

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2014 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2014

CFDA Number: 84.377A

ILLINOIS



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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (authorized under section 1003(g) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2014 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2014 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements. The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

Jim Butler, Group Leader
Office of State Support, OESE
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W246
Washington, DC 20202-6132

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due no later than April 15, 2015.

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Illinois State Board of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 100 N. First Street Springfield, IL 62777-0001
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Robin M. Lisboa Position and Office: Division Administrator for the Division of System of Support and District Intervention Contact's Mailing Address: Same Telephone: 1-217-524-4832 Fax: 1-217-785-9031 Email address: rlisboa@isbe.net	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Tony Smith	Telephone: 1-217-782-2223
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date: October 2015
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

For SEAs not approved for ESEA Flexibility: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools and Eligible Schools: As part of its FY 2014 application, an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition.

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

EXAMPLE:

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

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014. 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 SEAs approved for ESEA flexibility: Eligible Schools List: <http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/pdf/priority-schools-15.pdf>

For all SEAs: Awards not renewed, or otherwise terminated: All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2015-2016 school year. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, reason for nonrenewal or termination, the amount of unused remaining funds, and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds. **If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:**

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:					N/A

B. STATE-DETERMINED MODEL (OPTIONAL)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The actions listed in this section are ones that an LEA must take to receive a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to these criteria.

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

Check here if an LEA application review rubric is attached.
Attachment A: LEA Application RFP

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

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
School-level Criterion 1. Pre-Application Needs Assessment (pp.46-47).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:
Lea-Level Criteria 1-11, (pp.36-45).
School-level Criterion 4. Implement a Program to Improve Student Achievement (pp.49-50).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:
LEA-level Criterion 3. LEA Planning and/or Implementation Budget(s) (pp. 37-38).
School-level Criterion 2. School Planning and/or Implementation Budget(s) (p. 47).
LEA-level Criterion 9. Governance, Policies and Practices (pp. 42-44).

*LEA-level Criterion 10. LEA Planning and Implementation Preparation Activities (p.44).
School-level Criterion 3. School-specific Planning and Implementation Preparation Activities (pp.47-48).*

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

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

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 40).

LEA-level Criterion 7. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of External Providers (pp. 40-41).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

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

LEA-level Criterion 4. Alignment of Other Resources to Maximize Funding Impact (pp.38-39).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

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

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

LEA-level Criterion 9. Governance, Policies and Practices (pp. 42-43).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

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

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

LEA-level Criterion 8. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of Intervention Implementation (p.42).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:
LEA-level Criterion 1. Meaningful Family and Community Engagement (pp. 36-37).*

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:
LEA-level Criterion 11. Sustainability (pp. 44-45).
Lea-level Criterion 2. LEA Timeline (p.37).
School-level Criterion 6. 5-Year Schedule of School Activities (pp.51).*

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number in rubric:
School-level Criterion 5. Use of Evidence-based Practices (p.50).*

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (11) 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 and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:
LEA-level Application Rubric Appendix C, which includes all Proposed Activities, Budgets and Timelines (pp. 36-45).*

School-level Criterion 1. Pre-Application Needs Assessment (pp. 46-47).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

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

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

Rural Flexibility Explanation (p.18).

School-level Criterion 4. Implement a Program to Improve Student Achievement (pp.49-50).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

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

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

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 40).

See also Model-Specific Requirement Checklist – Selection of External Providers Model-Specific Requirements Checklist (p. 24).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria: Illinois does not intend to offer this model as an option in this application.

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

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

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 40).

See also Model-Specific Requirement Checklist – Selection of External Providers Model-Specific Requirements Checklist (p. 24).

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

D. LEA BUDGETS: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section C, the SEA must describe how it will evaluate an LEA's budget and application.

ISBE will conduct a search for external reviewers who have the following qualifications: Preferred grant readers should have school or district administrative experience, expertise in school improvement (transformation and reform), previous grant-writing and reading experience, familiarity with the new School Improvement Grant 1003(g) final requirements as published on the U.S. Department of Education website at <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>, program management and experience working with low-performing schools and districts serving specialized populations such as early childhood, students with special needs, and linguistically and culturally diverse English learners.

These reviewers, after being trained in the use of the rubrics, will conduct a review of all applications submitted using the rubrics attached to this application. The ISBE RFP requires multiple budgets and timelines and the rubrics contain strong criteria that use no more than one school year for planning and other pre-implementation activities, must have at least three school years of full implementation of the selected intervention, and may use one additional year for activities related to sustaining reforms following at least three years of full intervention implementation. The LEA Five-Year Budget Summary (see the LEA Application Forms - Attachment 11A or 11B at http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm) addresses the entire grant period. No LEA will be awarded more than five consecutive years of SIG funding for a particular school.

