

August 31, 2015

**TO:** Eligible Applicants

**FROM:** Tony Smith, Ph.D.  
State Superintendent of Education

**SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP):** FY 2016 School Improvement 1003(g) Grants

### General Information

**Eligible Applicants:** The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) requested from the U. S. Department of Education (ED) a waiver to the school eligibility requirements found in *Section I.A.1 of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) final requirements*. ED has granted permission for ISBE to replace its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III eligible schools list with the list of Illinois Priority schools eligible to compete for a SIG. The Priority schools list can be accessed on the SIG website at [http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip\\_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm).

Local education agencies (LEAs) with one or more Priority schools (as described below) are eligible to apply. An eligible LEA may apply for a SIG on behalf of one or more qualifying Priority schools. In addition, LEAs may reapply for a SIG for former Cohort I or II SIG recipient schools (i.e., those Cohort I SIG recipients whose grant has expired or was not renewed on or before June 30, 2014) and which now appear on the Priority school eligibility list for this fiscal year 2016 competition round. The State Superintendent may prioritize SIG grants for buildings in districts under independent authority by action of the State Board of Education.

**A Priority school** is a Title I or Title I eligible school that:

- Is among the persistently lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools in the state based on a three-year average (i.e., from 2011 to 2013) performance of the “all students group” category for the percentage of students meeting/exceeding standards on state tests in reading and mathematics combined; and
- Demonstrates a lack of progress; *or*
- Is a Title I participating or eligible secondary school that has an average graduation rate of less than 60 percent over the last three years (i.e., from 2011 to 2013).

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

***Persistently lowest-performing schools*** describes the lowest-achieving 5 percent of Title I schools (i.e., Priority schools) in the state based on the three-year average of the “all students group” category for the percentage meeting/exceeding standards in reading and math combined and that demonstrate a lack of progress.

***Lack of Progress*** is demonstrated by a school when there:

- Has been a decrease in the percentage of the “all students group” meeting/exceeding standards on the state assessments from any one year to the next; or
- Has been less than a 10 percent increase in the “all students group” meeting/exceeding standards on the state assessments for the most recent school year when compared to the immediate preceding school year and less than a 20 percent cumulative increase for the “all students group” when compared to the previous two years.

**Secondary School** is defined 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(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA),” located at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance03012012.doc> , ISBE has generated eligibility lists to include the districts and their schools that meet the Priority definition as described above. Again, this eligibility list is posted at [http://www.isbe.state.il.us/sos/htmls/sip\\_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm).

**Grant Award:** ISBE has the authority, pursuant to Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA SIG), to distribute funds to eligible applicants for the purpose of implementing SIGs. The total amount of funding available for this grant competition is approximately \$22 million per year. For purposes of compliance with Section 511 of P.L. 101-166 (the “Stevens Amendment”), applicants are advised that 100 percent of the funds for this program are derived from federal sources.

Annual grant awards to LEAs will range from not less than \$50,000 to no more than \$2 million per year, per participating Priority school, subject to available funds. **Actual allocations are based on the intervention model chosen, implementation cycle year, available funding, and ISBE guidelines as outlined in this RFP.**

An LEA may submit applications on behalf of as many eligible Priority schools as it demonstrates it can fully monitor and support. However, no LEA will receive more than 50 percent of the total amount awarded in this competition.

Payment under this grant is subject to receipt of funds by ISBE from ED. Furthermore, payment under this grant is subject to passage of a sufficient appropriation by the Illinois General Assembly for the program. Should the agency fail to receive sufficient federal funds for this program, ISBE will cease immediately all further obligations.

**Definitions:** The following definitions are provided to assist with the understanding of new funding cycle elements and related terms.

**Planning Year:** There is now an option for schools to take a **planning year**. A planning year is defined as the time after the award is made and before full implementation must begin. **Activities must be conducted during the planning year that are completely sufficient to ensure full implementation of the selected intervention on the first day of school of the year following the planning year.** These activities may include, but are not limited to, conducting a rigorous recruitment and selection process to hire a new principal and other necessary personnel; planning to extend the school day, week, or year and to use that time well; providing professional development to teachers and administrators; and finalizing negotiations with the union and/or Lead Partner organization. The Lead Partner is expected to have weekly site contact with the school during its planning year.

It is anticipated that grant funds will be available to schools that successfully demonstrate by the end of their planning year that they are fully prepared to implement their selected intervention model, with fidelity and in its entirety, for three one-year, full implementation continuation periods and a final one-year sustainability period, except in the case of school closure. **Prior to renewing the School Improvement Grant for an LEA that received funds for a year of planning and other implementation preparation activities for a particular school, ISBE must review the performance of the LEA in that school during the planning year against the LEA's approved application and determine that the LEA will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention for the school on the first day of the following school year.** It is not required that schools take a planning year, but ISBE will be prioritizing applications that do so.

**Full Implementation Year:** The second, third, and fourth years of funding are **full implementation years**, in which the plan described in this proposal must be implemented, fully and completely. All federal and state key requirements must be met. Failure to fully implement all key requirements is potential grounds for non-renewal of funds. See the definition of satisfactory progress for additional information.

**Sustainability Year:** Schools that successfully fully implement their selected model for three full implementation years are eligible for one additional year of sustainability funding. Activities undertaken during this final year must be sufficient to enable the school to sustain key levers of reform in the absence of School Improvement Grant funding. Activities may include, but are not limited to, academic return on investment analyses, gap analyses, realignment of district and school resources, and additional capacity building of staff. The LEA may contract with a Lead Partner for services during this final year of funding, but a daily or weekly on-site presence is not required.

**Grant Periods:** The grant period will begin no sooner than September 1, 2015, and will extend from the execution date of the grant agreement until June 30, 2016 (FY 2016). Four continuation periods are anticipated—July 1, 2016, to June 30, 2017 (FY 2017); July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018 (FY 2018); July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019 (FY 2019); and July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020 (FY 2020). Funding in the subsequent four continuation periods will be contingent upon a sufficient appropriation for the program **and** satisfactory progress in the preceding grant period.

**Satisfactory Progress** is defined in the Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 26, (February 9, 2015), section II.C available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-02-09/pdf/2015-02570.pdf>. ISBE *must* renew a SIG award if the LEA can show that its Priority schools are meeting the annual goals for student achievement established by the LEA and approved by ISBE. ISBE *may* renew an LEA's SIG award with respect to a particular school if:

- a) The school is making progress toward meeting the annual goals for student achievement established by the LEA;
- b) The school is making progress on the leading indicators in Appendix B; and
- c) The LEA is implementing interventions in the school with fidelity to applicable requirements and to the LEA's application.

Nothing in these requirements diminishes ISBE's authority to take appropriate enforcement action with respect to an LEA that is not complying with the terms of its grant.

**Application Deadline:** Mail the original proposal and one compact disc (CD) containing an electronic copy in PDF or Microsoft® Word files to the address below to ensure receipt no later than **4:00 p.m. CDT on Tuesday, October 13, 2015.**

Tonya Brust  
Illinois State Board of Education  
Division of System of Support & District Intervention, N-242  
100 North First Street  
Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

Proposals may also be hand-delivered to the following locations:  
**Springfield Office** - Information Center, 1st Floor, 100 North First Street, or  
**Chicago Office** -Reception Desk, 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 14-300

**Webinars:** ISBE offers a combination of prerecorded and live webinars to support applicants with the completion of their proposals. Prerecorded webinars are available on the Innovation and Improvement website at [http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip\\_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm).

In addition, ISBE will host live webinar opportunities for interested applicants. Dates, times, and registration information for those events will be posted at [http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip\\_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm) at the time of the release of this RFP.

**Additional Information and Changes to the RFP:** Should additional information become available or changes to the RFP be made prior to the deadline, ISBE will post those changes at [http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip\\_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm). Applicants are advised to check the site before submitting a proposal.

**Contact Persons:** For more information on SIG, contact A. Rae Clementz at [aclement@isbe.net](mailto:aclement@isbe.net), David Turovets at [dturovet@isbe.net](mailto:dturovet@isbe.net), or Robin M. Lisboa, Division Administrator for System of Support and District Intervention (SSDI), at [rlisboa@isbe.net](mailto:rlisboa@isbe.net) or by phone at 217-524-4832.

## **Background and Program Specifications**

School Improvement Grants (SIG), as authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), are made available from ED to state education agencies (SEAs) to provide subgrants to local education agencies (LEAs) for use in Priority schools. In awarding such grants, ISBE prioritizes 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 that students graduate from high school ready for college and careers and so that the school can exit Priority status. Under the final requirements, as published in the Federal Register in February 2015 and in accordance with recent waiver provisions of the ESEA, SIG funds must be focused on Priority schools as defined in the “Eligible Applicants” section of this RFP.

The CFDA number for the ESEA is 84.377A, and the Award number is S377A090014. 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 Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.

Selected grantees will be required to implement one of six approved school intervention models as listed below for each participating Priority school. The requirements and permissible activities for each model are outlined in the form of checklists in Appendix A and in Appendix B of the Pre-Application Needs Assessment.

### **Intervention Models**

1. Transformation Model – The Transformation model is one in which the LEA must replace the principal, grant the new principal operational flexibility, and make other governance changes to support the implementation of the intervention. It uses a rigorous evaluation system that incorporates student growth and rewards those teachers who are effective at improving student achievement and removes those who, after ample opportunity to improve, have not done so. The LEA must also ensure the implementation of other key requirements such as using data; providing high-quality, job-embedded professional development; instituting hiring and retention incentives; providing

- extended time for instruction and teacher collaboration; conducting ongoing program monitoring; and engagement with families and the community.
2. Turnaround Model – The Turnaround model is similar to the Transformation model in almost all requirements. The use of a rigorous evaluation system is still required by state law; however, in addition, before the start of the first day of the first year of full implementation, the LEA must use locally adopted competencies to measure effectiveness, screen, and rehire no more than 50 percent of all existing staff.
  3. 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) after a rigorous selection process.
  4. Evidence-based, Whole-school Reform Model – This is a federally pre-approved Whole-school Reform model\*, as defined below, that is supported by evidence of effectiveness that meets the Institute of Education Sciences' What Works Clearinghouse (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>) evidence standards with or without reservations; finds a statistically significant favorable impact on a student academic achievement or attainment outcome (with no statistically significant and overriding unfavorable impacts on that outcome for relevant populations in the study or in other studies of the intervention reviewed by and reported on by the What Works Clearinghouse); and is implemented by the LEA in partnership with a whole-school reform model developer\* as defined below.
  5. Early Learning Model – The Early Learning model has the same requirements as the Transformation model, with the exception of the requirement to provide extended time. Instead, the LEA must offer full-day kindergarten and establish or expand a high-quality preschool program (as defined in Appendix A).
  6. 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 or in new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

**Definitions:** The following definitions have been provided to assist with the understanding of the new intervention models and related terms.

**\*Whole-school Reform Model** means a model that is designed to:

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

**\*Whole-school Reform Model Developer** means an entity or individual that:

- a. Maintains proprietary rights for the model; or
- b. If no entity or individual maintains proprietary rights for the model, has a demonstrated record of success in implementing a Whole-school Reform model (as defined in these requirements) and is selected through a rigorous review process that includes a determination that the entity or individual is likely to produce strong results for the school.

**Evidence-based Strategies** are strategies supported by at least moderate evidence of effectiveness as defined in 34 CFR 77.1, such that one of the following conditions is met:

- a. There is at least one study of the effectiveness of the process, product, strategy, or practice being proposed that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations; finds a statistically significant favorable impact on a relevant outcome (with no statistically significant and overriding unfavorable impacts on that outcome for relevant populations in the study or in other studies of the intervention reviewed by and reported on by the What Works Clearinghouse); and includes a sample that overlaps with the populations or settings proposed to receive the process, product, strategy, or practice.
- b. There is at least one study of the effectiveness of the process, product, strategy, or practice being proposed that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations; finds a statistically significant favorable impact on a relevant outcome (with no statistically significant and overriding unfavorable impacts on that outcome for relevant populations in the study or in other studies of the intervention reviewed by and reported on by the What Works Clearinghouse); includes a sample that overlaps with the populations or settings proposed to receive the process, product, strategy, or practice; and includes a large sample and a multi-site sample.

