) can be found at the following U. S. Department of Education site: <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/freedom/local/reap.html>

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.*

*Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 16.*

- (13) An LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a whole school reform model developer, an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in a school, must demonstrate that (a) the evidence supporting the model includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the school to be served; and (b) it has partnered with a whole school reform model**

**developer that meets the definition of “whole school reform model developer” in the SIG requirements.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that LEAs that propose to use SIG 1003(g) funds to implement an evidence-based whole school reform model in its selected school(s) must ensure that the whole school reform model chosen meets the following final SIG requirements published in the National Federal Register (NFR). An evidence-based whole-school reform model must meet each of the following criteria:

1. Have evidence of effectiveness that includes at least one study that:
  - a. Meets What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards with or without reservations (i.e., are qualifying experimental or quasi-experimental studies);
  - b. Found a statistically significant favorable impact on a student academic achievement or attainment outcome, with no statistically significant and overriding unfavorable impacts on that outcome for relevant populations in the study or in other studies of the intervention reviewed by and reported on by the What Works Clearinghouse; and
  - c. If meeting What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards with reservations, includes a large sample and a multi-site sample as defined in 34 CFR 77.1 (Note: multiple studies can cumulatively meet the large and multi-site sample requirements so long as each study meets the other requirements listed here); and,
2. Be designed to:
  - a. Improve student academic achievement or attainment;
  - b. Be implemented for all students in a school; and
  - c. Address at a minimum and in a coordinated manner, each of the following:
    - i. School leadership;
    - ii. Teaching and learning in at least one full academic content area (including professional learning for educators);
    - iii. Student non-academic support; and
    - iv. Family and community engagement.
3. The Whole School Reform Model must be implemented by the LEA in partnership with the whole-school reform model developer who is an entity or individual that:
  - a. Maintains proprietary rights for the model; or
  - b. If no entity or individual maintains proprietary rights for the model, has a demonstrated record of success in implementing a whole-school reform model and is selected through a rigorous review process.

Please note: In addition to meeting the three rigorous criteria published in the National Federal Register as listed above, LEAs that propose to use SIG funds to implement an evidence-based whole school reform model from the list approved by the U. S. Department of Education must conduct due diligence to ensure that the supporting research evidence (see number 1 above) includes at least one study of successful implementation resulting in improved outcomes with a sample student population (e.g., economically disadvantaged students, English learners, same age/grade-level span, and other subgroups) served by the school for which the LEA is applying and school setting (e.g., urban, rural, American Indian reservation) similar to those of the school to be served.

The LEA must include detailed information in its SIG application that indicates the proposed model has been effectively implemented in a similar school(s) in the past by citing results from specific research studies in which the model was successfully implemented in a similar demographic setting with a similar school population and resulted in improved outcomes.

The following information must be submitted to USOE by the LEA:

- Evidence of successful implementation of the chosen whole-school reform model with a sample student population that is similar to the student population to be served at the school included in the LEA's SIG application; and
- Evidence of successful implementation in a school setting similar to that of the school to be served.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 17.*

**(14) For an LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA has demonstrated that it will conduct a rigorous review process, as described in the final requirements, of the charter school operator, charter management organization (CMO), or education management organization (EMO) that it has selected to operate or manage the school or schools.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that LEAs that propose to implement the Restart Model in one or more eligible schools conduct a rigorous review process in screening external providers. An LEA should be as specific as possible in its Requests for Proposal (RFP) or other document made available to potential providers regarding its expectations for how the provider will perform and be held accountable. In screening and selecting external providers, the LEA must take into account the specific needs of the Priority and Focus School(s) to be served. These criteria must include, but are not limited to:

- Researching and prioritizing external providers available to serve the school;
- Contacting other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding the provider's effectiveness;
- The provider identified must have a proven track record of success in working with schools that have similar demographic settings and student populations to the school(s) to be served by the LEA's SIG application. For example, the provider can demonstrate previous success working with large urban high schools that serve students in grades 9-12 or small rural high schools that may predominantly serve American Indian students in grades 7-12. The provider must have evidence that they have been successful in closing achievement gaps and, if applicable, graduation rates for ALL student groups within schools with similar student populations including students who are English learners, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities; and
- Describe the specific aspects of an external provider's past performance/record of success that LEAs will examine for screening

