

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

UTAH LEA Application



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

Each LEA should submit its FY 2014 application to:

Dr. Rebecca Donaldson
ESEA Federal Programs Coordinator
rebecca.donaldson@schools.utah.gov

In addition, the LEA must submit a paper copy of the original cover page signed by the LEA superintendent/charter school director to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

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

Dr. Rebecca S. Donaldson
ESEA Federal Programs Coordinator
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200

Application Deadline

Applications are due no later than 5:00 P.M. on November 20, 2015.

For Further Information

If you have questions about School Improvement Grants (SIG) 1003(g), please contact one of the following members of the USOE ESEA Federal Programs/School Improvement Team: Dr. Rebecca Donaldson (801-538-7869, Rebecca.donaldson@schools.utah.gov), Dr. Max Lang (801-538-7725, max.lang@schools.utah.gov) or Jeff Ojeda (801-538-7945, jeffrey.ojeda@schools.utah.gov).

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of LEA Applicant:	LEA Applicant's Mailing Address:
<p>LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Position and Office:</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address:</p> <p>Telephone:</p> <p>Fax:</p> <p>Email address:</p>	
LEA Superintendent/Charter School Director (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the LEA Superintendent/Charter School Director: X	Date:
<p>The LEA, 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>	

STATE OF UTAH SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT FY 2014

LEA APPLICATION

LEA APPLICATION: REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An LEA may include other information that it deems necessary; however, an LEA is required to respond to each of the following items and bullet points in the exact order in which they appear in this application.

As part of the application process, the LEA is required to present their school improvement (SIG) plan in person. The presenters should include, at a minimum, the LEA Superintendent/Charter School Director or designee, the LEA Title I Director, and the principal(s) of the school(s) included in the application. The school improvement (SIG) plan will be presented to the application reviewers in order to highlight specific aspects of the application, demonstrate the LEA’s capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement all requirements of the specific SIG model(s) selected, and to clarify questions that the reviewers may have regarding the LEA’s SIG plan.

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

An LEA must identify each Priority and Focus school the LEA commits to serve. An LEA must identify the school improvement model that the LEA will use in each Priority and Focus school.

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

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY	FOCUS (if applicable) ¹	INTERVENTION MODEL
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

¹An 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.

The actions listed in Part B of this application are those that an LEA must take *prior* to submitting 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 specific needs each school has identified.

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) must analyze the needs of each Priority and 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 analyze each of the data points listed below to determine the specific SIG intervention model for each school.

- a. Percent of students scoring proficient in Reading/ Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs must consider both overall school and subgroup achievement);
- b. Trend data for both Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs must consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- c. Demographic information relevant to the school's achievement in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics;
- d. Contextual data for the school (attendance, graduation and dropout rates, discipline reports, parent and community surveys);
- e. Teacher information (teacher attendance, turnover rates, teaching assignments aligned with highly qualified teacher status, teacher education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- f. Administrator information (how long the administrator has been at the building, or the replacement of the principal as required in the Turnaround, Transformation, and Early Learning models, administrator education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- g. Effectiveness of instructional programs that have been implemented;
- h. Analysis of family and community needs for each identified school;
- i. Effectiveness of any prior school reform efforts; and
- j. The LEA must provide the rationale for the specific SIG intervention model selected for each school included in the LEA application to demonstrate that the model(s) selected is aligned to the specific needs of individual school(s).

Scoring Rubric – B (1)

The LEA has analyzed the needs of each eligible school identified in the LEA's application and selected a SIG model for each school based on the results of the analyses.

0= provides no data 1=provides limited data 2=provides most data 3=provides all data

The percent of students scoring proficient for Language Arts and Mathematics includes overall school and subgroup achievement.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Trend data for both Language Arts and Mathematics for the overall school and subgroup achievement is included.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Demographic information is complete and includes all relevant data.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Contextual data is complete and includes all relevant data.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Teacher information is complete and includes all relevant data.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Administrator information is complete and includes all relevant data.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Effectiveness of instructional programs that have been implemented.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Analysis of family and community needs for each school site.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Effectiveness of prior school reform efforts is included.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Rationale for the SIG intervention model chosen for each school is included.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/30

- (2) For 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 model.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grants 1003(g) must commit to serve, and demonstrates that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention model through selected activities as appropriate. 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 following are examples of activities to consider:

- Survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community;
- Conduct activities to involve parents and stakeholders in the selection of an intervention model best suited to the specific needs of the school (e.g., hold community meetings);
- Develop the school improvement plan in line with the model selected;
- 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;
- Hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model;
- Establish organized parent groups;
- Conduct community-wide assessment to identify the major factors that significantly affect the academic achievement of students in the school, including an inventory of the resources in the community and the school that could be aligned, integrated, and coordinated to address these challenges.

In addition to family and community input, LEAs must consult with all relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's selection, application, and implementation of the chosen intervention model in its Priority and Focus Schools. LEAs must identify the process through which the LEA will involve:

- a. School administrators;
- b. Teachers;

- c. Parents;
- d. School Community Council (SCC); and
- e. The LEA must 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 for SIG schools).

