



Illinois State Board of Education


100 North First Street • Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001
www.isbe.net

Jesse H. Ruiz
Chairman

Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.
State Superintendent of Education

May 2010

TO: Eligible Applicants

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D. 
State Superintendent of Education

SUBJECT: **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP):** FY 2011 School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA SIG) and School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA SIG)

General Information

Eligible Applicants: Local educational agencies (LEA) that receive Title I, Part A funds **and** have one or more Tier I and/or Tier II schools as described below are eligible to apply. An eligible school district may apply for a SIG on behalf of one or more qualifying schools.

While Tier III schools are eligible for participation in SIG under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and under section 1003(g) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), they are not eligible at this time, under this RFP, so that priority for funding is given to Tier I and Tier II schools. Should additional funding become available for future competitions, this RFP will be re-released with priority consideration reserved for LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds and have one or more Tier III schools.

A Tier I school:

- Is a Title I school in federal improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that:
 - Is within the lowest achieving 5% of Title I schools in the state in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on a three (3) year average (i.e., from 2007-2009) performance of the "All" student groups' category for the percent meeting/exceeding standards in reading and math combined (i.e., 15.8% or less); and
 - Demonstrates lack of progress; **or**
- Is a Title I secondary school that:
 - Has an average graduation rate as reported in the Illinois Interactive Report Card, of less than 60% over the last three (3) years (i.e., from 2007-2009); and
 - Demonstrates lack of progress.

A Tier II school:

- Is a secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds that:
 - Is within the lowest achieving 5% of secondary schools in the state that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds, based on the three (3) year average (i.e., from 2007-2009) performance of the “*All student groups*’ category for the percent meeting/exceeding standards in reading and math combined (i.e., 35.2% or less); and
 - Demonstrates lack of progress; **or**
- Is a secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds that:
 - Has an average graduation rate, as reported in the Illinois Interactive Report Card, of less than 60% over each of the last three (3) years (i.e., from 2007-2009); and
 - Demonstrates lack of progress; **or**
- Is a Title I secondary school in federal improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that does not qualify as Tier I that:
 - Is no higher achieving than other Tier II schools (i.e., 35.2% or less), based on the three (3) year average (i.e., from 2007-2009) performance of the “*All student groups*’ category for the percent meeting/exceeding standards in reading and math combined; and
 - Demonstrates lack of progress; **or**
- Is a Title I secondary school in federal improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that does not qualify as Tier I that:
 - Has an average graduation rate, as reported in the Illinois Interactive Report Card, of less than 60% over the last three (3) years (i.e., from 2007-2009); and
 - Demonstrates lack of progress.

Definitions: The following definitions are provided to assist with the understanding of eligibility criteria and related terms.

Persistently lowest achieving schools describes the lowest achieving 5% of schools in the state based on the three (3) year average of the “*All student groups*’ category for the percent meeting/exceeding standards in reading and math combined and demonstrate a lack of progress.

Lack of Progress is determined by a comparison of the average performance and the 2009 “*All student groups* in reading and math. When the 2009 “*All student groups*’ category reflects a lower percentage than the average performance, a lack of progress is demonstrated.

Secondary School is defined in Section 22-22 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/22-22) as an attendance center serving students in any combination of grades 9 through 12 (although it may also have students enrolled in grades below grade 9).

Pursuant to the [Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003\(q\) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 \(ESEA\)](#), the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has generated eligibility lists respective of Tiers to include the districts and their schools that meet at least one of the Tier I or Tier II criteria strands described above. These eligibility lists are posted at www.isbe.state.il.us/SFSF/default.htm.

Officials from school districts that are not included on the eligibility lists, but believe they qualify with one or more Tier I and/or Tier II schools, should contact ISBE in writing at the e-mail address provided in the *Contact Person* section of this RFP.

Grant Award: Annual grant awards to LEAs will range from not less than \$50,000 to \$2 million per participating Tier I and Tier II schools, subject to available funds. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen and state education agency (SEA) guidelines. It is anticipated that grants will be available for two additional one-year continuation periods, except in the case of school closure. The total amount of funding available is \$137 million.

Payment under this grant is subject to receipt of funds from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) to ISBE. Furthermore, payment under this grant is subject to passage of a sufficient appropriation by the Illinois General Assembly for the program. Obligations of ISBE will cease immediately without further obligation should the agency fail to receive sufficient federal funds for this program. This grant is funded partially by 1003(g) ARRA funds. Submission of an application for this grant is an acknowledgement of all reporting requirements pursuant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, section 1512.

Grant Periods: The grant period will begin no sooner than July 1, 2010 and will extend from the execution date of the grant agreement until June 30, 2011 (FY 2011). Two continuation periods are anticipated—July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 (FY 2012) and July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 (FY 2013). Funding in the subsequent two continuation periods will be contingent upon a sufficient appropriation for the program and satisfactory progress in the preceding grant period.

Application Deadline: Mail the original proposal and four copies to the address below to ensure receipt no later than 5:00 pm on **June 14, 2010.**

School Improvement Grants
Illinois State Board of Education
Division of Innovation and Improvement, N-242
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

Proposals also may be hand-delivered to the following locations:

Springfield Office
Information Center
1st Floor
100 North First Street

Chicago Office
Reception Area
Suite 14-300
100 West Randolph Street

Webinars: ISBE staff has scheduled three different webinars as described below to support applicants with the completion of their proposals.

1. **Needs Assessment Webinar:** Interested applicants are invited to join an informational webinar related to the LEA Needs Assessment on **Monday, May 10, 2010** at **1:00 p.m.** Registration information is available at <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/918876984>. Applicants are not required to participate in the webinar in order to submit a proposal.
2. **Bidders' Webinar:** Interested applicants are invited to join an informational webinar related to specific proposal requirements on **Tuesday, May 11, 2010** at **1:30 p.m.** Registration information is available at <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/753857248>. Bidders are not required to participate in the webinar in order to submit a proposal.
3. **SIG 1003(g) RFP Technical Assistance Webinar:** Interested applicants are invited to join an informational webinar related to specific program requirements. ISBE staff will respond to frequently asked questions and provide additional technical assistance to help applicants complete their proposals on **Monday, May 24, 2010** at **1:00 p.m.** Registration information is available at <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/637230089>. Bidders are not required to participate in the webinar in order to submit a proposal.

All questions and answers from the webinar will be posted to http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm and will remain available until the proposal due date. Applicants are advised to access this information before submitting a proposal.

Additional Information and Changes to the RFP: All questions and answers will be posted to http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm and will remain available until the proposal due date. Should changes to the RFP be made prior to the deadline, ISBE will post those changes to http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm. Applicants are advised to check the site before submitting a proposal.

Contact Person: For more information on school improvement grants, contact Marci Johnson at 217-524-4832 or marjohns@isbe.net.

Background and Program Specifications

School Improvement Grants, as authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and under section 1003(g) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), are made available from ED to state education agencies (SEAs) to provide subgrants to local education agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools and Title I eligible secondary schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In awarding such grants, ISBE will give priority consideration to those LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need for school improvement funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended by the interim final requirements published in the [Federal Register](#) in January 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on Tier I and Tier II schools as defined in the *Eligible Applicants* section of this RFP.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act CFDA (Code of Federal Domestic Assistance) number for the ARRA SIG is #84.388A, and the Award Number is S388A090014. The School Improvement Grant 1003(g) CFDA number for the ESEA SIG is 84.377A, and the award number is S377A090014. Please note that grants funded under 84.388A are funds made available through the ARRA and thus will be subject to additional reporting requirements.