All applications will be read, reviewed, and scored by impartial readers who have been selected for their expertise and experience with school improvement efforts. For a detailed overview of the proposal scoring criteria, see the scoring rubrics in Appendices C and D. Criteria in the LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan Rubric measure the LEA's capacity to support and monitor implementation in the schools it commits to serve. Criteria in the Individual School-level SIG Improvement Plan Scoring Rubric measure the school's readiness to implement its plan fully and effectively.

The proposal scoring process will occur in six steps.

1. Reviewers will assign a ranking of STRONG, MODERATE, LIMITED, or MISSING for each sub-criteria (1.A, 1. B, 1.C...) in both the *LEA-level* and *School-level* portions of the application. These sub-scores will be averaged and, where necessary, multiplied by the appropriate factor (e.g., 2 if the criterion is worth 20 points, 5 if worth 50) in order to establish the total criterion score (e.g., LEA 1. Meaningful Community Engagement).
2. Thirty (30) priority points will be awarded to the School-level total for selecting the Transformation, Turnaround, Early Learning, or Restart model.
3. Thirty (30) priority points will be awarded to the School-level total if the school chooses to take a planning year.
4. Ten (10) priority points will be awarded to the School's Readiness total under the following conditions:
 - a. The school has not been funded under the SIG grant in the past, OR
 - b. The school has been previously funded under the SIG grant and ALL of the following are true:
 - i. There has been a net increase in the percent of students in the "all students group" who met or exceeded standards on the Illinois state assessment in reading from the baseline

- year (the year prior to receiving the grant) to the final year of the grant; AND
 - ii. There has been a net increase in the percent of students in the “all students group” who met or exceeded standards on the Illinois state assessment in math from the baseline year (the year prior to receiving the grant) to the final year of the grant; AND
 - iii. The student attendance rate increased from the baseline year to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card; AND
 - iv. If applicable, the four-year graduation rate increased from the baseline year to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card.
5. The total LEA SIG Improvement Plan score and the Individual School SIG Improvement Plan score will then be weighted and combined into a final evaluation score. District Capacity will count for 30 percent of the final evaluation score and School Readiness will count for 70 percent of the final evaluation score.
6. ISBE will then rank schools according to their total evaluation score to determine pre-finalist candidates.

Pre-finalists who are being considered for funding will participate in an interview process to provide additional clarification on their proposal. Assessments of school readiness, district capacity, overall plan coherence, and feasibility as a result of the interview will be used to guide final funding decisions.

Finalists who will be recommended for funding will work with ISBE staff to revise and strengthen their five-year budget; revise and strengthen their planning year and first full implementation year budgets; and implement specific conditions for funding based on information obtained from the application and interview. Final approval will be granted only upon completion of the specified conditions of funding.

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

USDE Approval Timeline

- March 31, 2015 – Drafts of the SEA application and RFP are posted to the ISBE website for public comment.
- March 31, 2015 –LEAs are notified about the public comment period via posting of the notice in the Superintendent’s Weekly Message.
- March 31, 2015 – Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners is solicited.
- April 15, 2015 – SEA submits public comments and State Application to U.S. Department of Education.

Cohort 3 Sustainability Award Timeline

- August 31, 2015 – SEA notifies LEAs about the USDE approval of Cohort 3 Sustainability
- September 16-17, 2015 – SEA seeks Board approval to award continuation grants to Cohort 3 schools.
- September 18, 2015 – Cohort 3 Sustainability Plans are due to the SEA.
- September 18, 2015 – SEA notifies LEAs of Cohort 3 sustainability award status.
- September 18 - October 1, 2015 – Cohort 3 schools submit Continuing Applications through the state grant management system and SEA staff review and approve the applications for sustainability funding.
- October 1, 2015 – SEA awards FY16 LEA grantees federal fiscal year 2014 Cohort 3 sustainability funding.

Cohort 6 New Grantee Award Timeline

- September 8, 2015 – Release FY 16 Cohort 6 RFP and notify priority districts and schools and the approved Lead Partners. Post announcement in online Superintendent’s Weekly Message.
- September 22, 2015 – Technical assistance webinar “FY16 School Improvement Grant 1003(g) Cohort 6 Competition: Guidance on Developing a Quality Application.”
- October 8, 2015 – Training webinar for contracted external application reviewers.