Scoring Rubric – B (2)

For 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 model.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has identified the process through which it will involve administrators.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which it will involve teachers.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which it will involve parents.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which it will involve the School Community Council (SCC).	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which it will involve the community.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which the local school board will be engaged to ensure successful implementation (including the prioritization or revision of appropriate board policies and allocation of resources).	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/18

- (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.**

The LEA 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. For additional supporting questions to help in the selection of the most appropriate model see Addendum A. LEAs must include the following information in their application:

- a. Describe how the LEA will implement with fidelity each requirement associated with the specific intervention model(s) selected for its eligible schools;
- b. Provide sufficient information describing how the LEA will successfully implement each requirement;
- c. Describe any steps already taken by the LEA to initiate school improvement efforts that align with SIG intervention models; and
- d. Provide a detailed timeline for implementation of the intervention model chosen for each school the LEA intends to serve.
- e. Describe annual SMART goals for the state’s SAGE assessment in Reading/language arts;

- f. Describe annual SMART goals for the state's SAGE assessment in mathematics;
- g. Describe how the LEA will measure progress on the leading indicators;
- h. Describe how the LEA will provide ongoing consultation 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).

Turnaround Model:

If an LEA selects the Turnaround Model, each of the following actions must occur:

- a. Replace the principal
- b. Provide LEA support to the new principal
- c. Grant greater flexibility to the principal (e.g. staffing, calendars, budget)
- d. Locally develop and adopt competencies to screen existing staff
- e. Identify and replace 50% of the existing staff, using locally adopted competencies
- f. Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff
- g. Select and hire new staff
- h. Provide ongoing job-embedded professional development
- i. Adopt a new governance structure
- j. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, and aligned with Utah Core Standards at each grade level
- k. Promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students
- l. Establish a schedule and implement strategies that increase learning time for students
- m. Provide appropriate social/emotional and community oriented services and supports for students
- n. Other permissible strategies (please specify)

Transformational Model:

If an LEA selects the Transformation Model it must ensure that it aligns the family and community engagement programs it implements in the elementary and secondary schools in which it is implementing the transformation model to support common goals for students over time and for the community as a whole.

If an LEA selects the Transformation Model, each of the following actions must occur:

- a. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformational Model if h/she has been the principal at the school more than two years
- b. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems that take into account data on student growth and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement that are fully aligned with Utah's ESEA Flexibility Waiver with regard to principal, teacher and school staff evaluation
- c. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement; remove those who have not done so
- d. Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development
- e. Implement strategies designed to recruit, place, and retain staff (e.g. additional compensation, institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices, etc.)
- f. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned, and aligned with Utah Core Standards at each grade level
- g. Promote the continuous use of student data (formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction (e.g. curriculum review, UMTSS model, additional supports for students with disabilities and English learners)

- h. Provide additional support and professional development to teachers and principal to support students with disabilities and English language learners
- i. Use and integrate appropriate technology-based support and intervention as part of the instructional program
- j. Secondary Schools only: Increase rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (provide multiple opportunities for all students)
- k. Secondary Schools only: Improve student transitions from middle school to high school
- l. Secondary Schools only: Increase graduation rate through a variety of methods
- m. Secondary Schools only: Establish early warning systems to identify students at-risk of failing to graduate
- n. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time
- o. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement (e.g. partnerships with parents and community to create safe schools; extended or restructured school day; approaches to improve climate and school discipline; full day kindergarten; or pre-kindergarten)
- p. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (e.g. staffing, calendar/time, budgeting, new governance arrangement, weighted per pupil budget formula)
- q. Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance from the LEA, SEA, or external consultant organization

Restart Model:

If an LEA selects the Restart Model, each of the following actions must occur:

- a. Develop, communicate, and implement the decision-making process for selecting the Restart Model
- b. Develop and implement a rigorous review process for selecting: charter school operator; charter school management organization (CMO); and/or educational management organization (EMO)
- c. Develop and implement a process for monitoring and evaluating the Restart Model to ensure that it serves and benefits students
- d. Other strategies (please specify)

Closure Model:

If an LEA selects the Closure Model, each of the following actions must occur:

- a. Develop and implement a process for ensuring that all students are accommodated at higher-achieving schools
- b. Develop and implement a communication plan to inform parents and the community about the Closure Model
- c. Provide support for students who are transitioning to new schools (e.g. transportation, class assignments, etc.)
- d. Other strategies (please specify)

Early Learning Model

If an LEA selects the Early Learning Model, it must implement each of the following early learning strategies:

- a. Offer full-day kindergarten for all kindergarten students
- b. Establish or expand a high-quality preschool program as defined in these requirements (Please see definition of "high-quality preschool program" in Addendum B).

- c. Provide educators, including preschool teachers, with time for joint planning across grades to facilitate effective teaching and learning and positive teacher-student interactions
- d. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the early learning model
- e. Implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation and support systems for teachers and principals, designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement, that is required under the Transformation Model that is aligned with Utah's ESEA Flexibility Waiver
- f. Use the teacher and principal evaluation and support system to identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so
- g. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the school, taking into consideration the results from the teacher and principal evaluation and support system, if applicable
- h. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that:
 - o Is research-based, developmentally appropriate, and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State early learning and development standards and State academic standards; and
 - o In the early grades, promotes the full range of academic content across domains of development, including math and science, language and literacy, socio-emotional skills, self-regulation, and executive functions
- i. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the educational and developmental needs of individual students, and
- j. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development such as coaching and mentoring (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to implement successfully school reform strategies.