Please Note: ISBE does not expect to have sufficient funds for all Tier I and II schools that are eligible, and therefore, will only send out applications for Tier III after eligible Tier I and II schools are funded.

The purpose of the grant is to assist the state's lowest performing schools 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 their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. For each of the Tier I and Tier II schools included in the proposal, the LEA must utilize one of four approved school intervention models identified below. Further explanation and details about each model are provided in Appendix A.

1. Turnaround Model
2. Restart Model
3. School Closure
4. Transformation Model

Lead and Supporting Partners

LEAs that are awarded SIGs will be required to work with an external Lead Partner to implement selected intervention models. The State Superintendent has selected, through the procurement process, a number of organizations with demonstrated records of success in supporting academically underperforming schools. In effect, these selected organizations are referred to as *Lead* and *Supporting Partners*, and are pre-qualified to subcontract and work with LEAs and schools receiving SIGs.

Lead and Supporting Partners are organizations that have served as national and state leaders in school improvement efforts. Lead Partners have been selected to lead and oversee the implementation of the school intervention models whereas Supporting Partners have been selected to assist LEAs with the implementation of district-wide human capital efforts and capacity-building strategies. Ultimately, the Supporting Partners will support the school-level work of Lead Partners. The Illinois Approved Lead and Supporting Partner lists are located in Appendices B & C respectively.

Lead and Supporting Partners are directly available to LEAs and must be accessed through contractual services executed between the school district and the chosen Partner. In some instances, ISBE may contract with approved Partners and broker services directly to LEAs.

LEAs are encouraged to partner with an organization listed on the Illinois Approved Provider List found at <http://www.isbe.net/apl/default.htm>. For those LEAs, however, desiring to use a provider not included on the Illinois Approved Provider List, pre-approval must be obtained from ISBE. A request for approval must be submitted to ISBE prior to the execution of a subcontract funded with SIG funds and must describe how the LEA recruited, screened, and selected the provider. The proposed provider will be required to submit an application to ISBE in which they will be asked to detail their experiences and record of success in supporting academically underperforming schools.

LEAs and Partners are expected to share accountability for the success of selected intervention models in substantially raising student achievement and enabling participating schools to make AYP and exit improvement status. To that end, it is expected that LEAs maintain the authority to terminate subcontracts with partners when identified benchmarks are not being achieved, and specified outcomes are not accomplished. Proposals must include timelines and details of the LEA's plan for the eventual phase-out of Lead and Supporting Partner services. This information must be included in the *Sustainability Plan* (Attachment 10) sections of the proposal.

All LEAs, Lead Partners, and Supporting Partners will be required to participate in data collection, evaluation, and reporting activities specified by ISBE so that successful strategies can be determined and shared throughout the State. In addition, ISBE's procurement for Lead and Supporting Partners focused on the establishment of an outcomes-based measurement model and corresponding metrics for evaluating success by schools, districts, and partners.

Waivers

ISBE has been approved by ED to extend the following waivers to SIG recipients (see Attachment 18).

- Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a Turnaround or Restart model to “start over” in the school improvement status timeline;
- 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

Reporting and Evaluation

LEAs awarded a SIG must participate in all evaluation and reporting activities conducted by ED and ISBE which include, but are not limited to:

- Participate fully in on-site reviews conducted by ISBE;
- Participate in designated school improvement activities and technical assistance offered by ISBE;
- Update annual improvement goals;
- Submit a revised budget and annual budget summary;
- Submit quarterly expenditure reports; and
- Submit annual continuation application.

Monitoring

ISBE will monitor each grantee to ensure effective implementation of the proposed activities of the selected school intervention models. The student achievement goals identified under the Improvement Goals section of this RFP and the nine (9) leading indicators identified later will serve as the basis for all monitoring activities.

Fiscal Information

Funding for SIG is made available from section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA and from section 1003(g) of ARRA. The total amount of SIG funding available to LEAs under this RFP is approximately \$137 million. Individual grant awards to LEAs will range from not less than \$50,000 to not more than \$2 million annually, per participating Tier I and Tier II schools. The amount of funding requested by the LEA must be commensurate to its capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools. Annual funding requests must be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention models. The total annual LEA funding request, however, may not exceed the number of participating Tier I and Tier II schools multiplied by \$2 million.

ISBE will determine if the amount requested by the LEA is appropriate based on information provided in the proposal evidencing the LEA's capacity to serve participating schools, selected school intervention models, schools being served, and other criteria identified in this RFP. Further information about the criteria for review and approval of proposals is included in the *Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposal* section of this document.

Grant funds are projected to be available for three (3) grant periods including FY 2011, FY 2012, and FY 2013. LEA's must ensure that funds are spent by June 30th of each year of the award. Carryover of funds into the next year of the grant is not permissible. After the initial award, grantees may apply for two additional, one-year periods of funding subject to sufficient federal funding for the program, progress toward meeting defined school goals, progress toward leading indicators, and effective implementation of selected intervention models.

The LEA must propose budgets for district-level activities as well as school-level activities. Further, LEAs must propose a separate budget for each participating Tier I and Tier II school for each year of the grant (i.e., FYs 2011, 2012, and 2013). Applicants must use the budget forms provided in Attachments 15 and 16 to submit proposed budgets. Budget forms are titled according to these criteria. Applicants are advised to identify appropriate budget forms and prepare accordingly. Budgets must indicate the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use to:

1. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
2. Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.

Use of Funds

The LEA must use ARRA SIG and ESEA SIG funds only for school improvement activities. Funds must be used to supplement the amount of non-federal funds that, in the absence of the Title I monies, would otherwise be made available to participating Tier I and Tier II schools. Therefore, SIG funds **cannot supplant non-federal funds or be used to replace existing services**. The LEA must also ensure that all of its Title I schools are comparable to its non-Title I schools in accordance with section [1120A\(c\) of the ESEA](#).

SIG funds **may not** be used for the following activities:

- Proposal preparation costs;
- Out-of-state travel for staff;
- Food purchases;
- Incentives of non-educational value (e.g., trinkets, cash, etc.);
- Promotional or marketing items;
- Field trips that are recreational in nature (Field trips without academic support will be considered entertainment and will not be funded);
- Motivational speakers;
- Capital improvements such as facility construction, remodeling, or renovations;
- Indirect costs; and
- Any expenditure that occurred prior to the execution of a grant agreement under this RFP.

SIG 1003(g) funds must be tracked and reported separately from the Title I, Part A funds and the ARRA Section 1003(a) School Improvement Grant. Local fiscal agents are to place improvement funds in a Title I account assigned for school improvement. These funding numbers must not be the same as is used for the Title I Basic grant award or Section 1003(a) School Improvement Grant.

Since these are school improvement funds, districts may not combine funds into one account, and the amount awarded to each school must be spent specifically on implementation of one of the intervention models (see Attachments 19 and 20).

Overview of Proposal Requirements

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the major program components required under this RFP. The *LEA Proposal Narrative Requirements* section and the *School Proposal Narrative Requirements* section, immediately following the overview, provide specific instructions on the information that must be submitted to demonstrate fidelity to the program requirements.

Schools to be Served

The LEA must identify each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA has the capacity to serve and identify the school intervention model that the LEA commits to use in each Tier I and Tier II school. An LEA that has nine (9) or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the Transformation Model in more than 50 percent of those schools (see Attachment 3). Applicants are required to provide an identification number for each participating school. School NCES ID numbers can be accessed at the National Center for Education Statistics website at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch>. The School NCES ID numbers are also listed on the Innovation and Improvement School Improvement Grant website at http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm.