- October 13, 2015 – FY16 SIG RFP district/school applications due to ISBE by 4:00 p.m.
- October 16, 2015 - External Review of applications begins.
- November 2-5 – External reviews due to SEA and hold inter-rater reliability session to identify finalists.
- November 6, 2015 – Notify finalists of interview dates and times.
- November 16-20, 2015 – Finalist interviews in Chicago and Springfield.
- December 16, 2015 – SEA obtains Board approval to award grants to selected schools.
- January 1, 2015 – New Grantee Express Grants due to SEA.

Illinois will use FY 2014 funds to make a combination of multi and single-year awards to grantees. FY 2014 funds will be used to make multi-year continuation awards to currently funded SIG schools and single- or multi-year awards to schools identified through a new application process, depending on availability of funds.

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

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

The Illinois State Board of Education was granted a priority schools list waiver, valid through 2016. Only priority schools on this list are eligible to apply for a SIG 1003(g) in 2015.

As part of the application, LEAs are required to submit academic achievement goals and information on the school’s status for 9 leading indicators. LEAs will need to submit a quarterly self-evaluation, an annual cumulative report that includes the 15 leading indicators, and supporting data that is needed for the school-level reporting metrics to demonstrate satisfactory progress (RFP – Appendix B, p.35).

Annually, ISBE will review the academic achievement goals set by the LEA to determine if each school is meeting their goals and making progress on the leading indicators.

ISBE will renew a SIG award if the LEA can show that its priority schools are meeting the annual goals for student achievement established by the LEA and that have been approved by ISBE. ISBE may renew an LEA’s SIG award with respect to a particular school, if:

- a) The school is making progress toward meeting the annual goals for student achievement established by the LEA consistent with section II.A.8 of the final requirements;*
- b) The school is making progress on the leading indicators in the RFP Appendix B, p.35; and*
- c) The LEA is implementing interventions in the school with fidelity to applicable requirements and to the LEA’s application.*

Failure on the part of an LEA to meet their annual achievement goals, considered to be not complying with the terms of its grant, will result in ISBE taking appropriate action such as the provision of more intense technical support or termination of funding.

- (2) Describe the SEA’s process for renewing the SIG award of an LEA that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities for a school, including the SEA’s process for reviewing the performance of the school against the LEA’s approved application to determine whether the

LEA will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention for the school beginning the first day of the following school year.

In the LEA's continuing application for funding, ISBE will require the LEA to describe how it has or will undertake the criteria outlined in Attachment B – LEA Implementation Review Criteria. The LEA's response/evidence for each criterion will be evaluated prior to full implementation, annually, or when changes are made for any applicable element. Required evidence will also be reviewed as part of the pre-visit monitoring artifacts, unless otherwise described in the evidence column of the LEA Implementation Review Criteria (Attachment B)

ISBE will review a SIG award of an LEA that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities for a school to determine if the LEA has demonstrated (e.g., through a monitoring visit) and provided documented evidence that its Priority school will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention beginning the first day of the following school year.

Failure on the part of an LEA to demonstrate and provide documented evidence for a Priority school that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities that its Priority school will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention beginning the first day of the following school year will result in termination of SIG funding.

- (3) *See the description on pages 11-16 of the ISBE FY15 Monitoring Manual at <http://www.isbe.net/sos/pdf/sig-monitoring-manual-fy15.pdf> for a full description of the types of monitoring ISBE conducts for each LEA that receives a grant. Additionally, Attachment C: SIG FY 2016 – 2020 Monitoring Cycle depicts the monitoring and data collection activities required of LEAs as part of the SIG 1003(g) grant.*
- (4) *ISBE will utilize a competitive application process that prioritizes district capacity to support and monitor full and effective implementation and school readiness to engage in radical, systemic reform. Among those schools that demonstrate the highest degree of district capacity and school readiness, priority will be given to schools that opt to select the Transformation, Turnaround, Early Learning or Restart models, as ISBE considers these models more rigorous and has a greater degree of state capacity to support and monitor their implementation.*
- (5) *N/A*
- (6) *N/A*

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

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.