Whole School Reform Model

Under the final SIG requirements published in the National Federal Register (NFR) on February 9, 2015 (80 FR 7224), an evidence-based whole-school reform model must meet 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 that 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.

The Utah State Office of Education will provide LEAs with a list of whole-school-reform models that have been vetted by the U. S. Department of Education. The list may be accessed at this website:

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigevidencebased/index.html>

Scoring Rubric B (3)

Based on the analysis of the data, select, design, and implement the interventions consistent with the final federal requirements for the chosen turnaround model.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

Describe how the LEA will implement with fidelity each of the requirements associated with the intervention model(s) selected its eligible schools.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Provide sufficient information describing how the LEA will successfully implement each requirement.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Describe any steps already taken by the LEA to initiate school improvement efforts that align with SIG intervention models.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Provides a detailed timeline for implementation of the school intervention model chosen for each school the LEA intends to serve.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Describe annual SMART goals for the state's SAGE assessments in Reading/language arts	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Describe annual SMART goals for the state's SAGE assessments in mathematics	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Describe how the LEA will measure progress on the leading indicators	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Describe how the LEA will provide ongoing consultation 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)	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/24

- (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.**

The LEA has identified how it will provide adequate leadership, resources, and support to each Priority and Focus School identified in the LEA's application. The description must include the following information on how the LEA will fully and effectively implement each requirement of the chosen school intervention model:

- a. Identify the specific LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model;
- b. Identify the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts; and
- c. Identify the fiscal resources (state, local, and federal) that the LEA will commit to ensure full and effective implementation of the specific intervention model chosen.
- d. If the LEA is not applying to serve each Priority School, the LEA must explain why it lacks the capacity to serve each of its Priority schools.

Scoring Rubric – B (4)

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

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has identified LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school improvement model.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Identify the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts;	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the fiscal resources (local, state, and federal) that will be committed to ensure full implementation.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
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.	Applicable to this applicant and has been addressed: Yes No Comments:

Score: ____/9

- (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.**

In conducting its 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 selecting external providers, the LEA must take into account the specific needs of the Priority School(s) to be served. The LEA must describe the alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services.

Only those LEA SIG applications that meet the external provider selection process criteria listed below will be approvable. Therefore, the LEA must provide the following information in its application for SIG funding:

- a. Detailed and relevant criteria for determining the need for external provider contracts based on the analysis of the LEA's internal capacity to support full implementation of the selected model(s) and operational needs;
- b. 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;
- c. Selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the school(s) to be served;
- d. Screening external providers to ensure the provider can meet the specific needs of the school(s) to be served;
- e. Screening 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;
- f. Selecting a provider that has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and student populations. For example, success in working with comprehensive urban high schools or with schools that serve English learners;
- g. Requiring a potential external provider to demonstrate its competencies through interviews and documentation;
- h. Requiring the provider to demonstrate that its strategies are evidence-based;
- i. Requiring the provider to demonstrate that it has the capacity to assist the school in fully implementing the strategies it is proposing;
- j. Alignment between the services provided by the external provider with existing LEA services;
- k. Clearly identifying the individual responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA;
- l. Initiating a contract with an external provider;
- m. Specifying how the LEA will hold the provider accountable to high performance standards;
- n. If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success and describe the expected services that the contractor will provide;
- o. A narrative description to support external provider contracts, if applicable; and
- p. 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. A list of approved School Support Team Leaders is available upon request of USOE staff and/or at the following link:

<https://dmi.schools.utah.gov/Tracker/LEA/Application/SstApplicationSearch.aspx>

Scoring Rubric – B (5)

In conducting its rigorous review process or 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

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

Detailed and relevant criteria for determining the need for external provider contracts based on the analysis of the LEA's internal capacity to support full implementation of the selected model(s) and operational needs

Rating: 0 1 2 3

Comments:

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	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the school(s) to be served	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Screening external providers to ensure the provider can meet the specific needs of the school(s) to be served	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Screening 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	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Selecting a provider that has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and student populations. For example, success in working with comprehensive urban high schools or with schools that serve English learners	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Requiring a potential external provider to demonstrate its competencies through interviews and documentation	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Requiring the provider to demonstrate that its strategies are evidence-based	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Requiring the provider to demonstrate that it has the capacity to assist the school in fully implementing the strategies it is proposing	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Alignment between the services provided by the external provider with existing LEA services	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Clearly identifying the individual responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Initiating a contract with an external provider	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Specifying how the LEA will hold the provider accountable to high performance standards	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success and describe the expected services that the contractor will provide	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
A narrative description to support external provider contracts, if applicable	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

The LEA will use an experienced School Support Team Leader who is external to the LEA.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Score: ____/48	
<p>(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.</p>	
<p>The LEA SIG 1003(g) Application must demonstrate that the LEA has committed other local, state, and federal resources to support successful implementation of the intervention model. A competitive LEA SIG application must include the following information:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A list of the financial resources that will support the intervention model (e.g. local, state, federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate); b. 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 c. A description of how LEA program personnel will collaborate to support student achievement and school reform (e.g. 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, and any other program personnel deemed necessary to meet the specific needs of each school included in the LEA's SIG application). 	
<p>Scoring Rubric – B (6) The LEA has described the actions it has taken, or will to take, to align other resources with the selected intervention.</p>	
<p>0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale</p>	
A list of the financial resources that will support the intervention model (e.g. local, state, federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate)	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
A description of how each of the financial resources listed above will support the goals of the school reform effort in the improvement plan	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
A description of how LEA program personnel will collaborate to support student achievement and school reform (e.g. 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, and any other program personnel deemed necessary to meet the specific needs of each school included in the LEA's SIG application).	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Score: ____/9	
<p>(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.</p>	