Note: Multiple studies can cumulatively meet the large and multi-site sample requirements as long as each study meets the other requirements in this paragraph.

### **Lead Partner (or other external agent)**

Throughout the rest of this document, the phrase “**Lead Partner (or other external agent)**” will be used. The other external agents referenced are charter school operators, Charter Management Organization (CMOs), Education Management Organization (EMOs), or Whole-school Reform model developers, and are intended to serve as a reference to the agent appropriate to the selected intervention model.

LEAs that select the Transformation, Turnaround, or Early Learning intervention model and are awarded SIGs are required to work with a Lead Partner to implement the selected intervention model in each awarded Priority school. The State Superintendent has approved, through the procurement process, a number of organizations with demonstrated records of success in supporting academically underperforming schools. These selected organizations are referred to as Lead Partners and are pre-approved by ISBE to subcontract and work with LEAs and schools receiving SIG funds.

Lead Partners are organizations that have served as national and state leaders in school improvement efforts and have been selected to work **as equal partners** with the LEA in order to lead and oversee the implementation of the school intervention models. Both the LEA and Lead Partner will **share accountability** for the successful implementation of the selected intervention model, with the ultimate goal to raise substantially student achievement. Lead Partners are responsible for working with the LEA to implement a coherent, whole-school reform effort that integrates structural and programmatic interventions. A Lead Partner must be prepared to provide weekly site contact during the planning year and daily on-site support, leadership, and assistance in the school it will serve during the three full implementation years.

An overview of each approved partner is at <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/apl/default.htm>. A district must identify a Lead Partner for each school submitted in the application. The same Lead Partner is not required for each school in a district’s application. In other words, the district may elect to contract with a separate and unique Lead Partner for each eligible school.

LEAs should identify a Lead Partner for each school prior to submitting their proposal and include pertinent information about the identified Lead Partner in the proposal. A detailed memorandum of understanding (MOU) outlining services, deliverables, and associated costs between an awarded LEA and approved Lead Partner must be submitted to ISBE prior to the execution of a final grant agreement. The initial contract period

for Lead Partners must coincide with and may not exceed the grant period established for SIG recipients by ISBE. The MOU must include terms of performance including, at a minimum, measurable and time-specific services to be provided. The MOU must include financial terms that establish, at a minimum, the amounts to be paid for services rendered. LEAs are directly responsible for paying the selected Lead Partners pursuant to their executed contracts. In all cases, the agreement must maintain the contractual authority for the LEA to terminate contracts with Lead Partners when identified benchmarks are not achieved and/or specific outcomes are not accomplished. All contractual terms must align with the SIG requirements and all Lead Partners must implement their services in accordance with the LEA's approved grant agreements. All LEAs and Lead 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.

LEAs are **strongly encouraged to partner with an organization listed on the Illinois Approved Partner List** found at <http://www.isbe.net/apl/default.htm> and ISBE is requesting that each LEA screen and select an external partner from the list. ISBE will assess the LEA's willingness to work with a Lead Partner to effectively implement the intervention models.

If the LEA decides to propose partnering with an unapproved Lead Partner or supports a school that selects the Restart or Evidence-based, Whole-school Reform model, the LEA must follow its procurement policies and, once it identifies an external agent, the LEA must submit a request for approval to ISBE prior to the execution of a subcontract funded with SIG funds in which it describes how the LEA recruited, screened, and selected the external agent. The proposed Lead Partner or other external agent is required to submit an application to ISBE and to detail its experiences and record of success in supporting academically underperforming schools. Please note that **the selection of an unapproved Lead Partner or other external agent will delay the execution of a final grant agreement and award.**

### **Reporting and Evaluation**

**LEAs that are awarded a SIG must, in order to be eligible for new grants and all continuation grants, participate in all evaluation and reporting activities conducted by ED and ISBE that include, but are not limited to:**

- Administering the state accountability assessment (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)) for at least the minimum required 95 percent LEA participation;
- Participating in on-site reviews conducted by ISBE;
- Participating in designated school improvement activities and technical assistance offered by ISBE;
- Updating annual improvement goals;
- Submitting a revised budget and annual budget summary;
- Submitting quarterly expenditure reports;
- Submitting quarterly progress reports; and
- Reporting progress on the ED-identified indicators and metrics in the following categories: School Data, Student Outcomes and Academic Progress, Student Culture and Climate, and Teacher Talent. Definitions of indicators and metrics can be found in Appendix C of the Pre-Application Needs Assessment and in Appendix B of this document.

### **Monitoring**

ISBE will monitor each grantee to ensure effective implementation of the proposed activities in the selected school intervention model. The student achievement goals (see Attachment 10) as well as the metrics identified by the state and ED (Appendix B) will serve as the basis for all monitoring activities. Appendix B of the RFP contains a table of metrics that ISBE will access and the year in the grant cycle in which improvement is expected.

## **Fiscal Information**

Funding for SIG is made available from Section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA. The total amount of SIG funding available to LEAs under this RFP is approximately \$22 million per year. Individual grant awards to LEAs will range from not less than \$50,000 to not more than \$2 million annually, per participating school. 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 Priority school identified in the LEA's application in order to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention in each of those schools. Annual funding requests must be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model. The total annual LEA funding request, however, may not exceed the number of participating Priority schools multiplied by, at most, \$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, 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 Proposals" section of this document.

Grant funds are projected to be available for five (5) grant periods including FYs 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020. The initial award in FY 2016 is for planning and other implementation preparation activities necessary to ensure full implementation in the following year, and should be no more than 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the required three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$750,000 in FY 2016; at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019; and at most \$750,000 in FY 2020). After the initial award in FY 2016, selected grantees may apply for three additional, one-year periods of full funding subject to: sufficient federal funding for the program; evidence that the school is prepared to implement the selected intervention model fully and with fidelity as of the start of the school year in FY 2017 and thereafter make progress toward defined school goals; evidence of progress toward leading indicators in the federally required metrics; and full and effective implementation of selected intervention models. Grantees that complete three full years of implementation of their selected intervention model may apply for a final one-year period of funding that should be no more than 50 percent of the amount awarded per year during the three full implementation years in order to sustain and institutionalize school and district reforms and maintain a trajectory of improved achievement.

As part of this application, the LEA must propose budgets for district-level activities as well as school-level activities in the planning year, three full implementation years, and the sustainability year. Further, LEAs must propose a separate budget for each participating Priority school for each year of the grant (i.e., FYs 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.) (See Attachment 11 – Five-Year Budget Summary.) Applicants must use the budget forms provided (Attachments 12 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 district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Priority school.
2. Implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve for a minimum of three years.
3. Conduct activities in the final year designed to support sustainability of the reform initiatives after the end of the grant period.



The LEA may use up to 5 percent of the total grant award for LEA administrative costs associated with the oversight and administration of the grant. Expenditures should be in accordance with the Office of Management and Budget's reasonable and necessary guidelines available at [http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title02/2cfr200\\_main\\_02.tpl](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title02/2cfr200_main_02.tpl). Indirect costs are not permissible.

### **Use of Funds**

If awarded the grant, the LEA must use ESEA SIG funds only for approved school improvement activities. The LEA must commit to provide awarded schools all of the state and local monies that they would have received in the absence of the award. 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 Priority 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:

- Costs associated with preparing this proposal or proposals for other grants;
- Out-of-state travel;
- Food purchases;
- Incentives of non-educational value (e.g., trinkets, cash, etc. for students; see Appendix A, Intervention Models, for specific information about incentives and awards);
- 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<sup>1</sup>;
- Any expenditure that occurred prior to the execution of a grant agreement under this RFP.

SIG funds must be tracked and reported separately from Title I, Part A funds. 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 those used for the Title I Basic grant award or SIG. LEAs with more than one award may not combine funds into one account. The amount awarded to each school must be spent specifically on implementation of the intervention model in that school.

## **Overview of Application Process**

**Step 1:** Pre-Application Process – Assemble Team

**Step 2:** Pre-Application Process – Pre-Application Needs Assessment Packet

**Step 3:** LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan Application

**Step 4:** Individual School(s) SIG Improvement Plan Application

**Step 5:** ISBE Program-Specific Terms of the Grant, Certifications, and Assurances

**Step 6:** Post-Application Process – Interviews with Finalists

## **Proposal Requirements**

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the costs of minor remodeling that are necessary to support technology if the costs are directly attributable to the implementation of a school intervention model and are reasonable and necessary. For more information on allowable "minor remodeling" expenses, please see the federal SIG guidance at <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance05242010.pdf>.

### **Step 1: Pre-Application Process – Assemble Team**

**Stakeholder Engagement:** The LEA must consult with critical stakeholders, including local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, parents, and community representatives, as well as its identified Lead Partner regarding the proposal and the implementation of one of the school intervention models in each of the participating Priority schools. Each participating Priority school should assemble a SIG proposal team that includes representatives from each of the stakeholder groups listed above. Applicants must complete an "LEA/School Stakeholders' Consultation Confirmation" form for *each* meeting that involves stakeholders and submit the completed forms with the proposal.

### **Step 2: Pre-Application Process – Pre-Application Needs Assessment Packet**

**FY 2016 SIG Pre-Application Needs Assessment:** The LEA must complete the prescribed needs assessment as the next step in creating a comprehensive school improvement reform strategy to support the LEA's FY 2016 SIG application. For each Priority school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate in its application that the intervention selected for each eligible school is designed to meet the specific needs of the school, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the school improvement needs identified by families and the community and takes into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention for each school. In general, the needs assessment is intended to help the LEA pinpoint the areas in which it needs to focus and prioritize its resources in order to substantially improve student achievement.

The FY 2016 SIG Needs Assessment will help the LEA:

- Review and analyze school data relevant to academic performance, climate, and culture;
- Identify gaps between current programs and the desired results to help inform the selection of one of the six approved intervention models;
- Examine policies, programs, practices, and contextual factors that either encourage or impede the presence of characteristics needed to support the development of a thriving teaching and learning community; and
- Solicit and incorporate family and community input in selecting the intervention for each school.

In an effort to assist the LEA with its analysis, the FY 2016 SIG Pre-Application Needs Assessment packet is available at [http://www.isbe.state.il.us/sos/htmls/sip\\_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm). The packet must be completed and submitted with the proposal.

### **Step 3: Complete Section I. LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan**

Use the FY 16 LEA Application Forms packet, with its numbered attachments, to complete this section. The directions in this step will outline the portions of the form packets that will be evaluated and for which points will be assigned. **All of the attachments in the FY 16 LEA Application Forms packet MUST be completed.** Any application submitted with an incomplete section, or **without the required, original signatures**, will be considered incomplete and **will therefore not be reviewed**. Directions on completing all attachments, compiling, and submitting the application can be found in the **Proposal Submission Specifications** section of this RFP.

The elements in this section should be compiled in such a way as to demonstrate that the LEA has the capacity to support, monitor, and serve all of the schools it is applying on behalf of. This section only needs to be **completed once by the LEA, regardless of the number of schools** it commits to serve; but if more than one school is being served, the LEA may need to explain how its policies, practices, and activities will vary for schools implementing different intervention models.

