

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2012 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name:

New York State



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

OMB Number: _____

Expiration Date: _____

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have

any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

DRAFT

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

States that have received approval of their ESEA flexibility request will not be required to maintain a separate list of Tier I and Tier II schools. Under this flexibility, an LEA is eligible to apply for SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models defined in the SIG final requirements in a priority school even if that school is not in improvement and thus the LEA would not otherwise be eligible to receive SIG funds for the school. An SEA approved to implement this flexibility may award SIG funds above the amount needed for SIG continuation awards to an LEA with Priority schools according to the rules that apply to Tier I and Tier II schools under the SIG final requirements.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012, provided \$535 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2012.

FY 2012 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2013.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2012 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2012 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2012 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2012–2013 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2012 funds or any remaining FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011 funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions. The U.S. Department of Education will not require those SEAs that will use FY 2012 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. Rather, such an SEA is required to submit an assurance that it is not making new awards, as defined above, through the separate application titled, “Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2012 SIG Program”.

An SEA that must submit a FY 2012 application will be required to update its timeline for making awards to LEAs, but may retain all other sections from its FY 2010 application, including its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools and priority schools.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2012 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2012 application to the following address: OST.OESE@ED.GOV

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before January 18, 2013.

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Legal Name of Applicant:</p> <p>New York State Education Department</p> | <p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p> <p>89 Washington Avenue Albany, NY 12234</p> |
| <p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Sally Bachofer</p> <p>Position and Office: Assistant Commissioner for School Innovation Contact's Mailing Address:</p> <p>Office of School Innovation 475 Education Building Annex 89 Washington Avenue Albany, NY 12234</p> <p>Telephone: 518.474.4817</p> <p>Fax: 518.474.7558</p> <p>Email address: sbachofe@mail.nysed.gov</p> | |
| <p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. John B. King Jr.</p> | <p>Telephone:</p> |
| <p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: Donald Juron, Chief Financial Officer, Signing for Chief State School Officer</p> <p>X</p> | <p>Date:</p> |
| <p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p> | |

FY 2012 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Please use this checklist to indicate the changes the SEA elects to make to its FY 2012 application from its FY 2011 application. An SEA will be required to update Section D (Part 1): Timeline, but will have the option to retain all other sections from its FY 2011 application, including its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS | <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to keep the same definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to revise its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) for FY 2012 |
| | <i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects not to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists | <i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA is substituting the PLA list with its list of priority schools (please see Waiver 4 in Section H of SEA application) |
| SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA | <input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 |
| SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA | <input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 |
| SECTION C: CAPACITY | <input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 |
| SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 | |
| SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION | <input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 |
| SECTION E: SEA RESERVATION | <input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 |
| SECTION F: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation with stakeholders provided | |
| SECTION G: WAIVERS | <input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012 |

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its FY 2012 application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA will be required to update its timeline, but may retain all other sections from its FY 2011 application, including its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools.

| SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2011 | <input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2012 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA is substituting the PLA list with its list of priority schools (please see Waiver 4 in Section G of SEA application) |
| <p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. The SEA elects not to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. The SEA does not need to submit a new list for the FY 2012 application. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below. | <p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA has generated a PLA list in accordance with their ESEA Flexibility request. List submitted below. |

Directions: An SEA that elects to generate new lists or must generate new lists of Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” must attach a table to its SIG application that include its lists of all Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for new awards.¹ An SEA that will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools does not need to submit a new list for the FY 2012 application.

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

Note: NYSED is submitting a list of eligible Priority Schools in Excel as a separate attachment, which is being sent with this application.