LEA Needs Assessment

For each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve, it must demonstrate that it has analyzed the needs of each school and selected one of the four approved intervention models for each school based on the analysis. In an effort to assist the LEA with the analysis, a Needs Assessment tool is provided (see Attachment 2). The LEA must submit Part I of the completed Needs Assessment with its proposal.

LEA Proposal Narrative

The LEA must include the following information in its proposal to be considered for a SIG. More explicit directions for preparing the LEA Proposal Narrative are provided in the *LEA Proposal Narrative Requirements* section of this RFP.

1. **Overview and Rationale:** Applicants must provide a detailed explanation of how the LEA analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school and used the Needs Assessment to select a school intervention model.

Additionally, the LEA must explain its capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related supports to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the proposal in order to implement fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why the LEA lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

2. **Proposed Activities:** Applicants must describe the actions the LEA has taken, or will take, to implement a school intervention model for each participating Tier I and Tier II school. Activities must be consistent with the final requirements outlined by ED and ISBE. The following resources are provided to assist applicants to fulfill the requirements of SIG:
 - [Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003\(g\) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 \(ESEA\).](#)
 - [Federal Register](#), Vol. 75, No. 13/Thursday, January 21, 2010.
 - Appendix A for an explanation and details of each intervention model.

Additionally the LEA must describe how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected interventions fully and effectively.

3. **Level of Commitment:** Applicants must describe the LEA's level of commitment by explaining the process used to consult with critical stakeholders, including local school board members, teachers' union

representatives, school staff, and partnering organizations, regarding the proposal and the implementation of a school intervention model in each of the participating Tier I and Tier II schools.

School Proposal Narrative

An LEA must include the following information in its proposal for **each participating Tier I and Tier II school**. More explicit directions for preparing the School Proposal Narrative are provided in the *School Proposal Narrative Requirements* section of this RFP.

1. **Narrative and Overview**: Using school-level performance indicators, applicants must explain how the analysis of current data informed the selection of an intervention model for each participating school.
2. **Proposed Activities**: Applicants must describe the proposed activities for the intervention model selected for the school, detailing specific information about data driven decision making, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and job-embedded professional development for each school the LEA seeks to fund.

Lead and Support Partners

The LEA must screen and select one Lead Partner from the Illinois Approved Provider List (see Appendix B) and describe the selection process. To assist with the screening process, ISBE is providing online access to the competitive proposals submitted by those entities selected as approved Lead Partners. The proposals include detailed descriptions of activities and services available from each Partner and can be reviewed at <http://www.isbe.net/apl/default.htm>. For those LEAs desiring to use a provider not included on the Illinois Approved Provider List, pre-approval must be obtained from ISBE prior to the execution of a subcontract. A request for approval must be submitted to ISBE and must describe how the LEA recruited, screened, and selected the provider and give a detailed description of the services the partner will provide.

Where applicable, letter(s) of commitment from the selected Partner(s) should be included in the LEA's proposal indicating that there is an agreement between the LEA and the Partner to work together to define the scope of work and deliverables. If the Lead Partner selected is not on the Illinois Approved Provider List, the provider is required to submit an application to ISBE detailing their experience and record of success in supporting academically underperforming schools. Lead Partner Applicants not on the Illinois Approved Provider List need to receive approval from ISBE prior to entering into a contract with any LEA receiving 1003(g) SIG funds. An LEA's grant proposal may be approved even if the Lead Partner has not yet received approval, however no funds will be distributed to the LEA until the Lead Partner receives approval from ISBE. To receive an application please visit http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm or contact Marci Johnson in the Division of Innovation and Improvement. See the *Contact Person* section of this RFP for information.

Timeline

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the proposal. The timeline must span the entire term of the grant and include activities through June 30, 2013. Additionally, the timeline must include district-level activities that will support the implementation of the school-level intervention model. The timeline must include phases such as planning, implementation, and monitoring. Activities related to policy, hiring, principal and teacher evaluation, professional development, and monitoring must be included within the appropriate phases.

Alignment of Resources

The LEA must describe specific actions the district has taken or will take to align other resources with proposed interventions and current and future funding sources to support identified improvement goals, including commitment to identify and reallocate existing district funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after the federal funds expire.

Sustainability Plan

The LEA must provide a sustainability plan and accompanying timeline that forecasts at least three years beyond completion of the grant. The sustainability plan must detail how the LEA will sustain the reform efforts after funds under this RFP expire. The plan must include details on the eventual phase-out of Lead and Supporting Partner services. Applicants must complete the *Timeline and Sustainability Plan* forms (see Attachment 10) and submit them with the proposal.

Annual Improvement Goals and Objectives

The LEA must hold participating Tier I and Tier II schools accountable for improving student achievement. Toward that end, the LEA must identify specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely (SMART) goals relevant to student achievement on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and/or the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PASE) in both reading/language arts and mathematics. LEA goals and objectives must be included for each year of the grant. Applicants must complete the *LEA Goals and Objectives* forms (see Attachment 8) and submit them with the proposal. Additionally for each school application the applicant must describe the school level strategies that will be put in place to support the attainment of each LEA goal (see Attachment 17).

Leading Indicators

ED has identified nine (9) leading indicators outlined below that ISBE will use to hold schools receiving SIG funds accountable. Applicants must provide data for each indicator from school years (SY) 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 for each participating Tier I and Tier II school. In addition to the LEA's progress toward meeting annual goals for student achievement, data collected on the leading indicators will be used to measure school performance over the course of the grant period. Data provided to ISBE in this application will be used to establish a performance baseline for each school and the district. The nine (9) leading indicators are:

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

Stakeholder Engagement

The LEA must consult with critical stakeholders including local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, and Lead and Supporting Partners regarding the proposal and the implementation of a school intervention model in each of the participating Tier I and Tier II schools. Applicants must complete the *LEA Stakeholders Consultation and Signature* forms (see Attachment 7) and submit them with the proposal.

LEA Proposal Narrative Requirements

The LEA Proposal Narrative should be completed by, or in consultation with, staff from the LEA, school(s) proposed for funding, and critical stakeholders including local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, and partnering organizations. Please note that the required components to be included in the proposal correspond to the criteria and point values that will be used to evaluate proposals (see *Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposals* section of this RFP). Applicants are advised to review those criteria before completing proposal narratives.

Section I: Overview and Rationale

For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must:

- A. Demonstrate that it has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention model for each school. Please **complete and attach** to the proposal Section I of the *2010 School Improvement Grant 1003(g) District Needs Assessment (Needs Assessment)* found in Attachment 2. In addition to the Needs Assessment, respond to each of the below items:
 1. Describe the process the LEA utilized to complete the Needs Assessment and explain how the district's performance data informed the selection of an intervention model for each school.
 2. Describe how the team's responses to Section II of the Needs Assessment impacted the LEA's decision(s) about appropriate intervention models and the LEA's capacity to support the requirements of each model selected.
 3. Summarize key functions, systems, policies, and processes that the LEA must examine and/or develop to support sustainable improvement efforts, specifically related to:
 - i. Leadership;
 - ii. Evaluating principal and teacher effectiveness;
 - iii. Data driven decision-making;
 - iv. Instructional programs; and
 - v. Professional development.
 4. Describe the LEA's ability to support rapid improvement and systemic change to create a thriving learning environment.
- B. Develop annual goals and supporting objectives (see Attachment 8) based on identified need and selected intervention model. Goals must be **s**pecific, **m**easurable, **a**ttainable, **r**elevant **and** **t**imely (SMART). Using information from Attachment 8 describe how the LEA arrived at its annual goals for student achievement on the ISAT and/or the PSAE in both reading/language arts and mathematics. Additionally explain how the LEA will monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds to help ensure the LEA's timely progression towards identified goals.
- C. Identify strategies that will be used to monitor the nine (9) leading indicators designated as metrics by ED. Applicants must complete the *LEA Strategies to Address Leading Indicators* forms (see Attachment 9) and submit them with the proposal.
- D. Summarize briefly the previous and current reform and improvement efforts that have occurred within the last five (5) years and explain what supported or impeded their success.
- E. Describe in detail what elements the LEA does not currently have in place to maximize improvement efforts and what steps or procedures will be taken to obtain the additional support and technical

assistance necessary to support the systemic change and district improvement goals. Include steps or procedures that will be taken to support systemic change.