- **District Application Cover Page** (Attachment 1)
- **Intervention Model Selection for Priority Schools** (Attachment 2)

- **Eligible But Not Served Priority Schools** (Attachment 3)
- **Annual Improvement Goals and Objectives** (Attachment 10): The LEA must hold participating Priority schools accountable for improving student achievement. The LEA must identify specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals and objectives relevant to student achievement on the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment in both English/language arts and mathematics or the current required Illinois state examinations. LEA goals and objectives must be included for each year of the grant. Applicants must complete the LEA Goals and Objectives forms and submit them with the proposal.
- **Five-Year Budget Summary** (Attachment 11A or 11B): The LEA must submit a five-year budget summary (FY 2016-FY 2020) that covers both LEA and school expenses. The budget should be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model and related activities for each year, in each Priority school the LEA commits to serve.
  - **If the school(s) is taking a planning year, use Attachment 11A.** The amount budgeted for the first year of the grant, the planning year, should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the required three years of full implementation. The amount budgeted for the final year of the grant, the sustainability year, should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the previous three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$750,000 in FY 2016; at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019; and at most \$750,000 in FY 2020).
  - **If the school(s) is not taking a planning year, use Attachment 11B.** The amount budgeted for the last two years of the grant, the sustainability years, should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the previous three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2016, 2017 and 2018 and at most \$750,000 in FYs 2019 and 2020).
- **LEA Comprehensive Planning and/or Full Implementation Budget** (Attachment 12): The LEA Comprehensive Budget for Planning Year 1, if it is being taken by any school(s) served by the LEA, must reflect the combined project costs for both the Planning Year LEA Budget and the Planning Year Individual School Budget(s). The amount budgeted for the first year of the grant, the planning year, should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the required three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$750,000 in FY 2016 and at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019). **Complete 1 set of Attachment 12, 12A, and 12B if any school(s) being supported is taking a planning year, for the activities budgeted for that planning year. Complete 1 set of Attachment 12, 12A, and 12 B for the activities budgeted for the first year of full implementation.**
  - **LEA Planning and/or Full Implementation Budget** (Attachment 12A): The LEA Budget must reflect ONLY district-level anticipated project costs, not school costs.
  - **LEA Planning and or Full Implementation Detailed Budget Summary Breakdown** (Attachment 12B): The LEA Detailed Budget Summary includes expenditure descriptions, itemization, and associated costs for just the district-level anticipated project costs.
- **LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan Narrative** (Attachment 13): Applicants must provide narrative responses to the prompts listed below as part of their proposals. Responses included as part of the LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan Narrative must be entered into the attachments provided. The total number of narrative pages may not exceed twenty (20). The narrative should be organized and sequenced according to the outline denoted below (i.e., by number and letter, e.g., 1. Meaningful Family and Community Engagement A...B...C...D...). The required components of the LEA Narrative correspond to the criteria and respective point values outlined in the rubrics. Please see Appendices C-D. Applicants are encouraged to review the rubric(s) for their selected intervention model(s) prior to writing the narrative.
- **LEA Appendices:** Include any pertinent appendices based on information requested in the narratives. All documents within this section must be cross-referenced within the LEA-level Narrative. Page numbers must be applied to all documents in this section and pages should be numbered consecutively.

The maximum number of pages for LEA appendices combined, NOT INCLUDING an appendix index, appendix entry title pages, model-specific checklists, MOUs, and timelines, **cannot exceed 20 pages**.

## **Section I. LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan**

---

### **1. Meaningful Family and Community Engagement – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the narrative, describe how the LEA will meaningfully engage families and the community in the planning, implementation, and sustainability of the intervention in the school(s) being served. The description should include:

- A. Specific strategies of the types listed below to increase engagement and involvement of parents and community partners:
  - a. Outreach to connect with hard-to-reach families,
  - b. Enhancement of a welcoming environment and social supports for newcomers,
  - c. Establishment of a family engagement system<sup>2</sup>,
  - d. Enhancement of communication to promote academic and social development of children utilizing two-way exchange of information,
  - e. Inclusion of parents<sup>3</sup> in the decision-making process for individual students as well as holding regular public meetings to review school performance and to develop school improvement plans,
  - f. Using surveys, dialogue, and parent forums to gauge satisfaction and support for schools,
  - g. Providing communications for parents, caregivers, and community (as applicable) in the language(s) of the home and/or community, and
  - h. On-site or accessible comprehensive services for children and community partnerships that promote families' access to services that support their children's learning and development.
- B. Regular, frequent meetings with parents, community members, and staff to update them on the key metrics of the intervention as well as progress made toward key strategies and interventions.
- C. Person(s) (or position(s)) in the LEA responsible for oversight and implementation of the outreach program.
- D. Metrics and other sources of data that measure the success and fidelity of implementation of the community engagement and outreach strategies.

### **2. LEA Timeline – Total of 10 Points Possible**

No narrative necessary. Submit a five-year timeline that clearly shows, with specific details, the actions that the LEA will be taking in order to change its policies, practices, and structures in order to support and monitor the implementation of the school(s) it is electing to serve. The timeline should show:

- A. No more than half of Year 1 is used for planning, and at least half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.
- B. **Both** strong LEA planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and strong LEA sustainability activities in Year 5.
- C. Detail sufficient and specific enough to determine that the LEA will ensure the intervention model will be fully implemented, supported, and monitored for no less than three years.

### **3. LEA Planning and/or Implementation Budget(s) – Total of 10 Points Possible**

No narrative necessary. Submit Attachments 11, 12, 12A, and 12B for review.

**Note:** Use Attachment 11A if the LEA is serving any school(s) taking a planning year. Use Attachment 11B if the LEA is serving any school(s) not taking a planning year. Complete a set of Attachments 12, 12A, and 12B

---

<sup>2</sup> The Illinois Family Engagement Framework Guide is at <http://www.isbe.net/family-engagement/html/framework.htm>.

<sup>3</sup> The term "parent" includes, in addition to a natural parent, a legal guardian or other person standing in loco parentis (such as a grandparent or step parent with whom the child lives, or a person who is legally responsible for the child's welfare). [Section 9101(31), ESEA.]

for the planning year, if any school(s) being served is taking a planning year. Complete a set of Attachments 12, 12A, and 12B for the first year of full implementation.

- A. Budget costs are clearly tied to LEA actions that are sufficient **to prepare for** the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.
- B. Budget costs are clearly tied to LEA actions that are sufficient **to support and monitor** the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served.
- C. The budget requests are reasonable and necessary expenditures and are in total compliance with Title I requirements.

#### **4. Alignment of Other Resources to Maximize Funding Impact – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the narrative, describe how the LEA will redirect significant local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served:

- A. In the planning year,
- B. In the full implementation years, and
- C. In the sustainability year.

#### **5. Goals and Objectives – Total of 10 Points Possible**

No narrative necessary. Submit Attachment 10 for review.

The LEA should:

- A. Identify strong and ambitious but achievable annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both English language arts and mathematics, and optionally two additional goals related to culture and climate, graduation or pass rates, or other school improvement goals.
- B. Identify strategic, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) objectives necessary to achieve the goals that will have the greatest impact on student achievement.
- C. Associate each objective with a specific measure of progress and target date for achievement. In total, objectives should be tied to all of the following leading indicators: climate and culture, teacher talent, and student achievement. Objective measures include various forms such as trend, growth, and fidelity metrics.

#### **6. Strong Review and Selection of the External Provider(s)<sup>4</sup> – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the appendices, attach the Selection of External Providers Model-Specific Requirements Checklist.

In the narrative, describe the highly rigorous process by which the LEA reviewed the qualifications of, selected, and contracted with the external provider(s) in the school(s) being served. The description should include:

- A. A summary of the evidence used to make a determination by the LEA that the external provider is likely to produce strong results. Note: There are model-specific criteria that the LEA must meet in making this determination. Include in the description how your process meets the requirements for the intervention model(s) selected by the school(s) being served.
- B. How the selected external providers(s) matched the LEA/school(s) needs identified in the Needs Assessment (i.e., the selection process was rigorous and targeted, ensuring that the most relevant factors were used to determine the best fit of LEA/school and external provider). If more than one school is being supported, describe the match for each school separately.

#### **7. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of External Providers – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the narrative, describe:

- A. A strong process for how the LEA will regularly monitor the Lead Partner, charter school operator, CMO or EMO, or whole-school reform model developer.

---

<sup>4</sup> External Provider refers to a Lead Partner, charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or Whole-school Reform model developer.

- B. The role and responsibilities of the Lead Partner (or other external provider), which should include seven or more of the following responsibilities (i.e., performed by the Lead Partner (or other external provider) or contracted through the Lead Partner organization):
  - a. Job-embedded professional development of faculty and/or coaches;
  - b. Development, implementation, and/or analysis of student formative, short cycle, interim, and/or summative assessments;
  - c. Active participation in hiring of district-funded administrators at the school;
  - d. Management of the transformation office or officer;
  - e. Strategy, design, and creation of performance management/communication system;
  - f. Assistance with school climate and culture;
  - g. Parent/Community engagement or outreach;
  - h. Extended time programming;
  - i. Development of the Teacher Evaluation System to include a student growth component;
  - j. Job-embedded professional development/coaching of administrators;
  - k. Curriculum alignment and/or mapping with the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) and other state standards;
  - l. Development and/or implementation of a turnaround/transformation scorecard;
  - m. Compensation system reform;
  - n. Retention, recruitment, and selection strategies for faculty, staff, and/or administrators;
  - o. Development of an incentive system that identifies and rewards staff based on student achievement and/or graduation rate, if applicable;
  - p. Operational support or training for scheduling;
  - q. A plan to analyze the cost/benefit of various grant activities that leads to a plan for sustainability after the grant period; and
  - r. Other substantial responsibilities not previously described.
- C. Specific outcome measures related to academic performance, climate/culture, or teacher talent, for which the external partner(s) will be held accountable.
- D. Evidence, in the form of an attached, signed MOU between the external provider(s) and the district, including language that the external provider(s) agrees to be accountable for the identified outcome measures, responsibilities, and to fulfilling any model-specific requirements.

### **8. LEA Monitoring and Oversight of Intervention Implementation – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the narrative, describe:

- A. A strong process, with specific details, for continuous monitoring of the progress and fidelity of implementation of the school(s) being served that includes, at a minimum, the following stipulations:
  - a. That the LEA will meet with school leadership, Lead Partner (or other external provider) staff, superintendent, and union leadership at least monthly to present progress reports based on relevant data that have been collected and analyzed; and
  - b. That the LEA will provide quarterly updates to the local school board and to families and the community to present progress on implementation of the intervention strategies and student achievement.
- B. A strong process, with specific details, by which the principal, building leadership, and Lead Partner (or other external provider) discuss their progress against the plan and are held fully accountable by the LEA.
- C. A strong process, with specific details, by which the LEA will review or accept review of the support it provides to the supported schools from the principal, school leadership, and/or Lead Partner (or other external provider).

## 9. Governance, Policies, and Practices – Total of 10 Points Possible

In the narrative, describe the LEA's capacity to and plans to:

- A. Modify its practices, policies, and/or structures (e.g., around staffing, budgets, purchasing, recruitment, retention, professional development, and so on) to support the school(s) in implementing the selected intervention(s).
- B. Provide effective oversight and support to the supported school(s) by adopting a new governance structure that includes, but is not limited to, identifying a dedicated "Turnaround Leader," "Transformation Officer," or "School Improvement Project Manager," as is appropriate to the selected intervention model(s), who reports directly to the district superintendent or chief academic officer.
- C. Provide a precise and clear description of accountability, decision-making authority, and communication flow that includes:
  - a. An attached organizational chart that matches the narrative and outlines the reporting structure for the district, school(s) identified, and Lead Partner (or other external provider);
  - b. At most, one person/position that is accountable for ensuring the successful implementation of the intervention(s) within the district; and
  - c. At most, one person/position that is accountable for ensuring the success of the intervention within the Lead Partner (or other external provider).

## 10. LEA Planning and Implementation Preparation Activities – Total of 10 Points Possible

In the narrative, describe:

- A. All of the activities, aligned to the submitted timeline and budgets, the LEA will undertake in order to strongly support the full implementation of the selected model prior to the first school day of the first year of full implementation.
- B. How the LEA's activities are aligned to the school(s)'s needs and may include, but are not limited to, *five or six* of the following:
  - a. Assisting with staff recruiting and selection;
  - b. Assisting with recruiting and assembling the principal and leadership team(s);
  - c. Assisting staff in instructional planning;
  - d. Negotiating changes/amendments to the Collective Bargaining Agreement potentially regarding extended day, staff removal/transfer, procedures, etc.;
  - e. Training for staff in order to implement the model;
  - f. Developing the program monitoring system and/or operationalizing the new governance structures and/or schedule in response to the grant proposal; and
  - g. Other activities as necessary.