¹ A “new award” is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2012–2013 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2012 funds or any remaining FY 2009, FY 2010 or FY 2011 funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

| SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2012 SIG FUNDS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| LEA NAME | LEA NCES ID # | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL NCES ID# | PRIORITY | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | GRAD RATE | NEWLY ELIGIBLE ² |
| | | | | | | | | | |

EXAMPLE:

| SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2012 SIG FUNDS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|----------------|
| LEA NAME | LEA NCES ID # | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL NCES ID# | PRIORITY | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | GRAD RATE | NEWLY ELIGIBLE |
| LEA 1 | ## | HARRISON ES | ## | | X | | | | |
| LEA 1 | ## | MADISON ES | ## | | X | | | | |
| LEA 1 | ## | TAYLOR MS | ## | | | | X | | X |
| LEA 2 | ## | WASHINGTON ES | ## | | X | | | | |
| LEA 2 | ## | FILLMORE HS | ## | | | | X | | |
| LEA 3 | ## | TYLER HS | ## | | | X | | X | |
| LEA 4 | ## | VAN BUREN MS | ## | | X | | | | |
| LEA 4 | ## | POLK ES | ## | | | | X | | |

Directions: All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds (e.g., reallocate to other schools with SIG grants or retain for a future SIG competition).

Note: This section is not applicable since, for SIG cohorts 1-3, rather than awarding (thus obligating to an LEA) a grant for 3-years, NYSED awarded 1-year grants, where, contingent upon performance and fidelity to model actions, schools would be eligible for continuing 1-year grants for a maximum of 2 additional years. At this time, there are no SIG schools from cohorts 1-3 that are considered to be not-renewed. Should a SIG school

² “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

from cohort 2 or 3 not by approved for a second or third 1-year funding period, those funds would be immediately available for SIG Cohort 4 schools.

| LEA NAME | SCHOOL NAME | DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED | AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS |
|---|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS: | | | |

Directions: In the boxes below, provide updates to any sections, if any, the SEA elects to revise. The only section the SEA will be required to update is *Section D (Part 1): Timeline*. The SEA does not need to resubmit information for any section in which it elects to use the same criteria as its FY 2011 SIG application. See Appendix A for guidelines on the information required for revised sections.

| SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below. |
| <p><u>Part 1</u></p> <p>The New York State Education Department (NYSED) has updated its SIG RFP for LEAs for FY 2012. A full copy of this updated application is being submitted with this application as a separate attachment. An LEA application for a SIG will be evaluated against the criteria identified in the SIG application scoring guide found on pages 52-69 of the NYSED SIG RFP for LEAs. The following is in specific response to the prompts required by USDE for this section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NYSED will require that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each Priority School for which it is submitting a SIG application to implement one of the four intervention models. Specifically, for each Priority School the LEA must demonstrate a critical and honest assessment of structural/systems gaps and needs, as well as student achievement gaps and needs that are identified as the result of a systemic analysis process. The assessment of needs section must address each of the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the School-level Baseline Data and Target-Setting Chart (Attachment B; SIG RFP). • Use statistics and descriptive language, to describe the population of students the school serves, and the unique needs of sub-group (e.g.: students with disabilities, English language learners, students from households that are eligible for free or reduced lunch, first-generation college-goers, and/or students traditionally under-represented in college). • Describe the systematic in-depth diagnostic school review of the school conducted by the district, a Joint Intervention Team (JIT), Integrated Intervention Team (ITT), or related outside education experts to determine its existing capacity, strengths, and needs. • Describe the results of this systematic school review, including the existing capacity, strengths, and needs to dramatically improve student achievement. • Discuss how the LEA/school will prioritize these identified needs in the implementation of the SIG plan. | |

NYSED will evaluate the quality and completeness of the LEA response to presenting this needs assessment and its relationship to the intervention model chosen as a solution to identified needs through a 4-level quality rubric (SIG RFP page 57).