The LEA SIG Application must demonstrate that the LEA has identified potential practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation of intervention strategies. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable the full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model. Competitive applications must include the following:

- a. A list of practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation;
- b. Proposed steps to modify identified practices and/or policies to minimize barriers;
- c. A procedure is in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies; and
- d. Description of how the LEA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement necessary changes (e.g. associations, administrators, local board of education).

Scoring Rubric – B (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.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

A list of practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Proposed steps to modify identified practices and/or policies to minimize barriers	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
A procedure in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Description of how the LEA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement necessary changes (e.g. associations, administrators, local board of education).	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/12

- (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).**

The LEA must identify how it will provide adequate and ongoing oversight, technical assistance, and support to each Priority and Focus School identified in the LEA’s application to ensure full and effective implementation of the intervention model chosen. The description must include the following information on how the LEA will successfully implement and support full and effective implementation of the school intervention model in each school:

- a. Specify how the LEA will provide leadership and support to each school identified in the application;
- b. Identify the specific LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model and the role each of these staff members will have in relation to the SIG processes;

- c. Identify the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts;
- d. Describe how the LEA will provide ongoing technical assistance to make sure each school is successful; and
- e. Describe how the LEA will collaborate with an experienced, USOE-approved School Support Team Leader to support school turnaround.

Scoring Rubric – B (8)

The LEA has described how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has specified how it will provide leadership and support to each school identified in the application.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model and the role each of these staff members will have in relation to the SIG processes.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has described how it will provide ongoing technical assistance to make sure each school is successful.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Describe how the LEA will collaborate with an experienced, USOE-approved School Support Team Leader to support school turnaround	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/15

(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.

The state of Utah requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grants 1003(g) must commit to serve, and demonstrates how it will provide multiple opportunities for meaningful family and community engagement in the ongoing 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 parents and the community in the top 5 languages of the school(s) as counted from the Home Language Survey.

An LEA must include information in the SIG application about how it 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;

- Periodic surveys of students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community;
- Ongoing communication with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, school 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 regarding their choices of other schools; or
- Hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for parents of students who will be attending a new school.

In addition to family and community input, LEAs must consult with all relevant stakeholders regarding the implementation of the chosen intervention model in its Priority Schools on an ongoing basis. Identify the process through which the LEA will continue to involve:

- Family and community;
- School administrators;
- Teachers; and
- Local school board.

Scoring Rubric – B (9)

The LEA has described how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has demonstrated that it has taken into consideration family and community input in the implementation of the selected intervention model through selected activities as appropriate	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has described the ongoing family and community involvement strategies to be implemented to provide opportunities for parents, family, and community members to be meaningfully engaged in the turnaround process	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which it will meaningfully engage administrators.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which it will meaningfully engage teachers.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified the process through which the local school board will be engaged to ensure successful implementation (including the prioritization.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/15

(10) The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has a comprehensive plan to sustain the improvements achieved through the SIG process when the grant funding period ends. Competitive applications must include the following:

- a. A list of the ongoing supports needed to sustain school improvement after the funding period ends;
- b. A description of how LEA staff will continue to collaborate to support the continued school improvement process in identified schools (e.g., curriculum coordinators for reading/language arts, mathematics, assessment, Title I, Title III/ESL, special education, Indian Education, early childhood, counseling, professional development, gifted/talented, migrant, and any other program personnel deem necessary to meet the specific needs of each school included in the LEA's SIG application).
- c. A description of the anticipated local, state, and/or federal resources that will be committed to meet the needs identified above and support continued implementation of the model(s) chosen;
- d. 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
- e. 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.

Scoring Rubric – B (10)

The LEA, with support of the local board of education, has plans for how the reforms will be sustained after the funding period ends.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA includes a list of the ongoing supports needed to sustain school improvement after the funding period ends.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA includes a description of how LEA staff will continue to collaborate to support continued school improvement process in identified schools.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA describes and enumerates the anticipated resources that will be committed to meet the needs identified above.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA included a written assurance from the 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.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA included a written assurance from the local school board that it will continue to support the implementation and refinement of the intervention model(s) described in the LEA application.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: ____/15

(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.

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:

- a. Research cited by the LEA that shows the evidence-based strategy meets What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards with or without reservations (i.e., are qualifying experimental or quasi-experimental studies);
- b. 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
- 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).

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

- d. 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;
- e. 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
- f. 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:

- g. Sheltered Instruction as a part of Tier I instruction; and
- h. 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 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 System of Supports (MTSS)
- Extended or full-day kindergarten
- High-quality Pre-K

Scoring Rubric – B (11)

The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SI intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

Research is cited that shows the strategy meets What Works Clearinghouse standards.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Results had statistically significant favorable impact on student achievement/outcomes.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
If meeting WWC standards with reservations, includes a large sample size and multi-site sample.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
LEA has selected strategies based on school appraisal results.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
LEA ensures effective Tier I instruction is provided for all students in Reading/language arts and mathematics based on Utah Core Standards.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

LEA considered student performance data on SAGE for ELA and math disaggregated by subgroups.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Evidence-based strategy has evidence of success in schools with similar demographics and settings.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Sheltered instruction as part of Tier I instruction has been addressed by LEA.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
English Language Proficiency standards used to meet student needs have been addressed.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score ___/27

(12) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each priority and focus school that receives school improvement funds.