## 11. Sustainability – Total of 10 Points Possible

In the narrative, describe:

- A. The annual process the LEA will use to engage in sustainability planning with each school, with significant detail and specificity.
- B. How the ongoing sustainability planning will include:
  - a. A cost-benefit analysis and return on (academic) investment,
  - b. Building staff capacity,
  - c. Repurposing staff,
  - d. Resource reallocation,
  - e. Re-evaluating partner agreements, and
  - f. Incorporating meaningful stakeholder engagement (policymakers, service providers, community partners, parents, and families).
- C. Anticipated activities undertaken during the final sustainability year of the grant.

- D. How those anticipated activities will achieve sustainability of effective interventions identified in the analyses listed in 11.B.
- E. How the LEA intends to maximize the reduced funding to sustain and institutionalize school reforms and improved student achievement.

**The LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan Narrative and Attachments Scoring Criteria are worth a total of 110 points possible. See Appendix C for scoring rubric.**

#### **Step 4. Complete Section II. School-level SIG Improvement Plan**

Use the FY 16 Individual School Application Forms packet, with its numbered attachments, to complete this section. The directions in this step will outline the portions of the form packet that will be evaluated and for which points will be assigned. **All of the attachments in the FY 16 Individual School Application Forms packet MUST be completed.** Any application submitted with an incomplete section, or without the required, original signatures, will be considered incomplete, and will **therefore not be reviewed**. Directions on completing all attachments, compiling, and submitting the application can be found in the **Proposal Submission Specifications** section of this RFP.

The elements in this section are model- or school-specific. They have been placed in this section because their implementation must, of necessity, vary from school to school. The LEA must play a key role in the authorship of this section, as many of the model-specific elements are LEA responsibilities (e.g., replacing the principal). The LEA is also responsible for ensuring the full and complete implementation of the plan described in this proposal in each of the schools it commits to serve. This step and the associated forms packet should be completed **separately for each school** the LEA is committing to serve.

- **Applicant Cover Page for Individual School** (Attachment 14)
- **Individual School Strategies** (Attachment 15)
- **Individual School Planning and/or Full Implementation Budget** (Attachment 16): The Individual School Planning and/or Full Implementation Budget reflect the school-level anticipated project costs associated with preparing for full implementation of the selected intervention in Year 2 and costs associated with full implementation. The amount budgeted for the planning year should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the required three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$750,000 in FY 2016 and at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019). **Complete 1 set** of Attachment 16 and 16A for the **planning year**, if the school is taking a planning year. **Complete 1 set** of Attachment 16 and 16A **for the first year of full implementation**.
  - **Individual School Detailed Planning Budget Summary Breakdown** (Attachment 16A): The Detailed Budget Summary Breakdown includes expenditure descriptions, itemization, and associated costs.
- **Individual School Narrative** (Attachment 17): Applicants must provide narrative responses to each of the prompts listed below for each school seeking funding. Responses included as part of the Individual School SIG Improvement Plan Narrative must be entered into the attachments provided. The total number of narrative pages may not exceed twenty (20). Responses included as part of the narrative must be organized and sequenced according to the outline denoted below (i.e., by number and letter, e.g., **3. School-Specific Planning and Implementation Preparation Activities A...B...C...**). The required components of the Individual School SIG Improvement Plan Narrative correspond to the criteria and respective point values that will be used to evaluate grant proposals with regard to the school's readiness to implement its SIG Improvement Plan as outlined in Appendix D. Applicants are advised to review those criteria before completing proposal narratives.
- **Individual School Appendices**: Include any pertinent appendices based on information requested in the narratives. All documents within this section must be cross-referenced within the School-level



Narrative. Page numbers must be applied to all documents in this section and pages should be numbered consecutively. The maximum number of pages for school appendices combined, NOT INCLUDING an appendix index, appendix entry title pages, model-specific checklists, MOUs, timelines, and letters of support, **cannot exceed 20 pages**.

## **Section II. Individual School-level SIG Improvement Plan**

---

### **1. Pre-Application Needs Assessment – Total of 20 Points Possible**

No narrative necessary. Submit the Pre-Application Needs Assessment Packet for review.

- A. Section I of the Pre-Application Needs Assessment describes the process used by the district, identifying which stakeholder groups and key district and school individuals contributed to which parts of the needs assessment process.
- B. The core challenges and issues related to turning around the school are clearly supported by the review of data in Section II, the results from the Parent and Community Input Protocol in Section III, as well as the District Capacity Analysis in Section IV. Areas of disagreement have been analyzed and incorporated into the final decision.
- C. Section V provides a strong rationale for why the selected intervention was chosen and how it aligns with the school's needs, parent and community input, and the research about school turnaround.
- D. Section V explains why the other intervention models were not selected.

### **2. School Planning and/or Implementation Budget(s) – Total of 10 Points Possible**

No narrative necessary. Submit Attachments 16, 16A, and 16B for review.

Note: Complete a set of Attachments 16, 16A, and 16B for the planning year, if the school is taking a planning year. Complete a set of Attachments 16, 16A, and 16B for the first year of full implementation.

- A. Budget costs are clearly tied to school activities that are sufficient **to prepare for** the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model on the first school day of the first year of full implementation.
- B. Budgets include sufficient detail to determine that the school will be able to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model in the first year of full implementation.
- C. The budget requests are reasonable and necessary expenditures and are in total compliance with Title I requirements.

### **3. School-Specific Planning and Implementation Preparation Activities – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the narrative, describe:

- A. How the planning and implementation preparation activities outlined in the Five-Year Schedule of School Activities will strongly prepare for the full implementation of the selected model on the first school day of the first year of full implementation.
- B. How the school's activities address the areas of need identified in the Pre-Application Needs Assessment and may include, but are not limited to, **five or six** of the following:
  - a. Planning and improving staff recruiting and selection;
  - b. Recruiting and assembling the principal and leadership team(s);
  - c. Guiding and compensating staff for instructional planning;
  - d. Negotiating changes/amendments to the Collective Bargaining Agreement potentially regarding extended day, staff removal/transfer, procedures, etc.;
  - e. Training staff on new programs or initiatives necessary to implement the model;
  - f. Developing a fidelity monitoring system and/or new leadership structures within the building;
  - and
  - g. Other activities as necessary.
- C. Attach at least five letters of support for the school's SIG plan that identify which specific elements of the school's implementation plan the authors will support -- and how -- through the planning year into

full implementation. Letters should come from key school and community partners who represent significantly affected stakeholder groups, including the teachers' union, the Parent Teacher Association, the school board, and school and community organizations that represent diverse parent and student populations with large constituencies, and should demonstrate strong familiarity with the elements of the proposed plan.

**Rural School Flexibility:** Under the SIG requirements, an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of Title VI (Rural Education Assistance Program) of the ESEA may propose to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model. In seeking this modification, the LEA's application on behalf of the school must describe:

- 1) Which element it will be modifying;
- 2) How it will modify the element; and
- 3) How the intent and purpose of the element will be met.

The model-specific evaluation criteria defined in the rubric for that model will apply to the key required elements, regardless of whether or not the LEA is taking this flexibility, as the proposed modification must meet the same intent and purpose. An LEA taking this flexibility should respond to the three questions above in the narrative section below. An LEA may modify one, and only one, element of the Turnaround or Transformation model.

#### **4. Implement a Program to Improve Student Achievement – Total of 50 Points Possible**

In the appendices, attach the Implementation Model Requirements Checklist for the model the school intends to implement in the appendices.

In the narrative, describe the plan that will be implemented in the school, with the assistance of the LEA and the Lead Partner (or other external provider), **in order to transform the school and improve student achievement.** Provide sufficient detail to determine **what required and/or permissible activities will be taken to improve outcomes** in the following areas.

To begin, provide a brief (250 word) overview of the plan. Then:

- A. Describe the specific elements of the plan that address school leadership. Indicate whether they are required or permissible. All model-specific requirements must be addressed with coherence and specificity, and be sufficient to transform the school and improve student achievement.
- B. Describe the specific elements of the plan that address teaching and learning. Indicate whether they are required or permissible. All model-specific requirements must be addressed with coherence and specificity, and be sufficient to transform the school and improve student achievement.
- C. Describe the specific elements of the plan that address student non-academic support. Indicate whether they are required or permissible. All model-specific requirements must be addressed with coherence and specificity, and be sufficient to transform the school and improve student achievement.
- D. Describe the specific elements of the plan that address family and community engagement. Indicate whether they are required or permissible. All model-specific requirements must be addressed with coherence and specificity, and be sufficient to transform the school and improve student achievement.
- E. Provide evidence, in the form of an attached, signed MOU or memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the LEA and the teachers' union or letter of intent signed by the superintendent and union president, which states that all parties either have negotiated or will negotiate an MOU for the school that includes language that directly and specifically agrees to implement, fully and with fidelity, the individual plan elements that are in compliance with the requirements of the selected intervention model.

## **5. Use of Evidence-based Practices – Total of 10 Points Possible**

In the narrative, describe:

- A. To the extent practicable, given the selected intervention model, the evidence-based practices included in the school’s implementation plan.
- B. The rationale for selecting these particular evidence-based practices or the reason it was not practicable to do so, given the selected intervention model.

## **6. Five-Year Schedule of School Activities – Total of 10 Points Possible**

No narrative necessary. Submit a five-year schedule of school activities, aligned to the LEA’s five-year timeline that clearly shows, with specific details, the actions that the school will be taking in order to prepare for, then implement, fully and with fidelity, its selected intervention, and how it will sustain the reforms achieved through that intervention. The timeline should show:

- A. No more than half of Year 1 is used for planning and at least half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.
- B. Both strong planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and strong sustainability activities in Year 5.
- C. Detail sufficient to be able to determine that the school will implement the selected intervention model, fully and with fidelity, for no less than three years.

**The Individual School-level SIG Improvement Plan Narrative and Attachments Scoring Criteria are worth a total of 110 points possible. See Appendix D for scoring rubric.**

### **Step 5: Certifications and Assurances (Attachments 4-9)**

The applicant is required to submit the certifications and assurances forms listed below and attached to this RFP. **A set of certifications and assurances (Attachments 4-9) must be completed by the LEA and MUST be signed by the superintendent. Any application that does not have all the required original signatures will be viewed as incomplete and will therefore not be reviewed.** Duplicate as needed.

- A. Program-Specific Terms of the Grant and Agreement for Priority Schools (Attachment 4)
- B. Certifications and Assurances, and Standard Terms of the Grant (Attachment 5)
- C. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transactions (Attachment 6)
- D. Certificate and Disclosure Regarding Lobbying (Attachments 7, 7A, 7B, and 7C)
- E. General Education Provisions Act – GEPA (Attachment 8)
- F. Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act – FFATA (Attachment 9)

### **Step 6: Post-Application Process**

ISBE staff will conduct face-to-face interviews with those applicants selected as SIG finalists from the initial proposal review process. The times and dates of interviews will be announced to finalists. Applicants should refer to the “Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposals” section of this RFP for specific information about how competition finalists will be determined.

## **Proposal Submission Specifications**

Each proposal must be submitted according to the specifications for format and sequence as outlined below. **Substantively incomplete proposals (e.g., missing signatures, budgets, and timelines) will not be considered for funding.** Each proposal must include an LEA Narrative and an Individual School Narrative for **each** participating Priority school.