- Consult with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in this application.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority or focus school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Award each School Improvement Grant to an LEA based on an individual review of each application and a case-by-case determination of the amount needed to plan for implementation, as applicable, to fully implement a model for three years, and sustain the model, as applicable, rather than make grant awards based on a formula.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers, including charter school operators and CMOs, to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or CMO accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of each LEA's grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority and focus school, as applicable. An SEA must post all LEA applications, including those of applicants that did not receive awards, as well as applications to serve Tier III schools. Additionally, if an LEA amends an application, the SEA will post the amended application.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, seek and obtain approval from the LEA to have the SEA provide the services directly prior to providing services.
- Prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, provide all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive School Improvement Grants with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and attach a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments received from LEAs to this application. The SEA also assures that it has provided notice and information regarding the waiver request(s) described below, if applicable, to the public in the manner in which the SEA customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

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

ISBE will use its administration funds to pay for additional staff, evaluate the LEAs and the state 1003(g) program, and provide professional development training to the staff and contractors. ISBE staff provides

technical assistance that is meaningful to the LEAs to assist them in the implementation of the intervention models and other school improvement efforts. One area of focused technical assistance is working with the approved Lead Partners. For this year ISBE will allow approved Lead Partners to submit an addendum to the RFSP they submitted in 2013 that better describes their experiences in providing supports in the 12 required areas. This updated information, along with updated references will assist LEAs as they work to choose lead partners who will better meet their needs. ISBE staff will also lead the annual convening of grantees to share insights, challenges and successes with each other and then help coordinate the SIG grantee participation in several statewide conferences, like the fall Title I Directors Conference, NCLB Conference, Raising Student Achievement Conference and more.

ISBE has also created the Illinois Center for School Improvement (Illinois CSI) to coordinate and lead the Statewide System of Support. Illinois CSI staff will share accountability and responsibility for overseeing and coordinating targeted and coordinated services to the SIG LEAs within the Statewide System of Support in the following areas:

1. Standards-aligned instructional systems;
2. Data-driven decision making for continued improvement;
3. Continuous LEA and school improvement; and
4. District leadership team support and coaching.

Illinois CSI personnel will design and support the use of a connected set of tools to improve instructional practice and student performance on a continuing basis district-wide. The Illinois CSI will help articulate a systemic and coherent approach to improving LEAs by helping to change LEA fundamental structures and processes that will lead to sustainable improvement. Illinois CSI does not work directly with schools. .

Illinois CSI staff will help transform evidence-based research into practice and train district leadership teams, coaches, and regional providers across the state in these effective practices. Illinois CSI also helps coordinate the Illinois Principals Association, the Illinois Association of School Boards, the Illinois Association of School Business Officials and other educational partners working in the SSoS districts. Thus, the Illinois CSI will bring coordination and coherence to the Statewide System of Support and provide training, professional development, tools, and resources for district leadership teams coaches, , and service providers throughout Illinois to better support the state's lowest-performing schools.

ISBE will generally use its 1003(a) School Improvement funds and other improvement funds to establish and operate the Illinois CSI and to fund the required monitoring activities and technical assistance provided by ISBE staff to funded schools and LEAs.

ISBE will reserve 5 percent.

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

[Illinois] requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. The SEA believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the state in

order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools or in its Priority and Focus schools, as applicable, or will allow any LEA in the state that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

Part 1: Waivers Available to All States

Waiver 1: Period of availability of FY 2014 funds waiver

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

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

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2014 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2014 competition, waive the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the "all students" group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: School improvement timeline waiver

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

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

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I or Tier II title I participating schools that will fully implement a SIG model beginning in the 2015–2016 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement a SIG model beginning in the 2015–2016 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I and Tier II schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

Waiver 4: Schoolwide program waiver

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

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

Assurances

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

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

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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 and focus 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 and focus school, as applicable.

The models the LEA may include are: (1) turnaround; (2) restart; (3) closure; (4) transformation; (5) state-determined model, if approved; (6) evidence-based whole school reform model; and (7) early learning model.

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

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY	FOCUS (if applicable) ²	INTERVENTION
Priority School ES #1	xxxxx	X		turnaround
Priority School HS #1	xxxxx	X		state-determined model
Priority School MS #1	xxxxx	X		transformation
Priority School ES #2	xxxxx	X		turnaround

Example (LEAs in an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility):

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II only)
Tier I ES #1	xxxxx	X			turnaround
Tier I ES #2	xxxxx		X		early learning model
Tier I MS #1	xxxxx	X			transformation
Tier II HS #1	xxxxx	X			state-determined model

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

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

See SIG FY 2016 RFP at http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm. All page numbers refer to pages in that document.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional

programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.

School-level Criterion 1. Pre-Application Needs Assessment (p.17).

- (2) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.