The LEA must describe in its SIG application how it will:

- Screen external providers to ensure that the provider with which it contracts has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the targeted school;
- Require a potential external provider to demonstrate its competencies through in-depth interviews and documentation;

- Require the provider to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based;
- Contact other LEAs that are provided as references to check previous record of success;
- Require the provider to demonstrate that it has the capacity to successfully implement the strategies it is proposing;
- Check references of the external provider before entering into a contract with the provider; and
- Initiate a contract with an external provider.
- If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success with similar schools and describe the specific services that the contractor will provide.
- The LEA must include a narrative description to support external provider contracts, if applicable.
- The LEA is required to use an experienced USOE-approved School Support Team (SST) Leader who is external to the LEA and who has successfully worked with similar schools engaged in school improvement efforts.
- An SST Leader may assist the school in the implementation of the intervention model and must make at least quarterly site visits to the school to review implementation and progress. A list of USOE-approved School Support Team Leaders is available upon request of USOE school improvement staff and/or at the following link to Utah's online TRACKER system: <https://dmi.schools.utah.gov/Tracker/LEA/Application/SstApplicationSearch.aspx>

The LEA must describe the alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services:

- The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are aligned and clearly defined;
- The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards; and
- The capacity of the external provider to serve the specific needs of the identified school(s) has been clearly demonstrated.
- The LEA must describe the reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place in time to open the 2016-2017 school year.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Pages 18 and 19.*

The SEA must describe how it will review each LEA's budget, including a description of the processes the SEA will use to determine if it is appropriate to award an amount different than that requested in the LEA's budget request.

The Utah State Office of Education may make a SIG award to an LEA for up to but not exceeding five years for a specific school. The LEA may elect to use one school year for planning and pre-implementation activities. At a minimum, the LEA must include a budget that supports three complete school years of full implementation of all requirements of the chosen SIG model. Following three full school years of SIG implementation, LEAs may use up to two school years for activities necessary to sustain the SIG reforms. If the LEA intends to engage in planning and pre-implementation activities prior to launching the first full school year of implementation and/or continue activities related to sustaining the SIG reforms following three school years of full implementation, these activities must be specifically accounted for in the LEA's budget

request. Thus, LEAs applying for FY 2014 SIG funds must submit a budget request that addresses the entire grant period for which they are requesting SIG funds. The following are provided as possible examples:

- The LEA requests five years of SIG funding: 1 year of planning/pre-implementation + 3 years of full implementation + 1 year of sustainability activities;
- The LEA requests five years of SIG funding: 3 years of full implementation + up to 2 years for sustainability activities;
- The LEA requests four years of SIG funding: 1 year of planning/pre-implementation or sustainability + 3 years of full implementation;
- The LEA requests just three years of SIG funding for full implementation but does not plan to request funds to support planning/pre-implementation and/or sustainability activities.

## PROTOCOL

In reviewing LEA SIG budget requests, the Utah State Office of Education maintains the authority to base the actual amount allocated for LEA subgrant awards on several factors:

First, all budget items will be thoroughly reviewed to ascertain whether or not a specific part of the budget request represents a necessary, reasonable, and allowable cost required to support planning/pre-implementation, full implementation of the proposed model, or sustainability of reforms. For example, if the LEA's budget request includes travel expenses to send LEA and/or school personnel to an expensive out-of-state conference, the LEA must specify how attendance at that particular conference will assist in effectively implementing the specific requirements of the selected SIG model to support improved student outcomes. Could this professional learning experience be provided more effectively if the LEA contracted with expert consultants and held professional development sessions at the local level to include greater participation by staff? How will staff be held accountable for implementing evidence-based strategies learned through the professional development? What types of follow-up and support will be provided to staff during implementation? Therefore, the actual amount granted to an LEA may vary from that which has been requested by the LEA if specific costs are deemed unnecessary, unreasonable, or are not allowable uses of SIG funds.