## Specifications for Formatting the SIG Proposal

- Proposal (one (1) hard copy only plus one (1) additional CD proposal) can be bound by either staples or removable clips (no spiral bindings or any other type of exterior binding);
- 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;
- All text in the proposal narratives and appendices must be typed and double spaced;
- 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, respectively) **on the proposal narratives and appendices** must be included;
- Text in the attachments, including the LEA and school narratives, must be typed on the interactive forms provided;
- Length of the LEA Narrative must not exceed 20 pages; and
- The number of pages in the LEA appendices, NOT INCLUDING an appendix index, appendix title pages, MOUs, timelines, or model-specific checklists, must not exceed 20 pages.
- Length of each Individual School Narrative must not exceed 20 pages.
- The number of pages of each Individual School appendices, NOT INCLUDING an appendix index, appendix title pages, MOUs, timelines, model-specific checklists or letters of support, must not exceed 20 pages.

## Sequence for Assembling the SIG Proposal

***LEA-level SIG Improvement Plan-*** Items 1-20 must be completed *once* for the district, regardless of the number of schools listed in the proposal.

1. **Attachment 1 - District Application Cover Page:** Complete all information included on the cover page. **Each form must be signed by the district superintendent or the official authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the LEA and the president of the local school board.** Any application that does not have all the required original signatures will be viewed as incomplete and will therefore not be reviewed.
2. **Attachment 2 - Intervention Model Selection for Priority Schools:** Identify each school for which the LEA is seeking funding in the application, provide the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) ID number, and indicate the intervention model selected for each school. Identify the Lead Partner (or other external agent) for each school and indicate the ISBE approval status of the selected partners, respectively.
3. **Attachment 3 - Eligible But Not Served Priority Schools:** Identify each school that is eligible to participate in the SIG grant, but that the LEA is not applying to serve. Provide the NCES ID number for each school and indicate the appropriate classification tier. Give the reason why the LEA has decided not to serve each school listed.

**Certifications and Assurances:** Each LEA applicant is required to submit **one set** of the following certifications and assurances for the LEA and **another set for each school included in the application.** These must be signed by the district superintendent, the principal, and/or the official legally authorized to submit the proposal and to bind the applicant to its contents.

4. **Attachment 4: Program-Specific Terms of the Grant and Agreements for Priority Schools**
5. **Attachment 5: Certifications and Assurances, and Standard Terms of the Grant**

6. \_\_\_ **Attachment 6: Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transactions**
7. \_\_\_ **Attachments 7, 7A, 7B, and 7C: Certificate Regarding Lobbying and Disclosure of Lobbying Activities**
8. \_\_\_ **Attachment 8: General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)**
9. \_\_\_ **Attachment 9: Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA)**
10. \_\_\_ **Attachment 10: Annual Improvement Goals and Objectives:** Identify SMART goals and objectives relevant to student achievement on the state academic assessments in both English/language arts and mathematics. LEA goals and objectives must be included for each year of the grant.
11. \_\_\_ **Attachment 11A or 11B - Five-Year Budget Summary:** The LEA must submit a five-year budget summary (FY 2016-FY 2020) that covers both LEA and school expenses for all schools being supported by the LEA. The budget should be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model and related activities for each year, in each Priority school the LEA commits to serve. The amount budgeted for a planning year should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the required three years of full implementation. The amount budgeted for sustainability year(s) should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the previous three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$750,000 in FY 2016; at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019; and at most \$750,000 in FY 2020).
12. \_\_\_ **Attachment 12 - LEA Comprehensive Planning and/or Full Implementation Year Budget: Complete 1 set of Attachment 12, 12A, and 12B if the LEA is serving any school(s) that is taking a planning year. Complete 1 set of Attachment 12, 12A, and 12B for the first year of full implementation.** Present combined budget costs from the LEA budget and all proposed school budgets for the appropriate fiscal year. If awarded the grant, proposed budgets must also be submitted for each continuation year of the grant (i.e., FYs 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020) prior to the execution of a grant agreement. 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.
13. \_\_\_ **Attachment 12A - LEA Planning and/or Implementation Year Budget:** Provide an LEA Budget for the Planning and/or first year of Implementation, which reflects only the district-level anticipated project costs. The amount budgeted for the planning year should not exceed 50 percent of the amount requested per year for the required three years of full implementation (e.g., at most \$750,000 in FY 2016 and at most \$1.5 million in FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019).
14. \_\_\_ **Attachment 12B - LEA Planning and/or Implementation Year Detailed Budget Summary Breakdown:** Provide a detailed budget breakdown for the LEA for the planning and/or implementation year only. Totals must correspond with the information provided in the LEA Budget (Attachment 12A).
15. \_\_\_ **Attachment 13 - LEA Narrative:** Prepare the LEA narrative as directed earlier in the RFP.
16. \_\_\_ **LEA Appendices:** Include any pertinent appendices based on information requested in the narratives. All documents within this section must be cross-referenced within the LEA Narrative. Page numbers must be applied to all documents in this section and pages should be numbered consecutively. **The maximum number of pages for all LEA appendices combined, NOT INCLUDING timelines, cannot exceed 20.**

***Individual School-level SIG Improvement Plan(s) – Items 17- 24 must be completed for each school seeking participation in the grant. Duplicate the named forms as needed.***

17. **Attachment 14 - Applicant Cover Page for Individual School:** Complete all information included in the cover page for each school for which the LEA is seeking funding.
18. **Individual School Needs Assessment:** Attach for each school's application. Provide this information as part of the completed Needs Assessment Packet.
19. **Attachment 15 - Individual School Strategies:** Use the LEA goals identified in Attachment 10 and describe the strategies the school-level team will implement to help the LEA reach the identified goals.
20. **Attachment 16 - Individual School Planning and/or Implementation Year Budget:** For the individual school applying, **complete 1 set of Attachments 16 and 16A to propose expenditures for school-level activities during its planning year, if it is taking one. Complete 1 set of Attachments 16 and 16A to propose expenditures for school-level activities necessary for the first year of full implementation.** If awarded the grant, proposed school budgets must also be submitted for each continuation year of the grant (i.e., FYs 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020) prior to the execution of a grant agreement. Budget information must be submitted on the interactive forms provided.
21. **Attachment 16A - Individual School Planning and/or Implementation Year Detailed Budget Summary Breakdown:** Provide a detailed budget breakdown for the individual school applying for its planning year, if it is taking one. Complete a second Attachment 16A to provide a detailed budget breakdown for the individual school's activities during its first year of full implementation. Totals must correspond with the information provided in the Individual School Narrative, respectively, as well as Attachment 11A or B – Five-Year Budget Summary. If awarded the grant, proposed budgets must also be submitted for each continuation year of the grant (i.e., FYs 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020) prior to the execution of a grant agreement. Budget information must be submitted on the forms provided.
22. **Attachment 17 - Individual School Narrative:** Prepare the school narrative as directed earlier in the RFP.
23. **Individual School's Letters of Support:** Provide letters of support from local school board members, teachers' union representatives, school staff, partnering organizations, and other stakeholder groups. There is no limit to the number of pages letters of support require.
24. **Individual School Appendices:** Include any pertinent appendices based on information requested in the narratives. All documents within this section must be cross-referenced within the School Narrative. Page numbers must be applied to all documents in this section and pages should be numbered consecutively. **The maximum number of pages for all individual school appendices combined, NOT INCLUDING an appendix index, appendix title pages, MOUs, timelines, and letters of support, cannot exceed 20.**

### **Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposals**

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

The proposal scoring process will occur in six steps.

1. Reviewers will assign a ranking of STRONG, MODERATE, LIMITED, or MISSING for each sub-criterion (1.A, 1. B, 1.C...) in both the *LEA-level* and *School-level* portions of the application. These sub-scores will be averaged and, where necessary, multiplied by the appropriate factor (e.g., 2 if the criterion is worth 20 points, 5 if worth 50) in order to establish the total criterion score (e.g., LEA 1. Meaningful Community Engagement).
2. Thirty (30) priority points will be awarded to the School-level total for selecting the Transformation, Turnaround, Early Learning, or Restart model.
3. Thirty (30) priority points will be awarded to the School-level total if the school chooses to take a planning year.
4. Ten (10) priority points will be awarded to the School's Readiness total under the following conditions:
  - a. The school has not been funded under the SIG grant in the past, OR
  - b. The school has been previously funded under the SIG grant and ALL of the following are true:
    - i. There has been a net increase in the percent of students in the "all students group" who met or exceeded standards on the Illinois state assessment in reading from the baseline year (the year prior to receiving the grant) to the final year of the grant; AND
    - ii. There has been a net increase in the percent of students in the "all students group" who met or exceeded standards on the Illinois state assessment in math from the baseline year (the year prior to receiving the grant) to the final year of the grant; AND
    - iii. The student attendance rate increased from the baseline year to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card; AND
    - iv. If applicable, the four-year graduation rate increased from the baseline year to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card.
5. The total LEA SIG Improvement Plan score and the Individual School SIG Improvement Plan score will then be weighted and combined into a final evaluation score. District Capacity will count for 30 percent of the final evaluation score and School Readiness will count for 70 percent of the final evaluation score.
6. ISBE will then rank schools according to their total evaluation score to determine pre-finalist candidates.

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

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

## Appendix A

### MODEL-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT AND PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITY CHECKLISTS

#### Selection of External Providers Model-Specific Requirements Checklist

**Directions:** Identify the model(s) selected by the school(s) being served by the LEA. Indicate in the column on the right whether or not the LEA has taken the steps required to be in compliance with the requirement. Then describe those steps in the narrative.

#### TRANSFORMATION, TURNAROUND, OR EARLY LEARNING

Plan is in Compliance

Requirement	
1. The Lead Partner will provide a weekly, on-site presence during the planning year.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The Lead Partner will provide a daily, on-site presence during implementation years.	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### RESTART

Plan is in Compliance

Requirement	
1. The LEA must determine that the selected charter school operator, CMO, or EMO is likely to produce strong results for the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA must consider the extent to which the schools currently operated or managed by the selected charter school operator, CMO, or EMO, if any, have produced strong results over the past three years (or over the life of the school, if the school has been open for fewer than three years), including:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Significant improvement in academic achievement for all of the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA;	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Success in closing achievement gaps, either within schools or relative to all public elementary school and secondary school students statewide, for all of the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA;	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. High school graduation rates, where applicable, that are above the average rates in the state for the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA; and	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. No significant compliance issues, including in the areas of civil rights, financial management, and student safety;	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### EVIDENCE-BASED, WHOLE-SCHOOL REFORM

Plan is in Compliance

REQUIREMENT	
1. The LEA must determine that the <u>federally pre-approved Evidence-based, Whole-school Reform model</u> is supported by evidence of effectiveness, which must include at least one study of the model that:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Meets "What Works Clearinghouse" evidence standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Without, or	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. With reservations; If meeting "What Works Clearinghouse" evidence standards with reservations, includes a large sample and a multi-site sample as defined in 34 CFR 77.1. (Note: Multiple studies can cumulatively meet the large and multi-site sample requirements so long as each study meets the other requirements in this section.);	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Finds a statistically significant favorable impact on a student academic achievement or attainment outcome (with no statistically significant and overriding unfavorable impacts on that outcome for relevant populations in the study or in other studies of the intervention reviewed by and reported on by the "What Works Clearinghouse"); and	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA must implement in partnership with a whole-school reform model developer, defined as an entity or individual that:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Maintains proprietary rights for the model; or	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. If no entity or individual maintains proprietary rights for the model, has a demonstrated record of success in implementing a whole-school reform model (as defined in these requirements) and is selected through a rigorous review process that includes a determination	<input type="checkbox"/>



that the entity or individual is likely to produce strong results for the school.

