

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

New York State Education Department



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 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

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

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

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2013 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 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<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: Bill Clarke</p> <p>Position and Office: Director, Charter Schools Office and School Turnaround Office</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address:</p> <p>Office of School Innovation 89 Washington Avenue 5N EB Mezzanine Albany, NY 12234</p> <p>Telephone: 518-473-8852</p> <p>Fax: 518-473-4502</p> <p>Email address: wclarke@mail.nysed.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</p> <p>Dr. John B. King Jr.</p>	<p>Telephone:</p> <p>(518) 474-5844</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>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>	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

See attached Priority Schools List.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
		<i>There are currently no LEAs with one or more schools for which previously awarded SIGs will not be renewed.</i>	
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

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

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

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

See below.

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

See below.

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

See below.

The New York State Education Department (NYSED) has updated its SIG RFP for LEAs for FY 2013. 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 51-68 of the NYSED SIG RFP for LEAs. The following is in specific response to the prompts required by USDE for this section:

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:

- 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 pages 51-68).

2. The FY 2013 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 pages 51-68) 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 2013, 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 51-68).*

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

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

The LEA application for a SIG will be evaluated against the criteria identified in the SIG application scoring guide found on pages 51-68 of the NYSED SIG RFP for LEAs. The following is in specific response to the prompts required by USDE for this section:

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements

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 2013, 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.

Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality

The FY 2013 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. 54):

The LEA must have a rigorous process for identifying, screening, selecting, matching, and evaluating partner organizations that provide critical services to Priority Schools. LEAs must complete the RFP Attachment C, "Evidence of Partner Effectiveness Chart."

- 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 (June 1, 2014).
- 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 2013 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.

Align other resources with the interventions

The FY 2013 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.

Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively

The FY 2013 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 (June 1, 2014).*

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.

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

The FY 2013 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; \$500,000 in year 1; \$250,000 in year 2; and \$250,000 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.

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?

Not applicable as there will not be a pre-implementation period associated with this grant.

(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?

Not applicable as there will not be a pre-implementation period associated with this grant.

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

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

For the FY 2013 competition, NYSED has a goal of approving LEA applications in a time period that provides LEAs enough time to make the necessary structural, staffing changes, and implement other activities prior to the start of the 2014-2015 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 2013 Competition:

January 3, 2014: SIG RFP for LEAs Issued
February, 28, 2014: LEA applications in response to the RFP submitted
May 2, 2014: Award/non-award decisions made; feedback provided to LEAs
Project Start Date: On or before June 1, 2014

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

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

For the FY 2013 SIG RFP, Attachment B: School-level Baseline Data and Target Setting Chart (p. 28), 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.

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

This is not applicable as NYSED does not anticipate funding its Tier III schools.

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

As a part of the New York State Education Department's (NYSED) efforts to hold schools and districts accountable for the results to be achieved in their SIG funded schools, NYSED's School Turnaround Office (STO) established a schedule of progress reporting and performance review. NYSED's STO expects districts to complete performance reports for each of its SIG funded schools every six weeks.

The primary purposes of the performance reports are to gauge the extent to which SIG schools are meeting their expected results and how well districts or EPOs are responding to the school-level data on implementation and performance to those ends. A secondary purpose is to monitor for ongoing compliance with SIG final requirements. The questions at each reporting period vary based on the phase of implementation.

The following three features are represented in each report:

1. Key Metrics. Districts and Educational Partnership Organizations (EPOs) are required to report on and analyze key leading indicators of success, which may include but not be limited to student attendance, student stability and mobility, teacher attendance, violent and disruptive incidents, and assessment data.
2. Project Plan and Timeline. Districts and EPOs are required to report on the extent to which the implementation of the approved SIG plan is meeting the expected results and any specific actions and strategy adaptations that are being made in response to such analyses.
3. Budget/Spending. NYSED expects districts and EPOs to draw down funds for approved activities at regular intervals throughout the project period. Districts and EPOs are required to regularly report on budget obligations and spending throughout the year. In addition, districts and EPOs are expected to pay close attention, and respond to questions about the relationship between spending and program implementation. Any budget amendment requests submitted by the district on behalf of the schools will be analyzed from the perspective of the intended outcomes of the original activities and whether results have been or will still be achieved.

Approximately one to two weeks after the progress report has been submitted, NYSED's STO conducts a performance review phone call with key project personnel from the district or EPO. NYSED STO elects to have these review conversations via conference call, on-site at the district, or on-site at NYSED with the district staff present.

Performance Review Conversations

The performance review conversations are held with district-level project leads (or EPO leads for Restart models) and are intended to complement and elaborate on key features of the written progress reports. District and EPO leads are expected to have substantive knowledge of the school-level projects from an oversight and support perspective. During the calls, district project leads are asked to spend about 5-7 minutes discussing the performance and progress at each SIG school, highlighting areas of strength as well as challenges encountered. Staff from NYSED ask follow-up questions centered on understanding the work that districts and schools are doing as they relate to the intended results of the projects. An emphasis is placed on the quality of evidence that the district project leads provide to support their assessments of performance to date.

NYSED Report Summary

After the performance review conversations, NYSED's STO sends a report to the district and EPO, summarizing any findings based on the review, and where necessary, identifying specific action items for the district to address.