Second, in reviewing LEA SIG budget requests, the Utah State Office of Education maintains the authority to base the actual amount allocated for LEA subgrant awards on other relevant criteria including the demographics, specific needs, and size of the school (e.g., number of students and staff members, the need to provide incentives for recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers, community and family outreach and involvement) along with other specific needs of the school that have been identified through the results of a thorough needs assessment conducted by an external School Support Team. Therefore, the actual amount granted to an LEA may vary from that which has been requested by the LEA.

Third, the LEA must demonstrate that proposed planning, pre-implementation, full implementation, and sustainability activities in its budget are reasonable, allowable, and necessary to ensure full and effective implementation of the chosen intervention model.

Finally, the USOE may be required to adjust an LEA's SIG award based on the level of FY 2014 SIG funds available to the SEA for LEA subgrant awards and the number of LEA SIG applications that are approvable. Therefore, the actual amount granted to an LEA may vary from that which has been requested by the LEA.

- The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.  
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 21.*

## **E. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.**

- January 23, 2015: ESEA Federal Programs staff held a mandatory meeting for all Utah Title I schools that were identified in December 2014 as meeting the definition of Priority and Focus schools based on Utah spring 2012 and spring 2013 Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) data. At this meeting, LEA Title I directors and principals of the identified schools were notified that a FY 2014 SIG Bidders' Conference would be held after USOE had data available from the Utah spring 2015 Student Achievement and Growth in Excellence (SAGE) assessments.
- March 9, 2015: A Survey Monkey was sent to all Utah LEA superintendents/charter school directors, LEA Title I directors, and Utah's Committee of Practitioners regarding the SEA's proposed waiver request to extend the availability of FY 2014 SIG funds through September 30, 2020.
- April 9, 2015: Results and comments from the Survey Monkey were reviewed and summarized.
- March 12, 2015: ESEA Federal Programs Director and Coordinator met with State Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent to review Utah's proposed FY 2014 SIG application process and gather their input.
- April 14, 2015: ESEA Federal Programs staff presented information regarding FY 2014 SEA and LEA SIG applications to Utah's Committee of Practitioners at their regularly scheduled meeting.
- June 17/August 12, 2015: ESEA School Improvement Team along with three highly successful experienced School Support Team Leaders provided full-day trainings for educators with approved School Support Team applications who wanted to be added to USOE's approved cadre of Title I School Support Team members.
- Late Summer/Early Fall 2015: Meet with USOE Data and Statistics staff and USOE Administration to identify Priority Schools that fall within the lowest-performing 5% of Title I Schools and Focus Schools that fall within the next lowest 10% of Title I Schools and to coordinate efforts of the ESEA Federal Programs staff regarding SIG with requirements with the new Utah 2015 S.B. 235: School Turnaround and Leadership Development Act.
  - Note: This timeline was developed after consultation with the State's OSS contacts. This step will be completed as soon as Utah's spring 2015 SAGE (Student Achievement and Growth in Excellence) proficiency data for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics is available. The projected date the data will be available is early September. This timeline allows the Utah State Office of Education to identify eligible schools based on two years of Utah's new SAGE assessment (spring 2014 and spring 2015 data) rather than just using the list of schools based on older data (2012 and 2013) from the State's previous end-of-level CRTs. Although the CRTs and SAGE differ and can't be compared directly, this process will provide the State with the ability to look at school performance trend data across four school years (2012 and 2013 CRT results; 2014 and 2015 SAGE results).
- September 2015: Provide initial written notification to LEA Superintendents/Charter Leaders and LEA Title I Directors of all schools identified as Priority and Focus Schools and the LEA's eligibility to compete for FY2014 SIG funds.