### Transformation Model-Specific Requirements Checklist

**Directions:** Indicate in the column on the right whether or not the school's plan includes elements required to be in compliance with the requirement or that are permissible activities. Then describe those steps in the narrative. **All requirements must be met.**

<b>A. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP</b>		<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>		
1.	The LEA must replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model or have replaced the principal within the two years prior to the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	The LEA must implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation and support systems for teachers and principals, designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement, that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be used for continual improvement of instruction;</li> <li>Meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels;</li> <li>Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth (as defined in these requirements) for all students (including English learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources), such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys;</li> <li>Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis;</li> <li>Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development; and</li> <li>Will be used to inform personnel decisions.</li> </ol>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	The LEA must use the teacher and principal evaluation and support system described above to 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	The LEA must implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the school, taking into consideration the results from the teacher and principal evaluation and support system, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The LEA must give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully each element of the transformation model to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>		<b>Plan Includes</b>
1.	Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development;	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority;	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	Implementing a per-pupil, school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>B. TEACHING AND LEARNING</b>		<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>		
1.	The LEA must ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA and a designated external Lead Partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	The LEA must ensure the school uses data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-	<input type="checkbox"/>

based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;	
3. The LEA must ensure the school promotes 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; and	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The LEA must provide staff with 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program, and	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to implement school reform strategies successfully.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Instruction in one or more core academic subjects, including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography;	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Conducting periodic monitoring reviews to ensure that the instruction is implemented with fidelity to the selected curriculum, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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 English learners acquire language skills to master academic content;	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or prekindergarten.	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 the provision of appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Increasing graduation rates through approaches such as 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>C. STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT</b>	
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
None Required.	N/A
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. 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;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build	<input type="checkbox"/>

relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

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



**D. FAMILY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

**REQUIREMENTS**

**Plan is in  
Compliance**

1. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.



### Turnaround Model-Specific Requirements Checklist

**Directions:** Indicate in the column on the right whether or not the school’s plan includes elements required to be in compliance with the requirement or that are permissible activities. Then describe those steps in the narrative. **All requirements must be met.**

<b>A. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP</b>		<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>		
1. The LEA must replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model or have replaced the principal within the two years prior to the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. The LEA must grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to improve student achievement outcomes substantially and increase high school graduation rates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Select new staff.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that are compliant with state law and:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Take into account data on student growth 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. 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, hiring a “Turnaround Leader” who reports directly to the superintendent or chief academic officer, or entering into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Have a strong plan for monitoring the Lead Partner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>		<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. The LEA may adopt a new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. The LEA must use the teacher and principal evaluation and support system described above to 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Implementing a per-pupil, school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<b>B. TEACHING AND LEARNING</b>		<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>		
1. Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program; and	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. 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.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA must ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, and a designated external Lead Partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 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;	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 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;	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for:	<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Instruction in one or more core academic subjects, including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography;</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Conducting periodic monitoring reviews to ensure that the instruction is implemented with fidelity to the selected curriculum, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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 English learners acquire language skills to master academic content;	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program;	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or prekindergarten.	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) and 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;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Increasing graduation rates through approaches such as 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>C. STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT</b>	
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
1. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. 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;	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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;	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**D. FAMILY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
None required.	N/A
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Restart Model-Specific Requirements Checklist

<b>A. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	
1. The 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), selected through the rigorous review process outlined in the Selection of External Providers Model-Specific Requirements Checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Any required or permissible activity in the Turnaround or Transformation models.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>B. TEACHING AND LEARNING</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	
1. A Restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Any required or permissible activity in the Turnaround or Transformation models.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>C. STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	
None.	N/A
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Any required or permissible activity in the Turnaround or Transformation models.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>D. FAMILY &amp; COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	
None.	N/A
<b>ADDITIONAL MODEL-SPECIFIC PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Plan Includes</b>
1. Any required or permissible activity in the Turnaround or Transformation models.	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evidence-based, Whole-school Reform Model-Specific Requirements Checklist**

<p><b>A. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP</b></p> <p align="center"><b>REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Plan is in Compliance</b></p>
<p>1. The model provided by and implemented in partnership with the Whole-school Reform model developer is designed to improve student academic achievement or attainment; will be implemented for all students in a school; and will address school leadership in a comprehensive and coordinated manner.</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>B. TEACHING AND LEARNING</b></p> <p align="center"><b>REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Plan is in Compliance</b></p>
<p>1. The model provided by and implemented in partnership with the Whole-school Reform model developer is designed to improve student academic achievement or attainment; will be implemented for all students in a school; and will address teaching and learning in a comprehensive and coordinated manner.</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>C. STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT</b></p> <p align="center"><b>REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Plan is in Compliance</b></p>
<p>1. The model provided by and implemented in partnership with the Whole-school Reform model developer is designed to improve student academic achievement or attainment; will be implemented for all students in a school; and will address student non-academic support in a comprehensive and coordinated manner.</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>D. FAMILY &amp; COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b></p> <p align="center"><b>REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Plan is in Compliance</b></p>
<p>1. The model provided by and implemented in partnership with the Whole-school Reform model developer is designed to improve student academic achievement or attainment; will be implemented for all students in a school; and will address family and community engagement in a comprehensive and coordinated manner.</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>



### Early Learning Model-Specific Requirements Checklist

**Directions:** Indicate in the column on the right whether or not the school's plan includes elements required to be in compliance with the requirement or that are permissible activities. Then describe those steps in the narrative. **All requirements must be met.**

<b>A. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
1.	The LEA must replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Early Learning model.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	The LEA must implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation and support systems for teachers and principals, designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement, that:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	a. Will be used for continual improvement of instruction;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth (as defined in these requirements) for all students (including English learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources), such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development; and	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f. Will be used to inform personnel decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	The LEA must comply with the requirements of the Early Childhood Block Grant Program specified in 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.20 (c)(5)-(10) and 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.30 (a), (b)(1), & (c). These requirements include additional requirements pertaining to leadership.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	The LEA must use the teacher and principal evaluation and support system described above to identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement, and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The LEA must implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the school, taking into consideration the results from the teacher and principal evaluation and support system, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>B. TEACHING AND LEARNING</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
1.	The LEA must provide full-day kindergarten.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Establish or expand a high-quality preschool program that has, at a minimum;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	a. High staff qualifications, including a teacher with a bachelor's degree in early childhood education or a bachelor's degree in any field with a state-approved alternate pathway (which may include coursework, clinical practice, and evidence of knowledge of content and pedagogy relating to early childhood) and teaching assistants with appropriate credentials;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b. A child-to-instructional staff ratio of no more than 10 to 1;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c. A class size of no more than 20 with, at a minimum, one teacher with high staff qualifications as outlined in paragraph (a) of this definition;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d. A full-day program;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Inclusion of children with disabilities to ensure access to and full participation in all opportunities;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f. Developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula, and learning environments that are aligned with the state early learning and development standards for at least the year prior to kindergarten entry;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g. Individualized accommodations and supports so that all children can access and participate fully in learning activities;	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h. Instructional staff salaries that are comparable to the salaries of local K-12 instructional staff;	<input type="checkbox"/>

i.	Program evaluation to ensure continuous improvement;	<input type="checkbox"/>
j.	On-site or accessible comprehensive services for children and community partnerships that promote families' access to services that support their children's learning and development; and	<input type="checkbox"/>
k.	Evidence-based health and safety standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	The LEA must comply with the requirements of the Early Childhood Block Grant Program specified in 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.20 (c)(5)-(10) and 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.30 (a), (b)(1), & (c). These requirements include additional requirements pertaining to teaching and learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	Provide educators, including preschool teachers, with time for joint planning across grades to facilitate effective teaching and learning and positive teacher-student interactions;	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The LEA must ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA and a designated external Lead Partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	The LEA must ensure the school uses 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	The LEA must ensure the school promotes 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	The LEA must provide staff with 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a.	Aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to implement school reform strategies successfully.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>C. STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
1.	The LEA must comply with the requirements of the Early Childhood Block Grant Program specified in 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.20 (c)(5)-(10) and 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.30 (a), (b)(1), & (c). These requirements include additional requirements pertaining to student non-academic support.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>D. FAMILY &amp; COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>Plan is in Compliance</b>
1.	The LEA must comply with the requirements of the Early Childhood Block Grant Program specified in 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.20 (c)(5)-(10) and 23 Ill. Admin. Code 235.30 (a), (b)(1), & (c). These requirements include additional requirements pertaining to family & community engagement.	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Appendix B**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (SIG) 1003(G)**  
**METRICS AND EXPECTED IMPROVEMENT CYCLE**

All data are collected in ALL YEARS and should be disaggregated by subgroup, and when appropriate, by grade level.

Category	Metric	Expected Improvement				
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Student Behavior and Climate Analysis</b>						
	<b>Chronic Absenteeism Rates</b> <sup>5</sup>		↑	↑	↑	↑
	<b>Discipline Incidents</b>		↑ <sup>6</sup>	↑	↑	↑
	<b>Drop-Out Rates</b>		↑	↑	↑	↑
	<i>5Essentials Survey</i> <sup>7</sup> , Culture Climate Indicators	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
<b>Advanced Course Analysis</b>						
	<b>Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate Rates and/or Advanced Math</b>			↑	↑	↑
	<b>Dual Enrollment Courses</b> (in a postsecondary institution) <sup>8</sup>			↑	↑	↑
	9 <sup>th</sup> Grade On-Track ( <i>Illinois State Course System</i> )		↑	↑	↑	↑
	10 <sup>th</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade On-Pace ( <i>Illinois State Course System</i> )			↑	↑	↑
	12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Course Enrollments ( <i>Illinois State Course System</i> )				↑	↑
<b>Teacher Talent</b>						
	<b>Distribution of Teachers' Performance Levels</b>		↑	↑	↑	↑
	<b>Teacher Attendance Rate</b>		↑	↑	↑	↑
	<i>5Essentials Survey</i> , Academic Rigor Indicators			↑	↑	↑
<b>Student Outcomes</b>						
	<b>High School Graduation Rate or Pass Rate</b>			↑	↑	↑
	<b>College Enrollment Rate</b>			↑	↑	↑
	<b>Percentage of limited-English-proficient students who attain English language proficiency on the annual state English language proficiency assessment.</b>			↑	↑	↑
<b>Student Achievement</b>						
	Formative Assessments, Quarterly/Semester Common Assessments		↑	↑	↑	↑
	Interim Assessments (e.g., NWEA/MAP <sup>9</sup> ) - Growth			↑	↑	↑
	ACT			↑	↑	↑
	<b>PARCC Assessment</b>			↑	↑	↑
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Percentage of students at or above proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics</b></li> <li>• <b>Student participation rate on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics</b></li> </ul>		↑	↑	↑	↑
<b>Other Metrics</b>						
	<i>5Essentials Survey</i> , Leadership Indicators	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
	<b>Number of Minutes in the School Year</b> <b>Type of Extension</b> (Extended day, week, year, etc.) <b>Intervention model</b> <b>AYP Status*</b> <b>Which AYP targets the school met and missed*</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>5</sup> **Boldfaced** metrics are federally required.

<sup>6</sup> Certain types of disciplinary measures may increase during the first year due to increased levels of identification, oversight, and implementation.

<sup>7</sup> *Italicized* metrics are required by the state.

<sup>8</sup> Also tracked is the number of students who take both dual enrollment and AP, IB, or advanced math.

<sup>9</sup> Northwest Evaluation Association/Measure of Academic Progress (NWEA/MAP).

\*These metrics will not be collected in years when an ESEA flexibility waiver has been granted to the state.

**Appendix C**

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (SIG) 1003(G) LEA-LEVEL SIG IMPROVEMENT PLAN SCORING RUBRIC**

Each criterion in this section is worth a total of 10 points (e.g., 1. Meaningful Family and Community Engagement). Within each criterion, reviewers will designate scores of STRONG, MODERATE, LIMITED, or MISSING for each sub-criterion (e.g., I.1.A, I.1.B, I.1.C., and I.1.D.). The sub-criteria scores will all be combined for the criterion to establish the total score. Strong will receive 100 percent of the sub-points possible, moderate will receive 67 percent, and limited will receive 33percent of the sub-points possible for the criterion.