2. The FY 2012 SIG RFP requires that LEAs provide acceptable plans and supporting evidence of its capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and support to each Priority School for which an intervention model (Turnaround, Restart, Closure, and Transformation) is being proposed. LEA proposals for the implementation of one of the four intervention models contain the following areas, specific to the intervention model chosen:

- Operational Autonomies (4 points)
- District Accountability and Support (6 points)
- Teacher and Leader Pipeline (4 points)
- External Partner Recruitment, Screening, and Matching (2 points)
- Enrollment and Retention Policies and Practices (2 points)
- Consultation and Collaboration (2 points)
- School Overview (2 points)
- Assessing the Needs of School Systems, Structures, Policies, and Students (4 points)
- School Model Selection and Rationale (4 points)
- School Leadership (8 points)
- Instructional Staff (8 points)
- Partnerships (6 points)
- Organizational Plan (8 points)
- Educational Plan (8 points)
- Training, Support, and Professional Development (4 points)
- Communication and Stakeholder Involvement/Engagement (4 points)
- Project Plan and Timeline (4 points)
- Budget and Budget Narrative (20 points)

An LEA's capacity to use SIG funds is a part of each of these categories within the LEA RFP. When scored through the SIG Application Scoring Guide (SIG RFP p. 52) the sum of these areas combine for a total of 100 points representing indicators of quality and capacity. As a numerical indicator of quality capacity, and commitment, NYSED has set a minimum threshold 65 points or higher on an individual SIG application to be considered for funding. Thus for FY 2012, an LEA that receives a quality score of 65 points or higher is considered by NYSED to have (initially) demonstrated an overall capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and support to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention model in the school identified. If an LEA application for a Priority School scores below 65, NYSED will consider the LEA to lack the capacity to implement the intervention model at the specific school.

3. In order to evaluate whether an LEA's budget for a particular Priority School includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively, NYSED has laid out explicit criteria for the LEA to present a budget for the school that identifies and explains all proposed costs for district and school-level activities for the entire project period (pre-implementation period plus three years of implementation). In addition, applicants are required to identify all other sources of income that will

support and sustain the whole-school change described in this application. Finally, for each major activity, LEAs are required to describe strategies for sustaining these actions or for how/why the district/school practice that will result from the activity can be sustained past the whole project period of the grant. NYSED will evaluate the quality and completeness of the LEA budget through a 4-level quality rubric (SIG RFP page 68-69).

Part 2

The LEA application for a SIG will be evaluated against the criteria identified in the SIG application scoring guide found on pages 52-69 of the NYSED SIG RFP for LEAs. The following is in specific response to the prompts required by USDE for this section:

1. Embedded throughout the proposal narrative and budget/budget narrative required for the NYSED SIG RFP for LEAs are the quality standards for the design and implementation of interventions consistent with the final requirements of each of the four intervention models. As a numerical indicator of quality, capacity, and commitment, NYSED has set a minimum threshold 65 points or higher on an individual SIG application to be considered for funding. For FY 2012, an LEA that receives a quality score of 65 points or higher is considered by NYSED to have (initially) demonstrated an overall commitment and capacity to fully implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Once funded, regular reporting to NYSED on progress and leading indicator data, as well as NYSED monitoring efforts will determine an LEA's continued commitment to implementing all final requirements.
2. The FY 2012 SIG RFP for LEAs has a specific section for evaluation; "External Partner Recruitment, Screening, and Matching to Priority Schools." Within this section, NYSED will evaluate an LEAs commitment based on the following standard and sub-criteria (SIG RFP p. 55):
 - The LEA must have a rigorous process for identifying, screening, selecting, matching, and evaluating partner organizations that provide critical services to Priority Schools.
 - Describe the rigorous process and formal LEA mechanisms for identifying, screening, selecting, matching, and evaluating external partner organizations that are providing support to this Priority School.
 - Describe the LEA processes for procurement and budget timelines (or any modifications to standard processes) that will ensure this Priority School will have access to effective external partner support prior to or directly at the start of the year-one implementation period (September 1, 2013).
 - Describe the role of the district and the role of the school principal in terms of identifying, screening, selecting, matching, and evaluating partner organizations supporting this school. Describe the level of choice that the school principal has in terms of the educational partners available and how those options are accessible in a timeline that matches the preparation and start-up of the new school year.