- September 2015: Send invitations for the SIG bidders' conference to LEA Superintendents/Charter Leaders and LEA Title I Directors.
- On or before September 30, 2015: Hold a full day SIG bidders' conference. At this meeting, USOE school improvement team members and other USOE staff will explicitly explain the LEA application process, the requirements of each SIG model, the scoring rubric, guidance documents, level of funds available for subgrants, and all details required for submission. If there are eligible LEAs who are not able to send staff to attend the meeting in person, USOE will make arrangements to provide online access to the meeting via Connect 8.
- On or before September 30, 2015 thru November 20, 2015: SIG application window open to LEAs.
- October 1 – November 20, 2015: USOE school improvement team will be available to provide technical assistance and support to eligible LEAs on an ongoing basis through phone calls, email, and webinars. Site visits may be made to LEAs upon their request to provide additional technical assistance and support during the application window.
- Early October 2015: Consult with USOE staff to identify highly qualified individuals who are external to USOE and are not associated with eligible LEAs to serve on the external SIG application review panel. Highly-qualified individuals will then be contacted. Potential reviewers will be asked about their availability to attend the review panel orientation and training meeting, the time commitment necessary to complete thorough reviews and scoring of each LEA application, and convening after reviewing applications to listen to LEA presentations and discuss recommendations regarding LEA applications that merit subgrant awards. Potential reviewers will also be asked to declare any conflicts of interest they may have with any of the eligible LEAs. No individual will be contacted to serve on the review panel if they are associated with any of the eligible LEAs or have potential conflicts of interest with any eligible LEA. For example, an LEA Title I director or superintendent who serves on the panel must not be from an eligible LEA. The configuration of the review panel will include individuals with experience, expertise, and success in:
  - Federal programs administration, special education, English language acquisition, literacy, mathematics, professional development, school improvement, charter schools, school and LEA leadership, parent and family involvement, early childhood education, higher education, and extended learning programs. Panel members will include individuals with expertise at the elementary and secondary levels of education.
- November 20, 2015: LEA SIG Applications due to USOE by 5:00 PM by email or hard copy if email is not an option for an LEA.
- November 30, 2015: Meet with Review Panel members for training on the SIG application, scoring rubric, confidential nature of the reviews, and to assign each individual a reviewer number to be listed on their scoring rubrics.
- November 30 to December 17, 2015: Review of SIG applications.

- December 18, 2015: Convene Review Panel to listen to LEA presentations, discuss applications and scores, and make recommendations on each LEA application. At the end of the meeting, USOE will collect all copies of the applications and scoring rubrics.
- December 2015: Prepare summary of reviews to provide feedback for each LEA applicant. Meet with USOE Administration to review and discuss recommendations for LEA subgrant awards.
- January 2016: Notify all FY 2014 SIG LEA applicants of their award status. Initial notification will consist of a phone call to each LEA Superintendent/Charter Leader and LEA Title I Director. This will be followed up by a formal letter on USOE letterhead along a copy of the LEA's feedback report. An official press release will be issued to announce the awards to the public. A summary of the grant awards, amounts awarded, SIG models selected, and all LEA applications that were received by USOE will be posted on the USOE website within 30 days of the grant awards.
- January 2016: Award FY 2014 SIG funds to successful LEAs
- January 2016: Approved SIG applicants may begin implementing approved planning and pre-implementation activities.
- Fall of 2016: Approved SIG applicants begin full implementation of their SIG plans.
- Utah State Office of Education will use FY 2014 SIG funds to make multi-year awards to new Utah Cohort 4 SIG grantees.
  - A portion of Utah's FY14 SIG funds will be used to provide the third year of SIG funding to Utah's six Cohort 3 SIG schools. (See Continuation Awards Application)

**F. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information below.**

- (1) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority and focus schools, as applicable, and describe 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 or focus schools, in an LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

During the annual progress review process, the Utah State Office of Education will analyze the student achievement SMART goals set by the LEA for each Priority and Focus School(s) according to the following process:

- Annually review school achievement data to determine if the participating school(s) are achieving expected improvement aligned with school improvement plan goals;

- Require a full school appraisal using USOE Title I Systems of Support school improvement appraisal tools in the first year of the intervention (if one has not been completed within the last two years); and
- Require a detailed school improvement plan using the school improvement plan template formulated with results from the school appraisal.