- F. Describe the LEA's capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to *each* Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected (e.g., if the LEA has selected the *Turnaround* and *Transformation* models, explain how the LEA will help schools fulfill the required activities for each model).
- G. If the LEA is **not** applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why the LEA lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. Applicants must complete the *Tier I and Tier II Schools Eligible But Not Served* forms (see Attachment 4) and submit them with the proposal.

SECTION II: Proposed Activities

The LEA must:

- A. Describe actions it has taken, or will take, to:
 - 1. Design and implement interventions consistent with the SIG 1003(g) final requirements;
 - 2. Screen and select external partners from the Illinois Approved Provider List found in Appendices B and C. Describe how the LEA selected the provider(s) and include, where applicable, letter(s) of intent from the partnering organization. Describe the measurable outcomes and time specific services the LEA will receive from the selected partner. If the LEA wishes to use a provider not included on the list, describe how the LEA recruited, screened, and selected external providers. Pre-approval from ISBE is required to subcontract with a provider not included on the Illinois Approved Provider List;
 - 3. Align other resources with the interventions;
 - 4. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions, fully and effectively, detailing how the LEA will work with the local school board and teachers' union to accomplish necessary changes. Provide any evidence of action already initiated related to the intervention; and
 - 5. Discuss district plans to develop, an evaluation system for teachers and principals incorporating student growth as a significant factor along with other factors as described in Public Act 096-0861 Section 24A-7, please visit <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/96/096-0861.htm> for more information. The LEA must assure that it will implement a new evaluation system for teachers and principals no later than the start of the 2012-2013 school year. The evaluation system should fairly and accurately differentiate teachers and identify and reward effective performance; and identify and address ineffective performance.
- B. Describe how the LEA will increase the capacity of the school board, central office, and district administrators to oversee and implement the intervention activities. Please address any district reconfiguration that may need to occur to support grant implementation (e.g., transformation officer, turnaround officer). Provide job descriptions for newly created positions and list the names and positions of key staff involved at both the district level and school level that will help ensure successful implementation of the reform model (i.e., central office turnaround manager, principal, reading coach, intervention specialist, and school improvement coordinator) and any other positions that would be paid with SIG funds.
- C. Submit a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the application. The timeline must span the entire term of the grant (i.e., through June 30, 2013) and focus on district-level activities that will support the

implementation of the intervention models. The timeline must include phases such as planning, implementation, and monitoring. Include items the LEA identified in sections I-A-4 and II-B of the *LEA Proposal Narrative Requirements* section of this RFP. Explain how the LEA plans to sustain the reform efforts after the grant funding ends. Provide a sustainability plan with a corresponding timeline that forecasts at least three years beyond the completion of the grant. Applicants must complete the *Timeline and Sustainability Plan* forms (see Attachment 10) and submit them with the proposal.

Section III: Level of Commitment

The LEA must:

- A. Explain the process it used to consult with critical stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Use Attachment 7 to provide names and signatures as evidence of stakeholder engagement.
- B. Detail how the community was given notice of intent to submit a SIG application.
- C. Describe the LEA's plan to support ongoing collaboration efforts and communication with staff, families, and the community.
- D. Describe the level of support from key stakeholders for the LEA's SIG proposal. The LEA may include letters of support, as applicable. Letters of support from the local school board, teachers' union, school staff, partnering organizations, and other stakeholder groups will be considered most relevant in the evaluation of proposals.

School Proposal Narrative Requirements

The School Proposal Narrative should be completed by, or in consultation with, staff from the LEA, school(s) proposed for funding, and critical stakeholders including local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, and partnering organizations. Please note that the required components to be included in the proposal correspond to the criteria and point values that will be used to evaluate proposals (see *Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposals* section of this RFP). Applicants are advised to review those criteria before completing proposal narratives.

Section I: Narrative & Overview

The information below must be provided for each school for which the LEA is seeking SIG funding. Provide documentation for each school.

- A. Provide the requested data on the *Cover Sheet for Individual School Submission* form (see Attachment 14) for each participating Tier I and Tier II. School. The data can be obtained from the School Improvement Plan located on the [Illinois Interactive Report Card](#).
- B. Describe how the school's performance data and information gleaned from the Needs Assessment (see Attachment 2) informed the selection of the intervention model for this school and provide the rationale for selecting this model.
- C. Describe the role the selected Lead Partner will take in the school and delineate specific services that will be provided to successfully implement the selected school intervention model (refer to the information provided for section II–A-2 in the *LEA Proposal Narrative* section of this RFP).
- D. List positions, titles, and the names of individuals involved in the oversight of the grant at the school level. Provide job descriptions for any newly created positions that are affected by the intervention models selected (e.g., principal, reading coach, intervention specialist, and school improvement coordinator). Indicate the full-time equivalency (FTE) or the percentage of time that each staffer will dedicate to the oversight of the intervention model at the school. Provide the name of the person who will monitor and evaluate the progress of this initiative.

Section II: Proposed Activities

Describe the proposed activities that address the intervention model chosen for this school. Refer to Appendix A for information on the required activities for each model.

- A. Complete the *Individual School Strategies* forms (see Attachment 17) and detail the school-level strategies required to reach the goals for student achievement identified by the LEA.
- B. Describe how the school will collect, analyze, and share data among school staff and the LEA. Include how the school will ensure that all administrators and teachers in the school are able to access and monitor each student's progress. Describe how school staff will analyze data to make necessary instructional modifications, enhance support services, or identify interventions.
- C. Describe how instructional practices will be aligned with assessment practices to measure student progress. Provide details about how the school will adjust instruction based on progress monitoring and collected data results. Include the process that will be used to make curriculum modifications. Include an outline of assessments used by grade level. A chart that summarizes this information may be included as an appendix to the proposal.

- D. Describe any support service(s) or interventions that will be put in place at the school to ensure full implementation of the selected model. Discuss the process that will be put in place to identify school-level needs and to ensure that high quality support and interventions are present.
- E. Describe the school-level, job embedded professional development that will occur to support the implementation of the selected model. Discuss how the approach will support all staff and how individual needs will be identified and addressed. Describe how the school will initiate and support collaborative efforts among staff such as grade level meetings, teacher inquiry, and learning communities.
- F. Describe the school's plan to communicate its vision and goals to the school staff, families, and the community. Provide details of continuous communication with the staff, families, and the community regarding status and progress of school improvement efforts.

Proposal Format

Each proposal must be submitted according to the specifications and format outlined below. **Incomplete proposals will not be considered.** Each proposal must include an LEA Proposal Narrative and a School Proposal Narrative for **each** participating Tier I and Tier II school. The proposal is to be developed in coordination and consultation with critical stakeholders including local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, and partnering organizations.

Proposal Specifications

Proposals must be prepared and submitted according to the following specifications:

- Pages must be 8.5" x 11" with print on one side only and 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides of the page;
- Text in the proposal narratives must be typed and double spaced;
- Text in the attachments must be typed on the interactive forms provided;
- Font must be 11-points or larger;
- Pages must be consecutively numbered;
- Page headers that identify the applicant (i.e., Region-County-District-Type Code, district name, and school name as appropriate) on the proposal narratives and appendices must be included; and
- Proposals with spiral binding or submitted in binders will not be accepted.