The LEA must describe how it will monitor each school that receives SIG 1003(g) funds to ensure full and effective implementation of each requirement of the chosen school intervention model, progress in meeting the annual goals for student achievement on the State's annual assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and the leading indicators (see Addendum C), and how the LEA will assist the school in making necessary changes if results do not improve.

- a. Describe how annual SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic/rigorous, and time-based) goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in reading/language arts will be monitored (e.g., rigorous formative and interim assessments, structured teacher planning and collaboration based on student needs, etc.);
- b. Describe how annual SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic/rigorous, and time-based) goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in mathematics will be monitored (e.g., rigorous formative and interim assessments, structured teacher planning and collaboration based on student needs, etc.);
- c. Describe how the LEA will measure progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements. (See Addendum C for a list of the leading indicators).
- f. Describe how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of the reform strategies being implemented;
- g. Describe how the LEA will monitor student achievement by individual teacher/classrooms;
- h. Describe the frequency and format of LEA monitoring;
- i. 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 monitoring required strategies needed);
- j. If student achievement results do not meet expected goals, describe how the LEA will assist the school in identifying and implementing strategies to improve outcomes (e.g., root cause analysis, development of targeted and specific 90-day plans, etc.).

Scoring Rubric – B (12)

The LEA must describe how it will monitor each priority and focus school that receives school improvement funds including by:

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has described how annual SMART goals on the state's assessment in reading/language arts will be monitored.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has described how annual SMART goals on the state's assessment in mathematics will be monitored.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA describes how it will measure progress on the leading indicators as defined in Addendum C.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has described how it will evaluate the effectiveness of the reform strategies being implemented.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has described how it will monitor student achievement by individual teacher/classrooms.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The frequency and format of LEA monitoring has been described.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has described the monitoring strategies it will use to monitor the implementation of each requirement of the selected intervention model.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
In the event that student achievement results do not meet expected goals, the LEA has described how it will assist the school in identifying and implementing strategies to improve outcomes.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

Score: _____/24

(13) An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, *if applicable*.

Beyond screening external providers prior to selection and including clear expectations in the provider's contract, an LEA must also review the performance of external providers regularly throughout the contract period to ensure that they are on track to meet the LEA's expectations. The LEA should continue to make expectations clear by including specific provisions in the signed memorandum of understanding (MOU), contract, or other agreement to hold the provider accountable for achieving the LEA's desired outcomes.

LEAs should make expectations clear by establishing measures against which the performance of the external provider will be assessed and developing, together with the selected provider, targets for these measures. Meaningful measures will address the progress of the provider in meeting specific contractual obligations as well as the provider's general contribution to the effort to reform the targeted school. For example, the measures for a restart model school operator could examine such factors as the school's academic achievement, student attendance, and parent and community engagement.

The Utah State Office of Education requires LEAs that plan to work with a charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or any other external provider to address the following in the application for a school improvement

grant 1003(g). The following should be considered the minimum requirements and we encourage LEAs to ensure the MOU helps meet all the needs intended.

- a. LEAs should request that the external provider prepare quarterly reports or briefings for the LEA that detail the provider's activities during that period and its progress toward achieving the outcomes for which it was hired (or its progress on the performance measures).
- b. The LEA might also conduct interim or formative assessments throughout the contract period to inform contract renewal decisions. LEAs are strongly encouraged to specify the type of ongoing review process it intends to use within the MOU, contract, or other agreement.
- c. The MOU, contract, or other agreement should also include a provision that would relieve the external provider of its duties should it not meet the performance targets, which would be reviewed on a yearly or more frequent basis.
- d. If an LEA wishes to contract with a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO to implement the restart model, it must select that charter school operator, CMO, or EMO through a "rigorous review process" that permits an LEA to examine a prospective provider's reform plans and strategies.
- e. If the LEA is partnering with a charter school operator or CMO to convert a school to a charter school under the restart model, the LEA should ensure that its MOU, contract, or other agreement with the provider is consistent with the terms and conditions of the performance contract between the charter school and its authorizer if the authorizer is an agency other than the LEA.

Scoring Rubric – B (13)

The LEA has demonstrated how it will hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting the outlined requirements, if applicable.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has requested that the external provider prepare quarterly reports or briefings that detail the provider's activities during that period and its progress toward achieving the outcomes for which it was hired.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA will conduct interim or formative assessments throughout the contract period to inform contract renewal decisions.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The MOU, contract, or other agreement also includes a provision that would relieve the external provider of its duties should it not meet the performance targets, which would be reviewed on a yearly or more frequent basis.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
If the LEA has contracted with a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO to implement the restart model, it has selected that charter school operator, CMO, or EMO through a "rigorous review process" that permits the LEA to examine a prospective provider's reform plans and strategies.	Rating: yes no Comments: Optional restart only
If the LEA is partnering with a charter school operator or CMO to convert a school to a charter school under the restart model, the LEA has ensured that its MOU,	Rating: yes no Comments:

contract, or other agreement with the provider is consistent with the terms and conditions of the performance contract between the charter school and its authorizer if the authorizer is an agency other than the LEA.