If a participating SIG school(s) is not meeting achievement goals after the first full year of implementation, the following procedure will be followed:

- The SEA will support the LEA in conducting a more thorough review of student achievement data;
- An instructional audit will be conducted by external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to focus on the quality of instruction and the fidelity of the implemented curriculum aligned to the Utah Core Standards;
- The LEA will hire external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to assist the LEA and school to revise plans, goals, and strategies to address increased student achievement;
- Quarterly reports on the implementation of the school improvement plan strategies/activities will be submitted by the external consultant to support, monitor, and report the progress being made in the implementation of the intervention model; and
- If the SEA determines that the LEA and school are not making adequate progress in the implementation of the intervention model, the SIG grant for the subsequent year may be reduced or eliminated.

- (2) **Describe the SEA’s process for renewing the SIG award of an LEA that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities for a school, including the SEA’s process for reviewing the performance of the school against the LEA’s approved application to determine whether the LEA will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention for the school beginning the first day of the following school year.**

An LEA receiving a FY 2014 School Improvement Grant (SIG) must submit a proposed budget to the Utah State Office of Education for approval before any activities for which SIG funds were requested may be carried out during the planning/pre-implementation period. The LEA’s proposed budget must ensure that funds have been requested for three full years of implementation of the selected intervention model in addition to any allowable activities the LEA plans to implement prior to the first day of the first full school year of full implementation of the selected model.

The Utah State Office of Education process requires that LEAs that request SIG funds to implement pre-implementation activities on behalf of one or more eligible schools provide justification that the selected activities are necessary and reasonable in order to ensure full and effective implementation of the chosen SIG intervention model on the first day of the first full school year of implementation.

Proposed activities must align with the identified needs of the specific school. For example, the LEA selects an evidence-based strategy to address the needs of English learners and the LEA’s budget request includes pre-implementation costs for expert consultants, materials, and stipends for teachers to attend required professional development on the strategy during the summer, or the LEA includes a request for funds to recruit and/or retain highly effective teachers for SIG schools through the use of signing bonuses, salary adjustments, district-supplemented teacher housing.

During and following the first year of full implementation of SIG and prior to renewing an LEA's SIG subgrant award for subsequent years, the USOE will gather information related to full and effective implementation through:

- School and LEA site visits (conducted by USOE staff and School Support Team Leaders);
- Structured interviews with principals and LEA staff;
- Focus group interviews with students, teachers, and parents;
- Required quarterly reports completed by the School Support Team Leader;
- Monitoring visits; and
- Reviews of student outcome data to ensure the LEA fully implemented the activities that were included in its approved application.

If it is determined that the LEA failed to fully implement the approved planning or pre-implementation activities for which SIG funds were requested in its approved subgrant application and budget, the USOE will reduce the level of funding awarded to the LEA for the next year of implementation by the amount that was requested for that activity.

If an LEA's application and budget are approved and then unforeseeable circumstances arise that prevent the LEA from implementing a proposed planning and/or pre-implementation activity, the LEA will be required to submit a request to the USOE for a revision to its approved SIG plan and budget.

**A reminder:** The LEA may apply for a minimum of \$50,000 per year per school for each of the three years of the grant up to a maximum of \$2,000,000 per year per school for each of the three years for a total of no more than \$6,000,000 over three years. However, in reviewing LEA FY 2014 SIG budget requests, the Utah State Office of Education maintains the authority to base the actual amount allocated for LEA subgrant awards based on the level of FY 2014 SIG funds available to the SEA for subgrants. Therefore, the actual amount granted to an LEA, including any amount requested for planning/pre-implementation activities, may vary from that which has been requested by the LEA.

The Utah State Office of Education will ensure that all activities proposed by the LEA receiving the SIG award are allowable expenditures to assist the LEA and school(s) in preparing for full implementation when the 2016-2017 school year begins. USOE has developed a Rubric to review the pre-implementation activities proposed by LEAs as a feedback resource to the LEA. This page of the Rubric will not be added to the overall score of the LEA application as this section is optional. The activities listed below are intended to be examples only. The focus of the activity should be its direct relationship to the needs of the school and the intervention model chosen for the school. Examples of allowable pre-implementation activities:

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- **Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.