Proposal Format

Please use the following as a checklist in assembling your completed proposal.

1. **Cover Page (Attachment 1):** Must be signed by the district superintendent, or official authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the LEA, and the president of the local school board.
2. **School Improvement Grant 1003(g) LEA Needs Assessment (Attachment 2):** Completed by LEA and critical stakeholders; submit only Section I with application.
3. **Tier I and Tier II Intervention Model Selection for Schools (Attachment 3):** Identify each school for which the LEA is seeking funding in the application and the intervention model selected for that school.
4. **Tier I and Tier II Schools Eligible But Not Served (Attachment 4):** Identify schools that are eligible to receive the SIG grant, but the LEA is not applying to serve; give the reason for their exclusion.
5. **Proposal Abstract (Attachment 5):** Briefly describe the overall objectives and the activities related to the grant. Not to exceed 10 page(s).
6. **LEA Proposal Narrative:** Follow the specifications found under *LEA Narrative Proposal Requirements* section of the RFP.
7. **LEA Forms:** Follow the specifications found under *LEA Narrative Proposal Requirements* section of the RFP.
 - A. **Selected Lead and Supporting Partners (Attachment 6):** Provide requested information about Lead and Supporting Partner(s) that will assist with the implementation of the selected intervention model for each school. Mark if the partner is on the Illinois Approved Provider List or if it needs to be approved by ISBE. Marking this form with the indication that the selected provider needs to be approved by ISBE does not constitute approval. Applicants must take separate action to request approval to subcontract with a provider not included on the Illinois Approved Provider List.

- B. **LEA Stakeholders Consultation and Signature Form (Attachment 7):** Provide requested information to describe the stakeholder engagement process the district utilized and also to document individuals that participated in the process.
- C. **LEA Goals and Objectives (Attachment 8):** Identify specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely (SMART) goals relevant to student achievement on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and/or the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PASE) in both reading/language arts and mathematics. LEA goals and objectives must be included for each year of the grant.
- D. **LEA Strategies to Address Leading Indicators (Attachment 9):** Provide LEA baseline data for each indicator from school years (SY) 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 and then identify strategies to address each leading indicator.
- E. **Timeline and Sustainability Plan (Attachment 10):** Describe how the LEA will sustain the improvement efforts for three years after the grant period has ended.
- F. **Letters of Support (Optional):** Provide letters of support from local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, partnering organizations, and other stakeholder groups.
- G. **LEA Budget Forms:** Include descriptions of the anticipated expenditures, correlated to the line items set forth on the Detailed Budget Summary Breakdowns. Must include subcontract information, if applicable (see item 7 of Attachment 20 for required subcontractor information).
- i. **LEA Comprehensive Budget Summary and Payment Schedule (Attachments 11, 11A, 11B):** This budget incorporates the LEA budget and all proposed school budgets for FY 2011. Proposed budgets must also be submitted for each continuation year of the grant (i.e., FY 2012 and FY 2013). The budgets must be submitted on the forms provided, and they must be signed by the district superintendent or official authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the LEA. The payment schedules must be based on the projected date of expenditures and be in accordance with ISBE's *State and Federal Grant Administration Policy and Fiscal Requirements and Procedures* handbook found at http://www.isbe.net/funding/pdf/fiscal_procedure_handbk.pdf (refer specifically to Section C: Procedures for Administration of Grants).
 - ii. **LEA Budget Summary and Payment Schedule (Attachment 12, 12A, 12B):** This budget includes the LEA budget only for FY 2011. Proposed budgets must also be submitted for each continuation year of the grant (i.e., FY 2012 and FY 2013). Budget information must be submitted on the forms provided, and they must be signed by the district superintendent or official authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the LEA. The payment schedules must be based on the projected date of expenditures and be in accordance with ISBE's *State and Federal Grant Administration Policy and Fiscal Requirements and Procedures* handbook found at http://www.isbe.net/funding/pdf/fiscal_procedure_handbk.pdf (refer specifically to Section C: *Procedures for Administration of Grants*).
 - iii. **Detailed Budget Summary Breakdown (Attachment 13).** Use this form to describe the items listed in the Budget Summaries and Payment Schedules for FY 2011, FY 2012, and FY 2013.
- H. **Cover Sheet for Individual School Submission (Attachment 14):** Complete this cover sheet for each school for which the LEA is seeking funding.

- I. **School Proposal Narrative:** Follow the specifications found under the *School Proposal Narrative Requirements* section of this RFP.
- J. **School Forms:** Follow the specifications found under the School Narrative Proposal Requirements section of the RFP.
 - i. **Individual School Budget Summary (Attachment 15, 15A, 15B):** Prepare a separate budget for each of the participating Tier I and Tier II schools for FY 2011. Proposed school budgets must also be submitted for each continuation year of the grant (i.e., FY 2012 and FY 2013). Use these forms to propose expenditures for school-level activities. Budget information must be submitted on the interactive forms provided.
 - ii. **Individual School Detailed Budget Summary Breakdown (Attachment 16):** Use this form to describe the items listed in the Budget Summaries and Payment Schedules for FY 2011, FY 2012, and FY 2013.
 - iii. **Individual School Strategies (Attachment 17):** Using the identified LEA goals in Attachment 8, describe the strategies the school level team will implement to help the LEA reach the identified goals.
- K. **Waivers (Attachment 18):** For each participating school, check the waiver(s) being requested from ISBE.
- L. **Certifications and Assurances:** Each applicant, **including each entity that is participating in a joint application**, is required to submit the following certifications and assurances. These must be signed by the official legally authorized to submit the proposal and to bind the applicant to its contents.
 - i. Program Specific Terms and Agreements (Attachment 19).
 - ii. Certifications and Assurances and Standard Terms of the Grant (Attachment 20).
 - iii. Certifications and Assurances for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 ARRA (Attachment 21)
 - iv. General Education Provisions Act (Attachment 22).
 - v. Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion (Attachment 23).
 - v. Certificate Regarding Lobbying (Attachment 24).
 - vi. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (Attachment 24 A,B,C).

Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposals

LEAs with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate the greatest need for school improvement funds and demonstrate the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status will receive priority consideration for funding. Following the notification of grant awards, an applicant may request copies of reviewer comments by contacting Marci Johnson in the Division of Innovation and Improvement. See the *Contact Person* section of this RFP for information.

LEA Narrative Scoring Criteria

Section I: Overview and Rationale (Total Points 80)

There is a thorough and detailed response to the requested information. Sufficient evidence is provided to give an in-depth understanding of the current status of the district and its ability to guide, lead, and provide high quality support to all of the schools applying for funding. It is evident that systemic change is underway and rapid improvement is expected. All required activities specific to the model selected should be directly addressed. Appendix B includes the intervention model information.

Section II: Proposed Activities (Total Points 110)

The proposed activities include details in response to the requested information. The narrative information fully explains or addresses each element listed in the proposal requirements. Explanations of any processes are fully described to ensure reviewers a clear picture of the district operations. Capacity issues are thoroughly discussed and any steps to meet capacity challenges are fully and directly addressed. All required activities specific to the model selected should be directly addressed. Appendix B includes the intervention model information.

Section III: Commitment (Total Points 30)

The descriptions provide clear evidence of partner engagement and stakeholder collaboration to ensure full implementation of the selected model. Specific steps to ensure communication and collaboration is taking place with school staff, families, community members, the local school board, and the teachers' union to support the district's vision for improvement and systemic change is included in the narrative. All required activities specific to the model selected are directly addressed. Appendix A includes the intervention model information.