In its FY 2012 SIG RFP, NYSED further defines a rigorous process for external partner selection as one that; 1) explicitly evaluates the track record of quality of an external partner, 2) Reaches a broad

audience of potential bidders; 3) is clear in expected deliverables, and 4) is specific in conveying the relationship between the school's needs and the potential external partner's ability to meet those needs.

3. The FY 2012 SIG RFP for LEAs makes explicit the requirement for LEAs to align other resources with the interventions identified in the SIG model. The notion that the SIG application is a whole-school change plan and not an isolated program within a school is communicated throughout the RFP and broadly evaluated through each section. In addition, the specific budget requirements (SIG RFP p. 22) require LEA applicants to identify all other sources of income that will support and sustain the whole-school change to be implemented through the intervention model.
4. The FY 2012 SIG RFP requires an LEA to explicitly describe how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively. For example, in the Operational Autonomies section of the RFP (p. 16) the LEA must:
 - Provide as evidence formally adopted Board of Education policies and/or procedures for providing the school the appropriate autonomy, operating flexibility, resources, and support to reduce barriers and overly burdensome compliance requirements, and
 - Submit as additional evidence, supporting labor-management documentation such as formally executed thin-contracts or election-to-work agreements, or school-based options, that state the conditions for work that match the design needs of Priority School.

As another example, in the External Partner Recruitment, Screening, and Matching section (p. 17), the LEA must:

- Describe the LEA processes for procurement and budget timelines (or any modifications to standard processes) that will ensure this Priority School will have access to effective external partner support prior to or directly at the start of the year-one implementation period (September 1, 2013).

As with other elements, NYSED evaluates the LEAs commitment to these actions, practices, and policies through evaluating LEA responses based on a 4-level rubric.

5. The FY 2012 SIG RFP requires LEAs to explicitly describe the LEAs strategies for sustaining the actions of the intervention model and for how/why the district/school practice that will result from the activity can be sustained past the whole project period of the grant (p. 22). In addition, the three-year SIG opportunity requires descending maximum funding ceilings each year; \$2 million – year 1; \$1.5 million year 2; and \$1 million for year 3. The expectation here is that the LEA makes an increasing commitment to utilize its own resources to support the model. These elements are evaluated within the Budget section of the RFP, through the 4-level rubric.

SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

not need to resubmit this section.

The NYSED RFP for LEAs for FY 2012 contains the opportunity for pre-implementation activities from the period of April 1, 2013 to August 31, 2013. “Training Support, and Professional Development” (SIG RFP p. 21), and “Project Plan and Time” (SIG RFP p. 22) sections of the LEA RFP are scored within each section.

1. The explicit evaluation criteria for pre-implementation are embedded into the “SIG Budget” (SIG RFP p. 22). NYSED will require LEAs to identify and explain all proposed district and school-level activities for the pre-implementation period. LEAs will be required to organize costs in the pre-implementation budget by major activity, based on each category of the proposal narrative. For each major activity, the LEA will be required to identify the line-item costs associated and provide an explanation/justification of the cost that closely connects to the project activity, goals, and outcomes identified. LEAs will be required to describe how each major pre-implementation activity will enable the LEA to prepare for successful full implementation of the intervention model. The budget and budget narrative will be evaluated on a 4-level scoring guide (SIG RFP p. 68-69.)
2. LEA plans and activities for pre-implementation that demonstrate solid grasp of what will logically prepare the school for effective implementation, accompanied by the capacity of the LEA and school to implement the plan, and budgeted activities that are directly connected to this plan, are the standards for pre-implementation. LEAs will be required to follow section J of USDE SIG guidance for pre-implementation activities. Within the context of USDE budget guidance, specific prompts for pre-implementation include:

Project Plan and Timeline: The LEA/school must provide a project plan that provides a detailed and specific, measurable, realistic, and time-phased set of actions and outcomes that reasonably lead to the effective implementation of the SIG plan. The project plan must contain each of the following elements:

- Describe the goals and key strategies for the pre-implementation period (April 1 to August 31, 2013) in preparation for the year-one implementation period.