- **Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2016-2017 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.
- **Other Allowable Activities to be described by the LEA**

(3) Describe how the SEA will monitor, including the frequency and type of monitoring (e.g., on-site, desk, self-reported) 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 priority and focus schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

During the annual progress review process, the Utah State Office of Education will analyze the student achievement goals set by the LEA for each Priority and Focus School(s) according to the following process:

- Annually review school achievement data to determine if the participating school(s) are achieving expected improvement aligned with school improvement plan goals;
- Require a full school appraisal using USOE Title I System of Support appraisal tools in the first year of the intervention (if one has not been completed within the last two years); and
- Require detailed school improvement plan using the school improvement plan template formulated with results from the school appraisal (if one has not been completed within the last two years).
- SEA ESEA Title I School Improvement personnel will make two half-day annual site visits to each SIG school (fall and spring) to monitor implementation and provide technical assistance;
- During annual fall SEA site visits to each SIG school, SEA personnel will meet with LEA and school administrators to offer technical assistance and conduct classroom observations;
- During annual spring SEA site visits to each SIG school, SEA personnel will conduct structured interviews with LEA and school administrators and conduct focus groups with teachers, parents, and students. The monitoring protocols developed by USED are used during this process. LEAs and school will receive a written report following these visits that note strengths and challenges.

- School Support Team Leaders (SSTL) make site visits at least quarterly to each SIG school they are working with to document progress toward plan implementation, problem-solve, and provide technical assistance.
- School Support Team Leaders provide and review each quarterly report with LEA and school administrators and submit electronic copies to the SEA through the State's online Tracker system.

If the school is not meeting goals after the first full year of implementation the following procedure will be followed:

- The SEA will support the LEA in conducting a more thorough review of student achievement data;
- An instructional audit will be conducted by external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to focus on the quality of instruction and the fidelity of the implemented curriculum aligned to the Utah Core Standards;
- The LEA will hire external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to assist the LEA and school to revise goals, plans, and strategies to address increased student achievement;
- Quarterly reports on the implementation of the school improvement plan strategies/activities will be submitted by the external consultant to support, monitor, and report the progress being made in the implementation of the intervention model; and
- If the SEA determines that the LEA and school are not making adequate progress in the implementation of the intervention model, the SIG grant for the subsequent year may be reduced or eliminated.

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

The Utah State Office of Education commits to serve all Priority Schools for which the LEA has submitted an approvable application. However, the Utah State Office of Education recognizes that the amount of FY 2014 SIG funds available to the State is limited and therefore, may require that the actual amount allocated for LEA subgrant awards vary from that which has been requested by the LEA. In the event that the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies, the SEA will utilize the scoring rubrics to evaluate the following elements in the application approval process:

- Prioritize LEA SIG applications that have the greatest promise of success in improving low-performing schools based on the LEA's commitment, capacity, and well-defined plans and budgets;
- Prioritize schools with the greatest need based on student achievement over a four year time frame;
- Prioritize based on where the school falls within the lowest 5% of Utah Title I schools;
- Prioritize based on the poverty level of the schools within the LEA;
- Prioritize schools and LEAs with the greatest commitment to fully implement the selected intervention models as defined by the LEA application;
- Prioritize schools that reflect the largest gap between the whole school and subgroup achievement; and
- Prioritize LEAs that demonstrate the commitment to serve, provide technical assistance, and monitor the schools for which it applies.

(5) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

- This is not applicable for Utah.

(6) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable 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.

- This is not applicable for Utah.

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

By submitting this application for new awards, the SEA assures that it will do or has done the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Consult with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in this application.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority or focus school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Award each School Improvement Grant to an LEA based on an individual review of each application and a case-by-case determination of the amount needed to plan for implementation, as applicable, to fully implement a model for three years, and sustain the model, as applicable, rather than make grant awards based on a formula.
- 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, including charter school operators and CMOs, to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- 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.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or CMO 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; amount of each LEA's grant; 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

and focus school, as applicable. An SEA must post all LEA applications, including those of applicants that did not receive awards, as well as applications to serve Tier III schools. Additionally, if an LEA amends an application, the SEA will post the amended application.

Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, seek and obtain approval from the LEA to have the SEA provide the services directly prior to providing services.

Prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, provide all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive School Improvement Grants with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and attach a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments received from LEAs to this application. The SEA also assures that it has provided notice and information regarding the waiver request(s) described below, if applicable, to the public in the manner in which the SEA 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.

USOE sent the survey stated below to all Utah LEA superintendents/charter school leaders, LEA Title I directors, and the Committee of Practitioners on March 9, 2015. Results from the survey were analyzed on April 9, 2015:

“Should the ESEA Federal Programs Section at the Utah State Office of Education apply for a waiver to extend the period of availability of its Federal Fiscal Year 2014 competitive School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) funds through September 30, 2020? Utah will be holding a competitive SIG subgrant application in the fall of 2015 for LEAs that have eligible Title I Priority and Focus schools. Please note: This waiver is NOT related to Utah’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver for accountability purposes. The purpose of this waiver request applies only to FFY 2014 (state fiscal year 2015) competitive SIG 1003(g) funds.”

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Please add any comments:

Results analyzed on April 9, 2015: A total of 113 individuals responded to the survey; 93.88% of respondents replied yes; 6.12% responded no. A total of 8 individuals added the following comments:

I am not a Title I district but if this helps other folks I am for it.

Depends on what strings are attached to it for the next 5 years.

We don't have any SIG schools, so I don't feel qualified to express my opinion.

The flexibility waiver should be for the same period of time.

This will make it so we can help more schools.

As with all federal money, it would be nice to have the 27 months to spend it.

Utah schools needs to improve and any amount counts.

I do not understand how this applies to my program.

**H. 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 (e.g. funding staff positions, supporting statewide support, etc.) that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grants allocation.

The Utah State Office of Education ensures it will not reserve more than 5% of its FY 2014 SIG funds for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities to complete the following:

- Provide state-level administration and oversight for the SIG program;
- Provide state-level technical assistance to LEAs including:
  - Training for the FY 2014 SIG application process;
  - Training for the implementation phase;
  - Conducting Leadership Institutes (e.g. LEA and school administrators, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, special educators, ESL educators);
- Review and approve SIG school improvement plans;
- Monitor SIG budgets and reimbursement requests; and
- Conduct semi-annual site visits to participating schools.

**I. 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.**

[Utah] requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. The SEA 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 and focus schools, as applicable, or will allow any 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.

**Part 1: Waivers Available to All States**

**Waiver 1: Period of availability of FY 2014 funds waiver**

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2014 funds for the purpose of making five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2016, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2014 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2020.

**Part 2: Waivers Available Only to States Not Approved for ESEA Flexibility**

None of the waivers in Part 2 apply to Utah.

**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 2014 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 2014 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: School improvement timeline waiver

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2013 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2014 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

Schools that started implementation of a SIG 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 or Tier II title I participating schools that will fully implement a SIG model beginning in the 2015–2016 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 a SIG model beginning in the 2015–2016 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 and Tier II 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 4: Schoolwide program waiver

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2013 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2014 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

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 or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the seven 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 and Tier II 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.

**PART II: LEA APPLICATION**

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of School Improvement Grant funds to eligible LEAs. SEAs should attach their LEA application.

**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.

Please see Utah’s FY 2014 LEA School Improvement Grant 1003(g) application.

**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 priority and focus school, as applicable, the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each priority and focus school, as applicable.

The models the LEA may include are: (1) turnaround; (2) restart; (3) closure; (4) transformation; (5) evidence-based whole school reform model; and (6) early learning model.

Example (LEAs in an SEA approved for ESEA flexibility):

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY	FOCUS (if applicable) <sup>1</sup>	INTERVENTION
Priority School ES #1	XXXXX	X		Early Learning Model
Priority School HS #1	XXXXX	X		Turnaround
Priority School MS #1	XXXXX	X		Transformation
Priority School ES #2	XXXXX	X		Whole School Reform Model

<sup>2</sup>An LEA in which one or more priority schools are located must serve all of these schools before it may serve one or more focus schools.