Section IV: Budget (Total Points 40)

The budget covers a three year period and includes activities related to supporting the implementation of selected intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the application. The budget reflects a reasonable allocation of funds for district level activities.

The School Application Scoring

Section I: Rationale (Total Points 80)

The information provides a thorough explanation of the need in the school. A detailed description of the process and selection of the model chosen and how the intervention will impact identified student groups. There is a comprehensive analysis of the school's performance and what will need to be in place to support the efforts of the selected model. Clear evidence of support for the selected school improvement efforts is provided. There is evidence of a strong commitment to work with Lead Partners to implement rapid improvement. The information provided identifies specific needs for support and technical assistance. All required activities specific to the model selected are directly addressed. Appendix A includes the intervention model information.

Section II: Proposed Activities (Total Points 110)

There is a thorough description of strategies that will result in measurable outcomes for each individual school with a thorough description of the proposed school-level activities. The individual school's strategies should align with the district's goals. A detailed description of the school's efforts to improve academic achievement is provided, and evidence of the data driven decision making processes that will be used to change the instructional practices in the school are explained. A clear description of how the school will align the instructional practices to the assessment practice to measure the student progress is provided. There is evidence of the supports currently in place and the need for additional services or interventions. A detailed description of the school's professional development plan, how it will align to the model chosen, and the process for monitoring the implementation is included. There is a thorough description of the school's communication outreach plans with parents, staff, and the community. All required activities specific to the model selected should be directly addressed. Appendix A includes the intervention model information.

Section III: Timeline and Budget (Total Points 20)

There is a timeline for the next three years that reflects implementation of the model selected. The timeline clearly includes progress monitoring or benchmarking. There is a three year budget which reflects a reasonable allocation of funds for the school-level activities and the funds needed to support the school's SMART goals. The *Budget Summary Breakdown* addresses each specific item deemed necessary to fully implement the selected model and support the improvement efforts.

Appendix A

Intervention Models

Please note the information pertaining to the specific elements of each model comes from the United States Department of Education. Some aspects, such as use of funds for Response to Intervention, may not be applicable for Illinois grantees.

Turnaround model:

- (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must:
 - (i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
 - (ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
 - A. Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
 - B. Select new staff;
 - (iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
 - (iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
 - (v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
 - (vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
 - (vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
 - (viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.
- (2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as:
 - (i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or
 - (ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

Restart model:

A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a Charter Management Organization (CMO), or an Education Management Organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

School closure:

School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

Transformation model:

A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

- (1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must:
 - (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
 - (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--
 - (1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and
 - (2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
 - (C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
 - (D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (*e.g.*, regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
 - (E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.
 - (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers’ and school leaders’ effectiveness, such as--
 - (A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;

- (B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
- (C) Ensuring that the school is not required accepting a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

- (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
- (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--

- (A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
- (B) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
- (C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
- (D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
- (E) In secondary schools--
 - (1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
 - (2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
 - (3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
 - (4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;

(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and

(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or

(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Appendix B

Illinois Approved Provider List

Overview of Approved Lead Partners

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL)	<p>AUSL's mission is to improve student achievement in high-poverty, chronically failing schools through dramatic interventions to comprehensively reset failing schools.</p> <p>In AUSL's Turnaround school model, the district closes a failing school at the end of the school year and reopens it after the summer under AUSL's management. Admission is open to any former student who wishes to attend, as well as all students in the school's geographic boundary area. AUSL replaces the principal with an individual selected by and accountable to AUSL, as well as the district, and also brings in a cohort of specially trained new teachers from AUSL's teacher residency program. AUSL evaluates all incumbent teachers and staff before re-hiring any who are interested in remaining. Typically, more than half of the school's incumbent teachers and staff are replaced.</p>	<p>Since 2002 AUSL has launched eight Turnaround elementary schools and one Turnaround high school in Chicago. AUSL is still managing all of these schools, and all but one have made steady year-to-year gains in student achievement. AUSL has also developed many strong collaborative partnerships, including key partnerships with Chicago Public Schools, Serve Illinois (AmeriCorps), New Leaders for New Schools, City Year, and university partners (National Louis University, Erikson Institute, and the University of Illinois at Chicago).</p>

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
<p>America's Choice, Inc., and its subcontractor ACT, Inc.</p>	<p>America's Choice will provide two programs:</p> <p>(1) the America's Choice Comprehensive Intervention Model in elementary schools, designed to prepare all students to enter middle school core instructional programs without need for remediation, and</p> <p>(2) the Rigor & Readiness Comprehensive Intervention Model in middle and high schools, designed to support students' development of college and career readiness.</p> <p>These programs include: an examination system aligned with state standards, a rigorous core curriculum with end-of-course examinations aligned to college and career readiness standards, instructional materials aligned to the curriculum, systematic monitoring of student progress, and "safety net" programs designed to accelerate learning.</p>	<p>States and school districts have successfully implemented America's Choice programs throughout the country, including in Georgia, New York, Florida, Arkansas, and Maryland.</p> <p>A study of Rochester, New York schools found that students in America's Choice schools made significantly higher achievement gains than students in other schools, and the performance gap for minority students was narrowed significantly in both reading and math. Also, a study by outside reviewers found that students in America's Choice schools scored an average of 9 points higher on reading comprehension tests, and 7 points higher on language scales.</p>

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
Consortium for Educational Change (CEC)	<p>CEC proposes to implement a School Transformation Model, which will focus on accelerating student learning by aligning resources of the school and district to: add time for student learning and teaching; share leadership through teams; support teacher practice; and establish clear and ambitious performance targets for everyone.</p> <p>This model would be implemented in a school or district using a work plan with the following four steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Set goals and standards; -Implement structures and plans; -Implement a learning environment; and -Become results focused. 	<p>CEC has more than 20 years of experience in working with Illinois school systems, helping them construct communities of learners and breaking down traditional hierarchies so that all members of the community contribute to the school system. CEC's work is supported by subcontractors and partners who are leaders in union/management collaboration, teacher and school leadership development, classroom instruction, curriculum, and standards assessment.</p> <p>In CEC's years of experience, it has helped schools improve students' grade-level proficiency, improve performance on state assessments, and work toward closing achievement gaps. For example, in CEC's past work with an ethnically diverse suburban Chicago school district, CEC helped increase the percentage of African American eighth-graders who met or exceeded ISAT standards in math from 40% in 2004 to 71% in 2009.</p>
Diplomas Now, a program of Johns Hopkins University	<p>The Diplomas Now model integrates four key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effective whole school reform with instructional, organizational, student, teacher and administrative support components; -A teacher-friendly early warning data system tied to identifying students in need of prevention, intervention and recovery strategies; -A team that works closely with teachers and administrators to provide targeted and intensive supports; and -A team-based organizational structure 	<p>In the 2008-2009 school year, the Diplomas Now model was implemented in a large, high-poverty middle school in Philadelphia. Working in partnership with school leadership and teachers, this school successfully made Adequate Yearly Progress for the first time in four years and the Diplomas Now model resulted in a 50% decrease in the number of students in grades 6-8 who were off-track to graduate based on the following key</p>