Optional restart only

Score: ____/9

- (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.**

The Utah State Office of Education requires LEAs that intend to use the first year of its SIG 1003(g) grant to engage in planning and/or pre-implementation activities for an eligible school to include a description of the specific activities to be implemented, the timeline for implementing those activities, and the rationale for how those activities will lead to the successful full implementation of the selected intervention model on the first day of school the first year of full implementation of the intervention model. The focus of all planning/pre-implementation activities must be the direct relationship of the activity to the specific needs of the individual school as identified through a school appraisal and the intervention model chosen for the school.

USOE will ensure that all activities proposed by the LEA receiving the SIG award are allowable expenditures designed 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 planning and 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.

- **Family and Community Engagement:**

The LEA must keep in mind that parents and community should receive these in their primary language when necessary and when most efficient for participants:

- 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, screen, 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 intervention and enrichment to students in schools that will implement a school improvement 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;
 - Compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, aligning curriculum to State standards and vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising common formative 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;
 - 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;
 - Develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.
- **Other Allowable Activities to be described by the LEA**

"Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2016-2017 school year.

Scoring Rubric – B (14)

The LEA has designed approvable planning and pre-implementation activities to assist the school(s) in preparing for full implementation when the 2016-2017 school year begins. The focus of the activity must be its direct relationship to the needs of the school and the selected intervention model.

These activities, while optional, are highly recommended during the planning and pre-implementation phase. LEAs that include plans for at these options may receive up to 10 Bonus Points.

Description and costs associated with family and community engagement activities.	1 point possible Comments:
Description and costs associated with rigorous review of external providers.	1 point possible Comments:
Description and costs associated with staffing.	1 point possible Comments:

Description and costs associated with instructional programs.	1 point possible Comments:
Description and costs associated with professional development and support.	1 point possible Comments:
Description and costs associated with preparation for accountability measures.	1 point possible Comments:
Description and costs associated with other allowable activities.	1 point possible Comments:
LEA has described how planning and pre-implementation activities will lead to successful implementation of the chosen model.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
<p>Bonus Points Awarded: _____/10</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>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 must describe 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of the specific element of either the Turnaround or Transformation model that the LEA proposes to modify; LEA's rationale for the need to modify the element identified; LEA must describe 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Scoring Rubric – B (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.</p>	
Identification of the specific element of either the Turnaround or Transformation model that the LEA proposes to modify.	Rating: yes no Comments:

LEA's rationale for the need to modify the element identified.	Rating: yes no Comments:
Description of how the LEA will still be able to meet the intent and purpose of that element to successfully implement the Turnaround or Transformation model.	Rating: yes no Comments:

(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.

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) on February 9, 2015 (80 FR 7224). 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 that 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:

- a. 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
- b. Evidence of successful implementation in a school setting similar to that of the school to be served.

A list of approved Whole School Reform Models may be found at the following U. S. Department of Education website: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigevidencebased/index.html>

Scoring Rubric – B (16)

For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA has described how it will:

LEA selected a model approved by the U. S. Department of Education that meets all three of the What Works Clearinghouse criteria.	Rating: yes no Comments:
Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample student population and setting similar to the population and setting of the school to be served.	Rating: yes no Comments:
Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.	Rating: yes no Comments:

- (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.

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 to implement the restart model, 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:

- a. Researching and prioritizing CMOs or EMOs available to serve the school;
- b. Contacting other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the CMO or EMO regarding the provider's effectiveness;
- c. The CMO/EMO 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;
- d. Describing the specific aspects of the CMO/EMO's past performance/record of success;
- e. Screening CMO/EMO's to ensure that the provider with which it contracts has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the targeted school;
- f. Requiring a potential CMO/EMO to demonstrate its competencies through in-depth interviews and documentation;
- g. Requiring the CMO/EMO to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based;
- h. Requiring the CMO/EMO to demonstrate that it has the capacity to successfully implement the strategies it is proposing;
- i. Checking references of the CMO/EMO before entering into a contract with the provider;
- j. Initiating a contract with an external provider;
- k. If the LEA has already selected a CMO/EMO, the LEA must provide evidence that the provider has a demonstrated record of success with similar schools and describe the specific services that the contractor will provide;
- l. The LEA must include a narrative description to support CMO/EMO contracts, if applicable;
- m. 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;
- n. 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>
- o. The responsibilities of the CMO/EMO and the LEA are aligned and clearly defined;
- p. The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the CMO/EMO accountable to high performance standards;
- q. The capacity of the CMO/EMO to serve the specific needs of the identified school(s) has been clearly demonstrated; and
- r. The LEA must describe the reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen CMO/EMOs to be in place in time to open the 2016-2017 school year.