Training, Support, and Professional Development: The LEA/school must have a coherent school-specific framework for training, support, and professional development clearly linked to the identified SIG plan and student needs. The framework articulated must contain each of the following elements.

- Pre-Implementation Period. Identify in chart form, the planned training, support, and professional development events scheduled during the pre-implementation period (April 1, 2013, to August 31, 2013). For each planned event, identify the specific agent/organization responsible for delivery, the desired measurable outcomes, and the method by which outcomes will be analyzed and reported. Provide a rationale for each planned event and why it will be essential in leading-up to the start of the school year.

SECTION C: CAPACITY

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

As explained under Section B: Evaluation Criteria, the FY 2012 SIG RFP requires that LEAs provide acceptable plans and supporting evidence of its capacity to implement a SIG intervention model (Turnaround, Restart, Closure, and Transformation) in each Priority School for which a SIG is being proposed. LEA proposals for the implementation of one of the four intervention models contain the following areas, specific to the intervention model chosen:

- Operational Autonomies (4 points)
- District Accountability and Support (6 points)
- Teacher and Leader Pipeline (4 points)
- External Partner Recruitment, Screening, and Matching (2 points)
- Enrollment and Retention Policies and Practices (2 points)
- Consultation and Collaboration (2 points)
- School Overview (2 points)
- Assessing the Needs of School Systems, Structures, Policies, and Students (4 points)
- School Model Selection and Rationale (4 points)
- School Leadership (8 points)
- Instructional Staff (8 points)
- Partnerships (6 points)
- Organizational Plan (8 points)
- Educational Plan (8 points)
- Training, Support, and Professional Development (4 points)
- Communication and Stakeholder Involvement/Engagement (4 points)
- Project Plan and Timeline (4 points)
- Budget and Budget Narrative (20 points)

When scored through the SIG Application Scoring Guide (SIG RFP p. 52) the sum of these areas combine for a total of 100 points representing indicators of quality and capacity. As a numerical indicator of quality and capacity, NYSED has set a minimum threshold 65 points or higher on an individual SIG application to be considered for funding. Thus for FY 2012, an LEA that receives a quality score of 65 points or higher is considered by NYSED to have (initially) demonstrated an overall capacity to implement a SIG model fully and effectively in the school identified. If an LEA application for a Priority School scores below 65, NYSED will consider the LEA to lack the capacity to implement the intervention model at the specific school.

LEAs are not required to submit an application to receive SIG funding for the implementation of one of the four intervention models, thus if an LEA chooses not to apply for a SIG, this will not in and of itself be considered a lack of capacity. Under NYSED's approved USDE ESEA Flexibility Waiver, LEAs have a choice to serve each Priority School with a whole-school change model through a SIG, a School Innovation Fund (SIF) grant (using RttT and 1003a funding), or to implement a school under registration review (SURR) plan which would be funded solely by the LEA. Both the SIF and the SURR plans for whole-school change are based upon the U.S. Secretary of Education's turnaround principles.

The FY 2012 SIG RFP for LEAs requires that LEAs provide acceptable plans and supporting evidence of

capacity to implement the required activities of the intervention model chosen (Turnaround, Restart, Closure, and Transformation) for each school for which SIG funding is sought. After the initial submission period for FY 2012 SIG, NYSED will identify specific Priority Schools within LEAs that did not apply for a SIG and follow-up with the LEA as to the reasons for not applying for a SIG and to determine their alternative plans for serving these Priority Schools. It is NYSED's expectation that all Priority Schools are served through a whole-school change model, whether SIG, SIF, or self-funded, or that they are beginning the closure process.