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
	and collaborative work environment.	<p>indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attendance (52% decrease in students with less than 80% attendance); -Behavior (45% decrease in students with three or more negative behavior comments); and -Course failure in Math and English (83% decrease in the number of students receiving an F in Math and 80% decrease in the number of students receiving an F in English).
EdisonLearning	<p>EdisonLearning proposes to serve as a national and on-site team of specialists dedicated wholly to partnership schools' curriculum, instruction and academic achievement.</p> <p>EdisonLearning will develop programs customized to meet the needs of each partnership school, but comprehensive models include several general components, such as: leadership development, school organization and scheduling support; learning environment management tools to promote a school culture in which students learn effectively; curriculum management and support tools that align to Illinois standards; intensive on-site and national professional development; benchmark assessment systems to track student progress; quality monitoring and management; and support for families who may not have considered the possibility of higher education.</p>	<p>Since 1995, EdisonLearning has partnered with school districts across the country to assist them in meeting student achievement goals. Throughout its history, EdisonLearning has had the opportunity to partner with numerous clients having diverse student bodies, largely serving clients in high-minority, low-income settings (the average school in an EdisonLearning Partnership is 87% minority and 65% socioeconomically disadvantaged).</p> <p>Data and independent reports (including a notable RAND Corporation report released in 2005), confirm that schools partnering with EdisonLearning have improved their students' academic performance over time. The American Institute for Research stated in a 2006 report that EdisonLearning was the most thoroughly researched comprehensive school reform organization in the country.</p>

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
<p>Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS): representing a consortium of regional offices and intermediate service centers</p>	<p>IARSS proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Administer a needs assessment of the district and school; -Coordinate with school and community "stakeholders" (i.e. parents, businesses, community organizations, and public officials) to develop a school intervention model; and -Direct resources and expertise toward intervention planning, capacity building, evaluation of existing staff, professional development, and implementation of the intervention model. 	<p>IARSS's Regional Offices of Education (ROE) and Intermediate Service Centers (ISC) have a proven track record of working with underperforming schools through delivering support, coaching and technical assistance to promote academic achievement. The ROE/ISCs specifically work with schools that are identified as not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress and are on the State/Federal Academic Early Warning and Academic Watch status lists.</p> <p>Schools that the ROE/ISCs have worked with have achieved gains in academic growth ranging from 7% to 42% in both reading and math on state and local assessments over a three year period and have been removed from warning or watch status, and/or made consistent incremental gains each year. These schools have a range of 200 to 2,300 students and represent a wide range of communities and subgroups.</p>
<p>Learning Point Associates and its subcontractors, Strategic Learning Initiatives and Pivot Learning Partners</p>	<p>Learning Point Associates' plan focuses on collaborative development and implementation of turnaround strategies to improve student achievement and build the capacity of school leaders and staff to sustain improvement.</p> <p>The proposed transformation design has six general components: a core school leadership team; a research-based diagnostic needs assessment; an instructional model to engage teachers in daily review of student data and weekly collaboration with other teachers; a parent and community</p>	<p>Learning Point Associates and its partner organizations have a long history of working with a broad range of districts, including chronically low-performing schools, to design, implement, evaluate, and monitor improvement and transformation efforts. In its past work with low-performing and high-need schools, Learning Point Associates and its partners have helped schools achieve improved student test scores, improved national standing, and increased success in meeting academic</p>

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
	engagement plan; a variety of support tools and expert coaching; and targeted intervention for special needs populations.	standards.
Success For All Foundation, Inc. (SFAF)	<p>SFAF will provide comprehensive turnaround models for target schools through a multi-dimensional set of strategies, focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leadership support and training for school administrators, staff and community to assist in improving student achievement and addressing school-specific issues; -Professional development and support in core learning areas (reading and math); -Development and implementation of a school-specific reform structure to address the needs of students showing lack of progress in academic, social, and behavioral realms; -Structured communication between schools and SFAF's Illinois Team Manager and consultants. 	<p>SFAF programs have been used in over 1,800 schools during the past 20 years, improving the achievement of more than 2 million students. Over 52 studies have assessed the effectiveness of SFAF's program, and independent reviews have consistently found that implementation of SFAF's programming resulted in significant increases in student achievement in various settings. A recent study of 22 comprehensive educational reform programs placed SFAF's program, and only one other, in the highest category awarded.</p>

Lead Partner and Service Area	Overview of Implementation Model	Record of Effectiveness
<p>Talent Development, a program of Johns Hopkins University</p>	<p>Talent Development proposes to implement two separate but interrelated programs: the Talent Development Middle Grades (TDMG) program for middle schools and the Talent Development High Schools (TDHS) program for high schools. Both programs focus on organizing students into smaller learning communities headed by teaching teams to create a successful learning environment with high student expectations, and to develop and promote the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders.</p> <p>The organization also seeks to promote community and family involvement and engagement through parenting assistance; initiatives to enhance family participation in and support of students, schools, and school programs; and coordination of school and community services and resources.</p>	<p>For the past 15 years, Talent Development has helped schools across the country to reorganize in ways that promote strong relationships for students and adults; implement innovative, evidence-based curricula and instructional strategies; and build professional communities that support distributed leadership, shared decision-making, and increased capacity for continual improvement.</p> <p>Talent Development offers research-based strategies developed by Johns Hopkins University, paired with intense technical assistance from master educators, to facilitate improvement in struggling schools. Schools that implement Talent Development reforms have seen increases in student attendance, reductions in suspension rates, and increased scores on student achievement tests.</p>

Appendix C

Illinois Approved Provider List

Overview of Approved Supporting Partners

Supporting Partner	Human Capital or District Capacity Building Strategies	Record of Effectiveness
<p>Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL)</p>	<p>AUSL proposes to share its expertise and support the efforts of Lead Partners in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Intervention and transformation of underperforming schools through AUSL's Transformation school model; -Operation of a teacher residency training program; -Focused projects related to school management and teacher development; and -Advice and assistance to districts and Lead Partners. <p>AUSL would assist clients in decision-making and capacity building through providing opportunities to observe AUSL's models in action, assisting clients to design their own adaptations of the AUSL model, and providing coaching and training support.</p>	<p>Over the last 8 years, AUSL has built a track record of success in launching and managing turnaround schools in Chicago. AUSL's work has resulted in dramatic gains in student achievement in Turnaround schools, including increasing the percentage of students meeting state ISAT standards and improving school cultures and parent involvement.</p> <p>Through its teacher residency training program, AUSL has trained over 300 new teachers, with 85% still working in education. AUSL has also developed many strong collaborative partnerships, including key partnerships with Chicago Public Schools, Serve Illinois (AmeriCorps), New Leaders for New Schools, City Year, and university partners (National Louis University, Erikson Institute, and the University of Illinois at Chicago).</p>
<p>Consortium for Educational Change (CEC)</p>	<p>CEC proposes to provide supporting services for human capital including: establishing an intensive induction and mentoring program for teachers and administrators; establishing meaningful performance evaluation and development systems that fairly and accurately differentiate teachers, based in part on student achievement; and establishing meaningful principal and administrator evaluation systems.</p> <p>CEC also proposes to build school board and district central office capacity with</p>	<p>CEC has more than 20 years of experience in working with Illinois school systems, helping them construct communities of learners and breaking down traditional hierarchies so that all members of the community contribute to the school system. CEC's work is supported by subcontractors and partners who are leaders in union/management collaboration, teacher and school leadership development, classroom</p>