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

1. For each priority and focus 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, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
2. For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.

3. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, or early learning model.
4. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority and focus 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 on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.
5. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
6. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.
7. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.
8. The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve (for example, by creating an LEA turnaround office).
9. The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.
10. The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
11. The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.
12. The LEA must describe how it will monitor each priority and focus school that receives school improvement funds including by:
13. An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.
14. For an LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.
15. For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.
16. For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will:
  - a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and

b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.

17. For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.
18. The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA's application.
19. 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.
20. 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.

**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 and focus 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 in each school it proposes to serve and the funds it will use to—

- 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 and focus schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application (SEA's without ESEA flexibility only.)

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, Tier II, priority, or focus 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 budget plan. Additionally, an LEA's budget may include up to one full academic year for planning activities and up to two years to support sustainability activities. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding to serve a single school.

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 and focus schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

**Example: LEA Proposing a Planning Year for One or More Schools**

LEA XX BUDGET						
	Year 1 Budget (Planning)	Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five- Year Total
Priority ES #1	\$150,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,100,000	\$750,000	\$4,356,000
Priority ES #2	\$119,250	\$890,500	\$795,000	\$750,000	\$500,750	\$3,055,500
Priority HS #1	\$300,000	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$650,000	\$5,245,750

Focus MS #1	\$410,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,775,000	\$1,550,400	\$550,000	\$5,755,400
LEA-level Activities			\$150,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$400,000
Total Budget	\$879,250	\$4,812,250	\$5,520,000	\$4,950,400	\$2,550,750	\$18,812,650

**Example: LEA Proposing to Implement a Model in One or More Schools on the First Day of the Upcoming School Year**

LEA XX BUDGET							
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 (Full Implementation)					
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$650,000	\$450,000	\$5,038,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$2,907,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$5,550,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$800,000	\$550,000	\$7,085,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$1,000,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$2,200,000	\$1,500,000	\$21,580,500

Note: An LEA may fill out both charts if it is applying for a planning year for some, but not all, of the schools it proposes to serve.

**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 and focus 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 and focus 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) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- (4) Ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus 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.

**E. WAIVERS: If an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility 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. **NOTE:** Only LEAs in SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility may request the following waivers.

These waivers do not apply to Utah.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a SIG 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 Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014** **School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program**

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2014 SIG funds. If no continuation awards will be made with FY 14 funds, indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

The schools listed below represent Utah’s six Cohort 3 SIG schools. \$1,023,226 from the State’s FY 2014 SIG funds will be used to provide the third year of SIG 1003(g) funding for these six schools.

<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>YEAR SCHOOL BEGAN SIG IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 14 ALLOCATION</b>
Granite	Lincoln Elementary	2014-2015	\$168,871
Granite	Roosevelt Elementary	2014-2015	\$168,871
Salt Lake	Lincoln Elementary	2014-2015	\$238,871
Salt Lake	Meadowlark Elementary	2014-2015	\$238,871
San Juan	Montezuma Creek Elementary	2014-2015	\$103,871
San Juan	Monument Valley High School	2014-2015	\$103,871
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 14:</b>			<b>\$1,023,226</b>

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 date of nonrenewal or termination, description of reason for nonrenewal or termination, amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocating those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction). If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED</b>	<b>AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS</b>
		NA for Utah			
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:</b>					

### School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2014 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2014 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards<sup>3</sup> to its LEAs unless the SEA has an approved new awards application.
- Use the renewal process described in Section II(C) of the final requirements 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 and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- 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 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.
- If the SEA approves any amendments to an LEA application, post the LEA's amended application on the SEA website.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

**For states planning to use FY14 SIG funds for continuation awards only: By submitting the assurances and information above, the SEA agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a FY 2014 SIG application for new awards; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the application for new awards (page 3).**

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 2015–2016 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2014 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.