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

For the FY 2012 competition, NYSED has a goal of approving LEA applications in a time period that provides LEAs enough time to make the necessary structural, staffing, and other pre-implementation activities prior to the start of the 2013-2014 school year. In addition, NYSED has a goal of approving only the highest of quality LEA applications. To meet these goals, NYSED proposes the following timeline:

FY 2012 Competition Round 1:

November 27, 2012: SIG RFP for LEAs Issued
 January 25, 2013: LEA applications in response to the RFP submitted
 March 1, 2013: Award/non-award decisions made; feedback provided to LEAs

FY 2012 Competition Round 2:

March 2013: Round 2 SIG RFP Issued
 May 2013: LEA applications in response to the RFP submitted
 July 2013: Award/non-award decisions made; feedback provided to LEAs

By running two successive rounds of the FY 2012 SIG competition, NYSED believes that it will be able to meet both goals identified above. LEA applicants who do not successfully win a SIG from round one, will be provided with quality feedback from its first application. LEAs may be able to use this feedback to resubmit an LEA/school application for Round 2. The approval process for Round 2 will still provide successful LEAs/schools with the time for critical pre-implementation activities.

SECTION D (PARTS 2-8) DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

2. For the FY 2012 SIG RFP, Attachment B: School-level Baseline Data and Target Setting Chart (p. 29), requires LEAs to set target benchmarks in a variety of leading and lagging indicators of student achievement. For leading indicators, NYSED will require quarterly reports from SIG schools in order to

identify whether the school is trending in a positive or negative direction, relative to the annual goals and targets set. In addition, at the end of each annual period, LEAs will report NYS assessment data, which will provide additional evidence of school progress. While these are initially awarded as 3-year grants, NYSED will compare NYS assessment data and other leading indicator data to the targets set by the LEA during its application and make a determination of whether to renew the funded application for its additional years based on its progress toward these targets.

3. Depending on the number of fundable SIG applications for the first round of the FY 2012 SIG competition, NYSED may open the SIG competition up to Tier III or Focus Schools. In the event that the FY 2012 SIG RFP is made available to Tier III or Focus Schools, the same method of reviewing annual goals identified in #2 of this section will be followed.
4. SIG recipients for the FY 2012 SIG RFP will be required to submit quarterly and annual reports on leading indicators and other program evaluation data. As an initial form of monitoring, NYSED will review these reports for implementation progress and fiscal expenditures on a quarterly basis. In addition, NYSED will conduct an annual on-site school review using the newly developed Diagnostic Tool for District and School Effectiveness, which measures the quality of implementation of the school's whole-school change model within the context of six tenets aligned with the U.S. Secretary of Education's turnaround principles.
5. With the newly created Priority School list under NYSED's approved ESEA waiver, the Department recognizes that it will not have sufficient funding to provide a grant to every eligible Priority School. Thus, NYSED is running the FY 2012 SIG RFP as a true competition. Within this competitive framework, the following describes the NYSED method of prioritization and award:

All applications reviewed for *Turnaround, Restart, and Transformation* models receiving the minimum required final average score or above will be ranked in order of the final average score, regardless of model proposed. All applications reviewed for *Closure* models that receive the minimum required final average score or above will be ranked separately, in order of the final average score. SIG funding will be awarded first to those applications for *Turnaround, Restart and Transformation* models receiving the minimum score or above. Applicants scoring at or above the minimum threshold will be awarded in rank order of score until funds are insufficient to fund the next ranking application in full. After all applicants in the *Turnaround, Restart and Transformation* models have been awarded NYSED will award *Closure* model applicants that have received the minimum average score or more in rank order. In the event of a tie score within the ranking for *Turnaround, Restart, and Transformation* models, the applicant with the highest combined score for Section II D. School Leadership and G. Organizational Plan will be ranked higher. In the event of a tie score within the ranking for the *Closure* model, the applicant with the highest total score for F. Project Plan Narrative/Timeline will be ranked higher.

6. If after running the first round of the FY 2012 SIG RFP competition, there are not enough fundable applications to expend all available funding, NYSED may opt to include Tier III or Focus Schools into the round 2 competition. If NYSED opens the round two FY 2012 SIG RFP competition up to Priority and Tier III or Focus Schools, these method of prioritization of award will mirror what has been described in #5

of this section.