Supporting Partner	Human Capital or District Capacity Building Strategies	Record of Effectiveness
	<p>respect to: collaborative relationship-building among district anchors (i.e. school board, administration, and local teachers' union); and leadership development and training.</p>	<p>instruction, curriculum, and standards assessment.</p> <p>CEC has developed ongoing relationships with a number of districts and schools throughout Illinois, including those that have not made Yearly Academic Progress and others that are restructuring. CEC has helped districts and schools to implement comprehensive reforms and to develop and implement school improvement plans. Through its work, CEC has helped schools achieve significant improvements in district, school, and student performance on the ISAT.</p>
<p>Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS): representing a consortium of regional offices and intermediate service centers</p>	<p>IARSS proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Implement human capital strategies, such as reforming district recruitment and hiring policies and establishing intensive induction and mentoring programs for teachers and administrators; -Establish meaningful performance evaluation and development systems that fairly and accurately differentiate teachers based on student achievement, and train administrators in their use; and -Establish meaningful principal and administrator evaluation systems that incorporate considerations of school climate and are based, in part, on student achievement. 	<p>IARSS's Regional Offices of Education (ROE) and Intermediate Service Centers (ISC) have a proven track record of working with underperforming schools through delivering support, coaching and technical assistance to promote academic achievement. The ROE/ISCs specifically work with schools that are identified as not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress and are on the State/Federal Academic Early Warning and Academic Watch status lists.</p> <p>Schools that the ROE/ISCs have worked with have achieved gains in academic growth ranging from 7% to 42% in both reading and math on state and local assessments over a three year period and have been removed from warning or watch status, and/or made consistent incremental gains each year. These schools have a range of 200 to 2,300 students and represent a wide</p>

Supporting Partner	Human Capital or District Capacity Building Strategies	Record of Effectiveness
		range of communities and subgroups.
<p>Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB), and its subcontractors Illinois Association of School Administrators, Illinois Association of School Business Officials, and Illinois Principals Association</p>	<p>IASB will provide expertise and support to Lead Partners, schools, and school districts over a 5 year period. Support will focus on training for superintendents, principals, school business officials, and other administrators, including targeted professional development activities and intensive coaching.</p>	<p>IASB provides regional and in-district professional development activities for school board members. In 2009, more than 1,300 school board members attended one or more of IASB's sessions.</p> <p>During 2008, IASB staff worked with boards of education, superintendents, staff, and community members in 44 districts where either the district or one or more schools within the district were in state academic warning or watch status. Based on 2008 data, 20 past-participating schools were no longer in warning or watch status at the school or district level. In 2009, work was done in 35 similar districts.</p>
<p>Learning Point Associates and its subcontractor, Pivot Learning Partners</p>	<p>Learning Point will work with turnaround school districts to guide them toward a systematic solution that is successful, both in building capacity and aligning capital management function in the short term, and in developing sustainable, long-term improvements in teaching and learning.</p> <p>Learning Point and its partner have expertise in developing school-specific strategies in: reforming district recruiting, hiring, and retention practices; establishing an alternative incentive and compensation system; creating an intensive induction and mentoring program; establishing a meaningful performance evaluation system; and providing training and coaching for capacity building.</p>	<p>Learning Point has a long history of working with a broad range of districts, including chronically low-performing districts, to design, implement, evaluate, and monitor improvement and transformation efforts. In its past work with low-performing and high-need schools, Learning Point has helped schools achieve improved student test scores, improved national standing, and increased success in meeting academic standards.</p>
<p>New Leaders for New Schools</p>	<p>Recruit, identify, and prepare up to 35 Partnership Zone principals over the</p>	<p>Over the past six years, New Leaders has partnered with the</p>

Supporting Partner	Human Capital or District Capacity Building Strategies	Record of Effectiveness
	<p>course of a planning period and two implementation years. The organization's work will focus on an intensive residency model, which includes the field's leading curriculum and training program for aspiring principals and a year of hands-on skills development and practice.</p> <p>New principals are also intensively supported during their entry into a school and during their first school year by an experienced coach.</p>	<p>Academy for Urban School Leadership to train and provide principals to lead turnaround schools. Since 2001, New Leaders has trained and supported more than 550 aspiring principals in urban areas across the country. The programs have a rigorous selection process, accepting fewer than 7% of applicants. Principals who have completed the program are highly-qualified and greatly diverse (participants range in age from 25 to 58 and 55% are African American). New Leaders currently supports 123 principals in Chicago, serving more than 70,000 children.</p> <p>New Leaders principals have achieved dramatic improvement in their schools. Students in elementary and middle schools led by New Leaders principals for at least three years are making academic gains faster than comparable students in their districts. Also, the most improved or highest performing schools in 5 cities and 2 states have been led by New Leaders Principals.</p>
Teach For America (TFA)	<p>TFA proposes to provide an entire staff of high-quality teachers for a turnaround school in Chicago. The teachers would come from TFA's corps of first and second year teachers and its base of veteran alumni teachers.</p> <p>TFA recruits and selects talented and diverse new teachers from among the nation's top graduating college seniors, and then trains them through an intensive residential summer institute. TFA also provides ongoing support and professional development to its</p>	<p>TFA has been recruiting, training, and supporting teachers in low-income classrooms since 1990 and has a track record of making a tremendous impact on student achievement. In Chicago, 500 TFA alumni currently work in education—350 as master teachers, 40 as assistant principals, 30 as school leaders, 22 as public schools administrators, and many as non-profit employees.</p> <p>In 2008, the Urban Institute found</p>

Supporting Partner	Human Capital or District Capacity Building Strategies	Record of Effectiveness
	<p>teachers, and connection and leadership opportunities through its alumni network.</p>	<p>that TFA corps members improve student achievement at two to three times the rate of other teachers in the same schools, including veteran teachers with three or more years of experience.</p>
<p>The Associated Colleges of Illinois (ACI)</p>	<p>ACI proposes to address human capital strategy by reforming district recruitment and hiring policies through a High-Need School Internship (HNSI) program. The HNSI program will develop a pool of highly qualified teachers, prepared specifically for high-need districts.</p> <p>By partnering with its member colleges and universities, ACI will host LEAs to operate six-week intensive summer internship experiences that prepare and position pre-service teachers to maintain ongoing relationships with their host LEAs. Upon graduation, top candidates from the HNSI program will be offered positions in the host LEAs, as those positions become available.</p>	<p>In pilot programs at six Illinois sites, HNSI programs have been shown to motivate pre-service teachers to seek jobs in high-need schools and to develop skills and dispositions that can make teachers more successful in high-poverty, hard-to-staff schools. Research has shown that internships that foster ongoing relationships with host LEAs can better prepare teachers to successfully assume jobs in those districts, and that those teachers may begin their first year jobs with skills and experience more commonly associated with second-year teachers.</p> <p>ACI has been addressing teacher shortage and quality issues since 2002, when it received a federal grant to fund an initiative to improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools. ACI offers a portfolio of programs that address teacher recruitment, preparation, and retention.</p>
<p>The Federation for Community Schools, and its subcontractors: Dr. Barbara Radner, Depaul University Center for Urban Development; and David Flatley,</p>	<p>The organization will work with lead partners to develop a low-performing school into a "community school" by providing robust enrichment programs before and after school. These programs are an extension, not an add-on, to the regular school day and will address academics and curriculum, healthy minds and bodies, parent support, and community engagement.</p>	<p>The Federation is the nation's only statewide coalition working on community schools, and is the most experienced and broad-reaching of such organizations in Illinois. Although the community school model is a newer concept, Chicago Public Schools have more than 150 community schools (out of its 600 public schools) and has already seen</p>

Supporting Partner	Human Capital or District Capacity Building Strategies	Record of Effectiveness
Columbia College Center for Arts Programs	The programs are implemented in partnership with the in-school day staff to create programming that supports skills and issues being addressed during the regular school day and provides supplemental enrichment programs like arts, music, and physical fitness.	<p>the benefit of the community school model through improvement in test scores, grades, student attitudes toward school, parent involvement and support, safety, and improved immunization rates, fitness levels, and overall well-being among students.</p> <p>Research shows that community schools have many positive impacts including statistically significant increases in ISAT math and reading scores, a reported 70% increase in students' completion of homework, fewer student behavioral incidences, and increased feelings of connectedness reported in parent surveys.</p>