**Criterion - 1. MEANINGFUL FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The narrative describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , a <i>strong plan</i> to meaningfully engage families and the community in the planning, implementation, and sustainability of the intervention in the school(s) being served that includes <i>five to seven of the specific strategies</i> of the types listed below to increase engagement and involvement of parents and community partners:	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , an <i>adequate plan</i> to meaningfully engage families and the community in the planning, implementation, and sustainability of the intervention in the school(s) being served that includes <i>three or four of the specific strategies</i> of the types listed below to increase engagement and involvement of parents and community partners:	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , a <i>scant plan</i> to meaningfully engage families and the community in the planning, implementation, and sustainability of the intervention in the school(s) being served that includes <i>one or two of the specific strategies</i> of the types listed below to increase engagement and involvement of parents and community partners:	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Outreach to connect with hard-to-reach families,</li> <li>b. Enhancement of a welcoming environment and social supports for newcomers,</li> <li>c. Establishment of a family engagement system,</li> <li>d. Enhancement of communication to promote academic and social development of children utilizing two-way exchange of information,</li> <li>e. Inclusion of parents in the decision-making process for individual students as well as holding regular public meetings to review school performance and to develop school improvement plans,</li> <li>f. Using surveys, dialogue and parent forums to gauge satisfaction and support for schools,</li> <li>g. Providing communications for parents, caregivers, and community (as applicable) in the language(s) of the home and/or community, and</li> <li>h. On-site or accessible comprehensive services for children and community partnerships that promote families' access to services that support their children's learning and development.</li> </ul>			
B.	The narrative description has <i>significant specific detail</i> AND describes <i>regular, frequent</i> (e.g., weekly) meetings with parents, community members, and staff to update them on the key metrics of the intervention as well as progress made toward key strategies and interventions.	The narrative description has either <i>moderate detail</i> OR describes <i>regular</i> meetings (e.g., monthly) with parents, community members, and staff to update them on the key metrics of the intervention as well as progress made toward key strategies and interventions.	The narrative description has either <i>limited detail</i> OR describes <i>few</i> meetings (e.g., quarterly) with parents, community members, and staff to update them on the key metrics of the intervention as well as progress made toward key strategies and interventions.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.

C.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , the person(s) (or position(s)) in the LEA responsible for oversight and implementation of the outreach program.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , the person(s) (or position(s)) in the LEA responsible for oversight and implementation of the outreach program.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , the person(s) (or position(s)) in the LEA responsible for oversight and implementation of the outreach program.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
D.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , metrics and other sources of data that measure the success and fidelity of implementation of the community engagement and outreach strategies.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , metrics and other sources of data that measure the success and fidelity of implementation of the community engagement and outreach strategies.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , metrics and other sources of data that measure the success and fidelity of implementation of the community engagement and outreach strategies.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 2. LEA TIMELINE – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The timeline shows, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , that no more than half of Year 1 is used for planning and at least half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.	The timeline shows, with <b>moderate detail</b> , that no more than half of Year 1 is used for planning and at least half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.	The timeline has either <b>limited detail</b> OR shows that <b>more</b> than half of Year 1 is used for planning or <b>less than</b> half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
B.	The timeline shows, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , both <b>strong</b> LEA planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and <b>strong</b> LEA sustainability activities in Year 5.	The timeline has either <b>moderate detail</b> OR contains <b>reasonable</b> LEA planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and <b>reasonable</b> LEA sustainability activities in Year 5.	The timeline has either <b>limited detail</b> OR contains <b>limited</b> LEA planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and <b>limited</b> LEA sustainability activities in Year 5.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
C.	The timeline shows, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , that the LEA will ensure the intervention model will be fully implemented, supported, and monitored for no less than three years.	The timeline shows, with <b>moderate detail</b> , that the LEA will ensure the intervention model will be fully implemented, supported, and monitored for no less than three years.	The timeline shows, with <b>limited detail</b> , that the LEA will ensure the intervention model will be fully implemented, supported, and monitored for no less than three years.	This section is <b>missing</b> , provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate, or indicates that the model will be fully implemented for <b>less than</b> three years.

**Criterion - 3. LEA PLANNING AND/OR IMPLEMENTATION BUDGET(S) – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The budget shows, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , that budget costs are <b>clearly tied</b> to LEA actions that are	The budget shows, with <b>moderate detail</b> , that budget costs are <b>tied</b> to LEA actions that are <b>sufficient</b> to prepare for	The budget has either <b>limited detail</b> OR budget costs are <b>poorly tied</b> to LEA actions OR those actions are <b>barely</b>	This section is <b>missing</b> , provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate, or the actions are

	<p><i>beyond sufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.</p> <p>Budget costs are <i>clearly tied</i> to LEA actions that are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to <i>support and monitor</i> the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served.</p>	<p>the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.</p> <p>Budget costs are <i>tied</i> to LEA actions that are <i>sufficient</i> to <i>support and monitor</i> the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served.</p>	<p><i>sufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.</p> <p>Budget costs are <i>poorly tied</i> to LEA actions OR those actions are <i>barely sufficient</i> to <i>support and monitor</i> the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served.</p>	<p><i>insufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) by the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.</p> <p>This section is <i>missing</i>, provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or the actions are <i>insufficient</i> to support and monitor the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention models.</p>
B.	<p>All budget requests are <i>reasonable and necessary</i> expenditures and are in <i>total compliance</i> with Title I requirements.</p>	<p>The <i>majority</i> of budget requests are <i>reasonable, all are necessary</i> expenditures, and <i>all</i> are in <i>total compliance</i> with Title I requirements.</p>	<p>Many budget requests are <i>not reasonable or necessary</i> expenditures OR <i>all</i> are <i>not in total compliance</i> with Title I requirements.</p>	<p>This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.</p>

**Criterion - 4. ALIGNMENT OF OTHER RESOURCES TO MAXIMIZE FUNDING IMPACT – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	<p>The narrative describes, with <i>sufficient specific detail</i>, how the LEA will redirect <i>significant</i> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <i>planning year</i>.</p>	<p>The narrative description provides <i>moderate detail</i> on how the LEA will redirect <i>significant</i> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <i>planning year</i> OR redirects <i>moderate</i> local, state and/or federal dollars.</p>	<p>The narrative description provides <i>limited detail</i> on how the LEA will redirect <i>significant</i> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <i>planning year</i> OR redirects <i>limited</i> local, state and/or federal dollars.</p>	<p>This section is <i>missing</i>, provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>does not redirect</i> local, state and/or federal dollars in the <i>planning year</i>.</p>
B.	<p>The narrative describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i>, how the LEA will redirect <i>significant</i> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <i>three full implementation years</i>.</p>	<p>The narrative description provides <i>moderate detail</i> on how the LEA will redirect <i>significant</i> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <i>three full implementation years</i> OR redirects <i>moderate</i> local, state and/or federal dollars.</p>	<p>The narrative description provides <i>limited detail</i> on how the LEA will redirect <i>significant</i> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <i>three full implementation years</i> OR redirects <i>limited</i> local, state and/or federal dollars.</p>	<p>This section is <i>missing</i>, provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>does not redirect</i> local, state and/or federal dollars in the <i>three full implementation years</i>.</p>

C.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , how the LEA will redirect <b>significant</b> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <b>sustainability year</b> .	The narrative description provides <b>moderate detail</b> on how the LEA will redirect <b>significant</b> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <b>sustainability year</b> OR redirects <b>moderate</b> local, state and/or federal dollars.	The narrative description provides <b>limited detail</b> on how the LEA will redirect <b>significant</b> local, state, and/or federal dollars to maximize the funding impact of SIG monies in the school(s) being served in the <b>sustainability year</b> OR redirects <b>limited</b> local, state and/or federal dollars.	This section is <b>missing</b> , provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate, or <b>does not redirect</b> local, state and/or federal dollars in the <b>sustainability year</b> .
----	---	---	---	---

**Criterion - 5. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The LEA has identified <b>strong and ambitious</b> but achievable annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both English language arts and mathematics <b>AND two additional goals</b> related to culture and climate, graduation or pass rates, or other school improvement metric.	The LEA has identified <b>moderately ambitious</b> and <b>achievable</b> annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both English language arts and mathematics <b>AND one additional goal</b> related to culture and climate, graduation or pass rates, or other school improvement metric.	The LEA has identified <b>unambitious</b> annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both English language arts and mathematics. The presence or strength of optional goals should not be considered if the annual goals for student achievement are unambitious.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
B.	The LEA has identified <b>strongly</b> strategic, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) objectives that are <b>necessary</b> and <b>well-aligned</b> to the goals and will have the <b>greatest impact</b> on student achievement.	The objectives the LEA has identified are <b>moderately</b> strategic, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) objectives OR they are <b>moderately aligned</b> to the goals but will have <b>impact</b> on student achievement.	The objectives the LEA has identified <b>are not</b> strategic, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) objectives OR they are <b>poorly aligned</b> to the goals OR they will have <b>limited impact</b> on student achievement.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
C.	The LEA has <b>clearly associated all objectives</b> with a <b>strong specific measure of progress</b> and <b>target date for achievement</b> . In total, objectives are tied to <b>all</b> of the following leading indicators: climate and culture, teacher talent, and student achievement. Objective measures include <b>multiple forms</b> such as trend, growth, and fidelity metrics.	The LEA has <b>associated all objectives</b> with a <b>moderate measure of progress</b> and <b>target date for achievement</b> OR <b>most of the objectives</b> are associated with a measure of progress and target date for completion. Objectives are tied to <b>most</b> of the leading indicators.	The LEA has <b>associated some objectives</b> with a <b>measure of progress</b> and <b>target date for achievement</b> OR the measures of progress <b>are a poor fit</b> for the objective. Objectives are tied to <b>a few</b> of the leading indicators.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 6. STRONG REVIEW AND SELECTION OF THE EXTERNAL PROVIDER(S) – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The narrative describes a <b>highly rigorous process</b> by which the LEA reviewed the qualifications of, selected, and contracted with the external provider(s) in the school(s) being served. The description includes a <b>strongly detailed summary</b> of the <b>strong and ample evidence</b> used to make a determination by the LEA that the external provider is likely to produce <b>strong results</b> . The narrative <b>clearly describes</b> how the process met the requirements for the intervention model(s) selected by the school(s) being served.	The narrative describes a <b>rigorous process</b> by which the LEA reviewed the qualifications of, selected, and contracted with the external provider(s) in the school(s) being served. The description includes a <b>moderately detailed summary</b> of the <b>evidence</b> used to make a determination by the LEA that the external provider is likely to produce <b>strong results</b> . The narrative provides a <b>moderate description</b> of how the process met the requirements for the intervention model(s) selected by the school(s) being served.	The narrative describes a <b>process</b> by which the LEA reviewed the qualifications of, selected, and contracted with the external provider(s) in the school(s) being served. The description includes a <b>limited summary</b> of the <b>evidence</b> used to make a determination by the LEA that the external provider is likely to produce <b>strong results</b> OR there is <b>limited evidence</b> . The narrative provides a <b>limited description</b> of how the process met the requirements for the intervention model(s) selected by the school(s) being served.	This section is <b>missing</b> , provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate, or the process described <b>did not meet the requirements</b> for the intervention model(s) selected by the school(s) being served.
B.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , how the selected external providers(s) matched the LEA/school(s) needs identified in the Needs Assessment (i.e., selection process was <b>rigorous</b> and <b>targeted</b> , ensuring that the <b>most relevant factors</b> were used to determine the <b>best fit</b> of LEA/school and external provider). If more than one school is being supported, the match for <b>each school is described separately</b> .	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , how the selected external providers(s) matched the LEA/school(s) needs identified in the Needs Assessment (i.e., selection process was <b>targeted</b> , ensuring that the <b>relevant factors</b> were used to determine a <b>good fit</b> between LEA/school and external provider). If more than one school is being supported, the match for <b>each school is described separately</b> .	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , how the selected external providers(s) matched the LEA/school(s) needs identified in the Needs Assessment OR if more than one school is being supported, the match for <b>each school is not described separately</b> .	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 7. LEA MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT OF EXTERNAL PROVIDERS – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , a <b>strong process</b> for how the LEA will <b>regularly and frequently</b> (e.g., weekly or monthly) monitor the Lead Partner, charter school operator, CMO or EMO, or whole-school reform model	The narrative description has <b>moderate detail</b> OR describes an <b>adequate process</b> for how the LEA will <b>regularly</b> (e.g., quarterly) monitor the Lead Partner, charter school operator, CMO or EMO, or whole-school reform model developer.	The narrative description has <b>limited detail</b> OR describes a <b>limited process</b> (e.g., biannually or annually) for how the LEA will monitor the Lead Partner, charter school operator, CMO or EMO, or whole-school reform model developer.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.