7. Not Applicable

8. Not Applicable

SECTION E: SEA RESERVATION

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

The SIG program is directly administered by the NYSED Office of School Innovation, School Turnaround Office, with support from the Office of Accountability. The School Turnaround Office in the Office of School Innovation is responsible for the initial design of the SIG RFP for LEAs, and for running the FY 2012 competition. In addition, the School Turnaround Office is responsible for providing formal and informal support through a community of practice with LEAs with SIG schools and basic fiscal administration of the FY 2012 grants. Within the Office of Accountability, a newly created Metrics Unit will be responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting leading and lagging indicators for SIG schools. The Title-I Office in the Office of Accountability is responsible for final SIG budget compliance, and fiscal monitoring of all continuing and new SIG grants. In addition, school and district review teams within the Office of Accountability will conduct annual whole school reviews and evaluation of SIG schools using the newly created Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE).

SECTION F: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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

NYSED consulted with its Title I Committee of Practitioners (Title I COP) on this specific application at the February 12, 2013 COP meeting. In addition, NYSED identified the parameters and information set forth in the SIG competition for FY 2012 in its ESEA waiver application, and has consulted with the COP around this waiver application, which includes the information on FY 2012 SIG, in October of 2011, January, 12, 2012, and January 31, 2012. The more than sixty (60) Title I COP members include NYSED staff, school superintendents, district administrators and five (5) teachers, advocacy groups, parents, state and local collective bargaining units for teachers, and representatives from the nonpublic school sector.

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

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2011 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2012 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2011 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2012 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]**.

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

Because the State does not elect to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the

SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2011 competition.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2011 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2012 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 or 2012-2013 school years cannot request this waiver to "start over" their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2013-2014 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2013-2014 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2011 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2012 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and

requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

LEA APPLICATION

SEA is using the same FY 2011 LEA application form for FY 2012.

The SEA does not need to resubmit the LEA application.

SEA has revised its LEA application form for FY 2012.

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

Note: NYSED is including with this application, a copy of the FY 2012 SIG RFP for LEAs in MS Word. This RFP for LEAs contains all of the LEA application requirements identified below. In order to facilitate a review of the RFP for LEAs, NYSED has also included a **crosswalk**, which identifies the specific LEA application requirement identified below, and its corresponding page numbers in the RFP for LEAs (see **FY 2012 SIG requirements crosswalk.doc, attached**).

1

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Priority or Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR REVISED SEA APPLICATION SECTIONS

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?
- (2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? (*For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.*)

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2012–

2013 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

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

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

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

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Priority or Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Priority, Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Priority or Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

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

The SIG program is directly administered by the NYSED Office of School Innovation, School Turnaround Office, with support from the Office of Accountability. The School Turnaround Office in the Office of School Innovation is responsible for the initial design of the SIG RFP for LEAs, and for running the FY 2012 competition. In addition, the School Turnaround Office is responsible for providing formal and informal support through a community of practice with LEAs with SIG schools and basic fiscal administration of the FY 2012 grants. Within the Office of Accountability, a newly created Metrics Unit will be responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting leading and lagging indicators for SIG schools. The Title-I Office in the Office of Accountability is responsible for final SIG budget compliance, and fiscal monitoring of all continuing and new SIG grants. In addition, school and district review teams within the Office of Accountability will conduct annual whole school reviews and evaluation of SIG schools using the newly created Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE).

APPENDIX B

| | Schools an SEA MUST identify | Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Priority | Schools that, based on the most recent data available, have been identified as among the lowest-performing schools in the State. The total number of priority schools in a State must be at least five percent of the Title I schools in the State. | A school among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the achievement of the “all students” group in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, combined, and has demonstrated a lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group; A Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years; or A Tier I or Tier II school under the SIG program that is using SIG funds to implement a school intervention model. |
| Tier I | Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” ³ | Title I eligible ⁴ elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years. |

³ “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

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

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

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

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

⁴ For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Tier II | Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” | Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years. |
| Tier III | Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ⁵ | Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two years. |

⁵ Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.