Scoring Rubric – B (17)

For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model with a CMO or EMO in one or more eligible schools, the LEA has described how:	
The LEA has researched and prioritized CMO/EMO available to serve the school	Rating: yes no Comments:
Contacted other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the CMO/EMO regarding effectiveness	Rating: yes no Comments:
The CMO/EMO identified has 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.	Rating: yes no Comments:
The LEA has described the specific aspects of the CMO/EMO provider's past performance/record of success	Rating: yes no Comments:
Screen CMO/EMOs to ensure that the provider with which it contracts has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the targeted school	Rating: yes no Comments:
Require a potential CMO/EMO to demonstrate its competencies through in-depth interviews and documentation	Rating: yes no Comments:
Require the CMO/EMO to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based	Rating: yes no Comments:
Require the CMO/EMO to demonstrate it has the capacity to successfully implement the strategies it is proposing	Rating: yes no Comments:
Check references of the CMO/EMO before entering into a contract with the provider	Rating: yes no Comments:
Initiate a contract with a CMO/EMO	Rating: yes no Comments:
If the LEA has already selected a CMO/EMO, 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	Rating: yes no Comments:
The LEA must include a narrative description to support CMO/EMO contracts, if applicable	Rating: yes no Comments:
The LEA will 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	Rating: yes no Comments:

The responsibilities of the CMO/EMO and the LEA are aligned and clearly defined	Rating: yes no Comments:
The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the CMO/EMO accountable to high performance standards	Rating: yes no Comments:
The capacity of the CMO/EMO to serve the specific needs of the identified school(s) has been clearly demonstrated	Rating: yes no Comments:

(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.

The Utah State Office of Education requires that LEAs include a detailed timeline that indicates when and how each of the requirements of the selected school intervention model will be implemented. Individuals or groups of people who are responsible for each requirement must be identified (e.g., LEA Superintendent, principal, instructional coach, teachers, parent liaison, curriculum director, LEA transportation department, etc.). Please include a table such as the following by adding rows as needed for each required element of the specific model chosen:

Model Requirement	Objective	Evidence and Data Sources	Activities	Responsibility	Milestones (Dates)

If the LEA chooses to engage in planning/pre-implementation activities, then the following requirements apply in addition to those listed above:

- a. Dependent upon the selected school improvement model, the LEA must include a description of proposed planning/pre-implementation year activities;
- b. The time-line for implementing planning/pre-implementation activities; and
- c. A description of how each of the proposed planning/pre-implementation activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention model.

Scoring Rubric – B (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.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale

The LEA has included a table that includes each required element of the intervention model selected.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified who is responsible to ensure each required element is implemented.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has identified dates when activities related to each required element will be implemented.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:

The LEA has identified evidence and data sources to be collected to ensure the full implementation of each required element.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has included a description of the planning year activities related to the selected school improvement model. (Optional)	Rating: yes no Comments:
The LEA has included a time-line for implementing planning/pre-implementation activities. (Optional)	Rating: yes no Comments:
The LEA has provided a description of how each of the proposed planning/pre-implementation activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention model. (Optional)	Rating: yes no Comments:

Score: ____/12

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 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 the following 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 and necessary to ensure the 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.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Priority and Focus School it commits to serve. NOTE: The amount of funds applied for must include a planned budget for each year of the three full years of implementation of the grant.

The LEA may apply for a minimum of \$50,000 per year per school for each of the three years of full implementation of the SIG grant (\$150,000 minimum for 3 years) 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.

The LEA budget included in the SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and full and effective implementation of each of the chosen school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets must include the following:

- a. The LEA provides a budget for each Priority and Focus school included in the LEA SIG application for the three years of full implementation of the selected model;
- b. 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);
- c. If the LEA plans to apply for SIG funds to support LEA efforts, the budget includes all costs associated with LEA leadership and support of the selected school intervention model(s);
- d. The LEA budget includes costs for purchased professional services to ensure high-quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform to support the specific needs of the school;
- e. The budget detail provides sufficient information to support all budget requests; and
- f. The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation annually.

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 Priority or Focus school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the planning/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 Priority and Focus schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000. NOTE: Funds awarded for approved LEA SIG applications will be determined by the amount of FY14 SIG funding available for subgrants at the Utah State Office of Education.

Example 1: 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 2: 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)					
PriorityES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$650,000	\$450,000	\$5,038,000
PriorityES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$2,907,500
PriorityMS#1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$5,550,000
PriorityHS #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.

Budget Information (C)

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.

0= provides no information 1=provides limited information 2=provides most information 3=provides all information and rationale	
The LEA provides a budget for each of the three years of full implementation of the grant for each Priority School included in the SIG application. The LEA must include a budget of no less than \$50,000 per school per year and no more than \$2 million dollars per year per school or no more than \$6 million per school over three years.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
For each school included in the SIG application, the budget provides 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, etc.)	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
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 school intervention models.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA budget includes costs for purchased professional services to ensure quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform to support the specific needs of the school.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Budget details provide sufficient information to support budget requests.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation.	Rating: 0 1 2 3 Comments:
Score____/18	
D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.	
The LEA must assure that it will—	
<input type="checkbox"/> Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Priority and Focus School that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements. <input type="checkbox"/> 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 Priority School that it serves with school improvement funds. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that 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.	
Utah State Office of Education required assurance:	

- Conduct a school appraisal using the USOE Title I System of Support Handbook tools. This appraisal must be conducted by an experienced School Support Team leader who is external to the LEA. A list of approved School Support Team Leaders is available upon request of USOE staff.