School-level Criterion 1.A and 1.B Pre-Application Needs Assessment (p.17).

Pre-Application Needs Assessment Part III (http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm).

- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, early learning model, or state-determined model.

School-level Criterion 4. Implement a Program to Improve Student Achievement (p. 18).

Appendix A - Model Specific Requirement and Permissible Activities Checklists (pp.24-34).

- (4) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.

LEA-level Application, which includes all Proposed Activities, Budgets and Timelines (pp. 12-16).

School-level Criterion 1. Pre-Application Needs Assessment (p. 17).

- (5) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.

LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 13).

LEA-level Criterion 7. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of External Providers (pp. 13-14).

- (6) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.

LEA-level Criterion 4. Alignment of Other Resources to Maximize Funding Impact (p. 13).

- (7) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.

LEA-level Criterion 9. Governance, Policies and Practices (p. 15).

- (8) The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve (for example, by creating an LEA turnaround office).

LEA-level Criterion 8. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of Intervention Implementation (p. 14).

- (9) The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.

LEA-level Criterion 1. Meaningful Family and Community Engagement (p. 12).

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

LEA-level Criterion 11. Sustainability (pp. 15-16).

Lea-level Criterion 2. LEA Timeline (p.12).

School-level Criterion 6. 5-Year Schedule of School Activities (p.19).

- (11) The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.
School-level Criterion 5. Use of Evidence-based Practices (p.19).
- (12) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that receives school improvement funds including by
- a. Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and
LEA-level Criterion 5. Goals and Objectives (p.13).
 - b. Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
LEA-level Criterion 8. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of Intervention Implementation (p.14) and Reporting and Evaluation (p.7).
- (13) An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.
LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 13).
LEA-level Criterion 7. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of External Providers (pp.13-14).
- (14) For an LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.
LEA-level Criterion 10. LEA Planning and Implementation Preparation Activities (p. 15).
LEA-level Criterion 2. LEA Timeline (p.12).
- (15) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.
Rural Flexibility Description (p.17).
School-level Criterion 4. Implement a Program to Improve Student Achievement (p. 18).
Appendix A - Model Specific Requirement and Permissible Activities Checklists (p.24-34).
- (16) For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will
- a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and
LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 13).
Appendix A - Model Specific Requirement and Permissible Activities Checklists (p.24).
 - b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.
LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 13).
Appendix A - Model Specific Requirement and Permissible Activities Checklists (p.24).

(17) For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.

*LEA-level Criterion 6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s) (p. 13).
Appendix A - Model Specific Requirement and Permissible Activities Checklists (p.24).*

(18) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA’s application.

*LEA-level Criterion 2. LEA Timeline (p.12).
School-level Criterion 6. 5-Year Schedule of School Activities (p.19).*

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

See the LEA and School Application Forms Packets at http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use in each school it proposes to serve and the funds it will use to —

- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools, or priority and focus schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application (SEAs without ESEA flexibility only).

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I, Tier II, priority, or focus school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s budget plan. Additionally, an LEA’s budget may include up to one full academic year for planning activities and up to two years to support sustainability activities. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding to serve a single school.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, or the number of priority and focus schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

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

LEA XX BUDGET						
	Year 1 Budget (Planning)	Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five- Year Total
Priority ES	\$150,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,100,000	\$750,000	\$4,356,000

#1						
Priority ES #2	\$119,250	\$890,500	\$795,000	\$750,000	\$500,750	\$3,055,500
Priority HS #1	\$300,000	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$650,000	\$5,245,750
Focus MS #1	\$410,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,775,000	\$1,550,400	\$550,000	\$5,755,400
LEA-level Activities			\$150,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$400,000
Total Budget	\$879,250	\$4,812,250	\$5,520,000	\$4,950,400	\$2,550,750	\$18,812,650

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

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

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

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

See the LEA Application Forms Packet – Attachment 4 at http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (3) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- (4) Ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds

and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

E. WAIVERS: If an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. **NOTE:** Only LEAs in SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility may request the following waivers.

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

Continuation Awards Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	YEAR SCHOOL BEGAN SIG IMPLEMENTATION (e.g. 2013-14 school year)	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 14 ALLOCATION
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 14:			

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	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 2014 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2014 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards³ to its LEAs unless the SEA has an approved new awards application.
- Use the renewal process described in Section II(C) of the final requirements to determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.

³ A “new award” is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2015–2016 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2014 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

If the SEA approves any amendments to an LEA application, post the LEA's amended application on the SEA website.

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

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