Additional On-site Monitoring and Performance Review

In addition to written reports and telephone conversations with district project leads, NYSED may, depending on need and availability, conduct on-site check-in visits to a number of SIG schools. Such visits may be conducted with or without advanced notification. In addition, NYSED's STO work with district staff to arrange individual or group telephone or video conversations with school-level leaders and/or teachers as a part of ongoing monitoring efforts.

Performance Reporting and Review Data and Findings

Performance data collected and reported on SIG projects, as well as any summary findings from NYSED through document, telephone, or on-site review will become a part of a portfolio of evidence used to support Commissioner's decisions about continued SIG funding, school accountability status, registration, and continued intervention in Priority Schools. The data from these reviews may also be reported in whole or in part to the New York State Board of Regents and the United States Department of Education as a part of ongoing efforts to ensure all students have the opportunity for a sound and basic education and achieve college and career ready standards.

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

The NYSED SIG funding will be awarded according to the following:

All applications reviewed for Turnaround, Restart, and Transformation models from eligible Priority schools that have not previously been awarded 1003[g] SIG, receiving the minimum required final average score or above, will be ranked in order of the final average score, regardless of the model proposed (Priority 1). All applications reviewed for Closure models that have not previously been awarded 1003[g] SIG that receive the minimum required final average score or above will be ranked separately; in order of the final average score (Priority 2). All applications for Turnaround, Restart, Transformation, and Closure models from eligible Priority schools that have previously received 1003[g] SIG funds will be ranked separately, in order of final average score, regardless of model (Priority 3).

*Funding will be awarded **first** to those applications for Turnaround, Restart and Transformation models in schools that have not previously been awarded 1003[g] SIG receiving the minimum score or above (Priority 1). 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 Priority 1 applicants have been awarded, NYSED will award Priority 2 applicants that have not previously received 1003[g] SIG that received the minimum average score or more in rank order, until funds are insufficient to fund the next ranking application in full. After all Priority 2 applicants have been awarded NYSED will award Turnaround, Transformation, Restart, and Closure applicants (Priority 3) that have met the minimum standard or above in rank order, until funds are insufficient to fund the next ranking application in full.*

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.

The New York State Education Department reserves the right to reject all proposals received or cancel this RFP if it is in the best interest of the Department. If any funded LEAs withdraw or become ineligible within the year of funding, the leftover funds may be used to fund the next highest ranking applications.

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

Not applicable. We do not anticipate Tier III schools being eligible.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

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

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

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

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

The SIG program is directly administered by the NYSED School Turnaround Office, with support from the Office of Accountability. The School Turnaround Office is responsible for the initial design of the SIG RFP for LEAs, and for running the FY 2013 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 2013 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 School Turnaround Office is also 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).

G. 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.

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

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 Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

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

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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 Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver *

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

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

through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

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

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

**Please note: this waiver is not applicable to NYSED as it already has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.*

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver *

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

**Please note: this waiver is not applicable to NYSED as it already has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.*

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

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

NYSED posted the following public notice. At the time of the submission of this draft application, NYSED received zero public comments in response to this posting. A copy of the web-posting is presented below:

The screenshot shows a web browser window titled "Adobe Contribute - [School Improvement Grants 1003 (g)]". The address bar shows the URL: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/turnaround/SchoolImprovementGrants1003g.html>. The main content area displays the following text:

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Priority Schools List Waiver: notice of and opportunity to comment on proposed waiver to be requested:

On May 29, 2012, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) received approval from the United States Department of Education (USDE) for its Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) flexibility waiver request. The key changes that the waiver permits align with the Regents Reform Agenda and allow the State to implement its next generation accountability system. With this approved flexibility waiver, NYSED has discontinued identifying schools for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring in Tiers I, II, and III, and instead identifies the states lowest-achieving schools as Priority Schools. In New York State a Priority School is either: a) among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in New York State; b) a Title I participating or Title I eligible high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years; or c) a Tier I or II SIG school.

For the purposes of eligibility for 1003(g) SIG funding, the Department is submitting a waiver request to the USDE that enables NYSED to replace its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools with its list of Priority Schools under ESEA flexibility, and waive the school eligibility requirements in Section 1.A.1 of SIG final requirements. This will enable Priority Schools to compete in the FY 2012 1003(g) SIG competition. In submitting this waiver request, NYSED assures USDE that its Priority School definition provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the state's lowest-achieving schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of PLA schools in the SIG final requirements.

NYSED is submitting a waiver request to the USDE to waive section 421 (b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225 (b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017

If you have comments on this proposed waiver, they may be submitted via email to turnaround@mail.nysed.gov.

USDE Application for School Improvement Grant (1003g) Awards Competition 2013:

This application is used by the Department to access United States Department of Education (USDE) SIG funding for New York State LEAs. The application and crosswalk document (listed below) will be submitted to USDE, and contain the newly redesigned SIG RFP which Focus Districts with Priority Schools used in the most recent SIG competition. If you would like to share your comments or suggestions for how to revise or refine this application to improve future SIG competitions, please email them to: turnaround@mail.nysed.gov.

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.

Note: NYSED is including with this application, a copy of the FY 2013 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 2013 SIG requirements crosswalk with NYSED SIG RFP. doc, attached.)

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please see the attached document titled, "FY 2013 SIG requirements crosswalk with NYSED SIG RFP".

- (1)** For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2)** The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3)** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4)** The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5)** The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (6)** For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7)** The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8)** As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement

models in its Tier I and Tier II schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

Continuation Awards Only Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	COHORT #	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:			

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

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

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

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

Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards² to its LEAs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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