Addendum A

Questions to Assist LEAs in Selecting an Appropriate SIG Intervention Model

The purpose of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) is to ensure the success of students in under-performing schools. The underlying process for determining which model would work best for any given student population is best decided when the LEA personnel work closely together to determine and meet the needs and demands in instruction and school culture in conjunction with the school site administration and staff. We encourage this to be an open conversation and discussion in order to involve all stakeholders in meeting the needs of their students. To this end, the following is meant to assist LEAs in determining which model may work best for a particular school's situation. The purpose is to identify the model that will best support systemic and sustainable change needed to turn the school around for students' success.

6 Intervention Models

1. Turnaround Model – replacement of the principal and 50% of staff and other requirements
 - a. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
 - b. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
 - c. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
 - d. How will staff replacement be executed – what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
 - e. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
 - f. What supports will be provided to the staff being assigned to other schools?
 - g. What are the budgetary implications of retaining a surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
 - h. What is the LEAs own intervention and implementation capacity to execute and support turnaround? What organizations can assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
 - i. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-activity flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
 - j. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

2. Restart Model – Close the school and reopen it as a charter school or school administered by an Education Management Organization (EMO) or Charter Management Organization (CMO)
 - a. Are there qualified charter management organizations (CMOs) or education management organizations (EMOs) willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school to a charter school) in this location?

- b. Will qualified community groups initiate a home-grown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
 - c. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served – home grown charter, CMO, or EMO?
 - d. How can statutory, policy and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
 - e. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
 - f. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
 - g. What is the LEA’s own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
 - h. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
 - i. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO or EMO?
 - j. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?
3. Closure Model – close the school and assign students to other, higher-performing schools
- a. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
 - b. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and are readily transparent to the local community?
 - c. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
 - d. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive the students from the schools being considered for closure?
 - e. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
 - f. How will current staff be reassigned? What is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
 - g. Does the statutory, policy and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
 - h. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff are reassigned?
 - i. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
 - j. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
 - k. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
 - l. What is the impact of school closure to the school’s neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
 - m. How does school closure fit within the LEA’s overall reform efforts?

4. Transformation Model - replace the principal and implement turnaround principles. Align the teacher and leader evaluation system with the criteria in the ESEA flexibility guidance
 - a. How will the LEA select a new leader for the schools, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
 - b. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
 - c. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
 - d. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
 - e. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought and sustained?

5. New to this application – Evidence-Based, Whole-School Reform Strategy – Implemented by the LEA in partnership with a strategy developer)
 - a. What are the conditions of the contractual arrangement between the LEA and the strategy developer?
 - b. Is that strategy developer also the Lead Partner, or does a third-party serve in that capacity?
 - c. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
 - d. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
 - e. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
 - f. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
 - g. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought and sustained?

6. New to this application – Early Learning Model – requires full-day kindergarten, creation or expansion of a high-quality preschool program, cross-grade instructional planning time that includes preschool teachers, replacement of the principal, and implementation of practices school-wide
 - a. Is full-day kindergarten already in place, and if not will the LEA be able to sustain the cost of full-day kindergarten beyond the SIG funding?
 - b. Is a preschool program in place or will it be newly created? If it will be newly created, what structure will best fit the community needs?
 - c. What is required to bring the preschool program to the status of a high-quality program?
 - d. How will the cross-grade, joint planning time be organized and scheduled?
 - e. Will the LEA be able to sustain the cost (if any) of the planning time beyond the SIG funding?

- f. What are the expectations, including work products, of teachers from their joint planning time?
- g. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
- h. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
- i. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
- j. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
- k. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought and sustained?

Addendum B

Definition of High-quality Preschool Program

What is the definition of “high-quality preschool program” as that term is used in the discussion of an early learning model?

A “high-quality preschool program” means an early learning program that includes structural elements that are evidence-based and nationally recognized as important for ensuring program quality, including at a minimum:

- (1) High staff qualifications, including a teacher with a bachelor’s degree in early childhood education or a bachelor’s degree in any field with a State-approved alternate pathway, which may include coursework, clinical practice, and evidence of knowledge of content and pedagogy relating to early childhood, and teaching assistants with appropriate credentials;
- (2) High-quality professional development for all staff;
- (3) A child-to-instructional staff ratio of no more than 10 to 1;
- (4) A class size of no more than 20 with, at a minimum, one teacher with high staff qualifications;
- (5) A full-day program;
- (6) Inclusion of children with disabilities to ensure access to and full participation in all opportunities;
- (7) Developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula, and learning environments that are aligned with the State early learning and development standards, for at least the year prior to kindergarten entry;
- (8) Individualized accommodations and supports so that all children can access and participate fully in learning activities;
- (9) Instructional staff salaries that are comparable to the salaries of local K-12 instructional staff;
- (10) Program evaluation to ensure continuous improvement;
- (11) On-site or accessible comprehensive services for children and community partnerships that promote families’ access to services that support their children’s learning and development; and
- (12) Evidence-based health and safety standards.

Addendum C

What are the leading indicators that will be used to hold schools receiving SIG funds accountable?

The following metrics constitute the leading indicators for the SIG program:

- (1) Number of minutes within the school year;
- (2) Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- (3) Dropout rate;
- (4) Student attendance rate;
- (5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high school, or dual enrollment classes;
- (6) Discipline incidents;
- (7) Chronic absenteeism rates;
- (8) Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation and support system; and
- (9) Teacher attendance rate.