	developer.			
B.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , the role and responsibilities of the Lead Partner (or other external provider), which includes <b>10 or more</b> of the responsibilities listed below:	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , the role and responsibilities of the Lead Partner (or other external provider), which includes <b>at least seven</b> of the responsibilities listed below:	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , the role and responsibilities of the Lead Partner (or other external provider), which includes <b>fewer than seven</b> of the responsibilities listed below:	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Job-embedded professional development of faculty and/or coaches;</li> <li>b. Development, implementation, and/or analysis of student formative, short cycle, interim, and/or summative assessments;</li> <li>c. Active participation in hiring of district-funded administrators at the school;</li> <li>d. Management of the transformation office or officer;</li> <li>e. Strategy, design, and creation of performance management/communication system;</li> <li>f. Assistance with school climate and culture;</li> <li>g. Parent/Community engagement or outreach;</li> <li>h. Extended time programming;</li> <li>i. Development of the Teacher Evaluation System to include a student growth component;</li> <li>j. Job-embedded professional development/coaching of administrators;</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k. Curriculum alignment and/or mapping with ILS and other state standards;</li> <li>l. Development and/or implementation of a turnaround/transformation scorecard;</li> <li>m. Compensation system reform;</li> <li>n. Retention, recruitment, and selection strategies for faculty, staff, and/or administrators;</li> <li>o. Development of an incentive system that identifies and rewards staff based on student achievement and/or graduation rate, if applicable;</li> <li>p. Operational support or training for scheduling;</li> <li>q. A plan to analyze the cost/benefit of various grant activities that leads to a plan for sustainability after the grant period;</li> <li>r. Other substantial responsibilities not previously described.</li> </ul>	
C.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail, specific outcome measures</b> related to academic performance, climate/culture, <b>and</b> teacher talent, for which the external partner(s) will be held accountable.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail, outcome measures</b> related to academic performance, climate/culture, <b>or</b> teacher talent, for which the external partner(s) will be held accountable.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail, vague outcome measures</b> related to academic performance, climate/culture, <b>or</b> teacher talent for which the external partner(s) will be held accountable.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
D.	Evidence, in the form of an attached, <b>signed MOU</b> between the external provider(s) and the district, includes <b>strong, specific language</b> that the external provider(s) <b>agrees to be accountable</b> for <b>the identified outcome measures</b> , responsibilities, and to fulfilling any model-specific requirements.	Evidence, in the form of an attached, <b>signed letter of intent</b> between the external provider and the district, includes <b>moderate language</b> that the external partner <b>agrees to be accountable</b> for the outcome measures <b>to be identified in the future</b> , responsibilities, and to fulfilling any model-specific requirements.	Evidence, in the form of <b>a statement in the narrative</b> , includes <b>language</b> that the external partner <b>agrees to be accountable</b> for the outcome measures <b>to be identified in the future</b> , responsibilities, and to fulfilling any model-specific requirements.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 8. LEA MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT OF INTERVENTION IMPLEMENTATION – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , a <b>strong process</b> for <b>continuous</b> (e.g., weekly) monitoring of the progress and fidelity of implementation of the school(s) being served that includes monitoring activities that <b>strongly exceed the minimum activities listed below</b> :	The narrative description provides <b>moderate detail</b> OR describes a <b>process</b> for <b>regular</b> (e.g., monthly) monitoring of the progress and fidelity of implementation of the school(s) being served that includes monitoring activities <b>beyond the minimum activities listed below</b> :	The narrative description provides <b>limited detail</b> OR describes a <b>process</b> for <b>infrequent</b> monitoring of the progress and fidelity of implementation of the school(s) being served that includes, <b>at minimum, the activities listed below</b> :	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
	<p>a. That the LEA will meet with school leadership, Lead Partner (or other external provider) staff, superintendent, and union leadership at least monthly to present progress reports based on relevant data that have been collected and analyzed; and</p> <p>b. That the LEA will provide quarterly updates to the local school board and to families and the community to present progress on implementation of the intervention strategies and student achievement.</p>			
B.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , a <b>strong process</b> by which the principal, building leadership, and Lead Partner (or other external provider) discuss their progress against the plan and are held <b>fully accountable</b> by the LEA.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , an <b>adequate process</b> by which the principal, building leadership, and Lead Partner (or other external provider) discuss their progress against the plan and are held <b>accountable</b> by the LEA.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , a <b>vague process</b> by which the principal, building leadership, and Lead Partner (or other external provider) discuss their progress against the plan and are held <b>somewhat accountable</b> by the LEA.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
C.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , a <b>strong process</b> by which the LEA will review or accept review of the support it provides to the supported schools from the principal, school leadership, and/or Lead Partner (or other external provider).	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , an <b>adequate process</b> by which the LEA will review or accept review of the support it provides to the supported schools from the principal, school leadership, and/or Lead Partner (or other external provider).	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , a <b>vague process</b> by which the LEA will review or accept review of the support it provides to the supported schools from the principal, school leadership, and/or Lead Partner (or other external provider).	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 9. GOVERNANCE, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , the LEA's <b>strong capacity and plans</b> to modify its practices, policies, and/or structures (e.g., around staffing, budgets,	The narrative description provides <b>moderate detail</b> OR describes the LEA's <b>moderate capacity and plans</b> to modify its practices, policies, and/or structures (e.g., around staffing,	The narrative description provides <b>limited detail</b> OR describes the LEA's <b>limited capacity and plans</b> to modify its practices, policies, and/or structures (e.g., around staffing, budgets,	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

	purchasing, recruitment, retention, professional development, and so on) to <b>strongly support</b> the school(s) in implementing the selected intervention(s).	budgets, purchasing, recruitment, retention, professional development, and so on) to <b>moderately support</b> the school(s) in implementing the selected intervention(s).	purchasing, recruitment, retention, professional development, and so on), which will provide <b>limited support</b> to school(s) in implementing the selected intervention(s).	
B.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , the LEA’s <b>strong capacity and plans</b> to provide <b>strong, effective oversight and support</b> to the supported school(s) by adopting a new governance structure that includes, but is not limited to, identifying a dedicated “Turnaround Leader,” “Transformation Officer,” or “School Improvement Project Manager,” as is appropriate to the selected intervention model(s), who reports <b>directly to the district superintendent or chief academic officer</b> .	The narrative description provides <b>moderate detail</b> OR describes the LEA’s <b>moderate capacity and plans</b> to provide <b>oversight and support</b> to the supported school(s) by adopting a new governance structure that includes, but is not limited to, identifying a dedicated “Turnaround Leader,” “Transformation Officer,” or “School Improvement Project Manager,” as is appropriate to the selected intervention model(s), who reports <b>directly to the district superintendent or chief academic officer or a designated representative</b> .	The narrative description provides <b>limited detail</b> OR describes the LEA’s <b>limited capacity and plans</b> to provide <b>oversight and support</b> to the supported school(s) by adopting a new governance structure that includes, but is not limited to, identifying a dedicated “Turnaround Leader,” “Transformation Officer,” or “School Improvement Project Manager,” as is appropriate to the selected intervention model(s), who reports <b>directly to the district superintendent or chief academic officer or a designated representative</b> .	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
C.	The narrative provides a <b>precise and clear</b> description of accountability, decision-making authority, and communication flow that includes: a. An attached organizational chart that <b>strongly</b> matches the narrative and <b>clearly</b> outlines the reporting structure for the district, school(s) identified, and Lead Partner (or other external provider); b. At most, one person/position that is <b>clearly</b> accountable for ensuring the successful implementation of the intervention(s) within the district; and c. At most, one person/position that is <b>clearly</b> accountable for ensuring the success of the intervention within the Lead Partner (or other external provider).	The narrative provides a <b>moderately clear</b> description of accountability, decision-making authority, and communication flow that includes: a. An attached organizational chart that <b>moderately</b> matches the narrative and <b>reasonably</b> outlines the reporting structure for the district, school(s) identified, and Lead Partner (or other external provider); b. At most, one person/position that is accountable for ensuring the successful implementation of the intervention(s) within the district; and c. At most, one person/position that is accountable for ensuring the success of the intervention within the Lead Partner (or other external	The narrative provides a <b>limited</b> description of accountability, decision-making authority, and communication flow that includes: a. An attached organizational chart that <b>poorly</b> matches the narrative and <b>unclearly</b> outlines the reporting structure for the district, school(s) identified, and Lead Partner (or other external provider); b. At most, one person/position that <b>might be</b> accountable for ensuring the successful implementation of the intervention(s) within the district; and c. At most, one person/position that <b>might be</b> accountable for ensuring the success of the intervention within the Lead Partner (or other external provider).	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

provider).

**Criterion - 10. LEA PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PREPARATION ACTIVITIES – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , all of the activities, <b>well-aligned</b> to the submitted timeline and budgets, the LEA will take in order to <b>strongly support</b> the full and effective implementation of the selected model prior to the first school day of the first year of full implementation.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , all of the activities, <b>aligned</b> to the submitted timeline and budgets, the LEA will take in order to <b>support</b> the full and effective implementation of the selected model prior to the first school day of the first year of full implementation.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , most of the activities the LEA will take in order to <b>support</b> the full and effective implementation of the selected model prior to the first school day of the first year of full implementation OR the description is <b>poorly aligned</b> to the submitted timeline and budgets.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
B.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , how the LEA’s activities are <b>well-aligned</b> to the school(s)’s needs and include, but are not limited to, <b>five or six</b> of the activities listed below:	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , how the LEA’s activities are <b>aligned</b> to the school(s)’s needs and include, but are not limited to, <b>three or four</b> of the activities listed below:	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , how the LEA’s activities are <b>aligned</b> to the school(s)’s needs and include, but are not limited to, <b>one or two</b> of the activities listed below:	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Assisting with staff recruiting and selection;</li> <li>b. Assisting with recruiting and assembling the principal and leadership team(s);</li> <li>c. Assisting staff in instructional planning;</li> <li>d. Negotiating changes/amendments to the Collective Bargaining Agreement potentially regarding extended day, staff removal/transfer, procedures, etc.;</li> <li>e. Training for staff in order to implement the model;</li> <li>f. Developing the program monitoring system and/or operationalizing the new governance structures and/or schedule in response to the grant proposal; and</li> <li>g. Other activities as necessary.</li> </ul>			

**Criterion - 11. SUSTAINABILITY – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , the <b>strong</b> annual process the LEA will use to engage in sustainability planning with each school.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , the annual process the LEA will use to engage in sustainability planning with each school.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , the annual process the LEA will use to engage in sustainability planning with each school.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
B.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , how the ongoing sustainability planning will	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , how the ongoing sustainability planning will include <b>all or most</b> of the	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , how the ongoing sustainability planning will include <b>all or some</b> of the	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

	include <b>all</b> of the elements below:	elements below:	elements below:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A cost-benefit analysis and return on (academic) investment,</li> <li>b. Building staff capacity,</li> <li>c. Repurposing staff,</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Resource reallocation,</li> <li>e. Re-evaluating partner agreements, and</li> <li>f. Incorporating meaningful stakeholder engagement (policymakers, service providers, community partners, parents, families).</li> </ul>	
C.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , anticipated activities undertaken during the final sustainability year of the grant.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , anticipated activities undertaken during the final sustainability year of the grant.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , anticipated activities undertaken during the final sustainability year of the grant.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
D.	The narrative describes, with <b>strong rationale</b> , how those anticipated activities will achieve sustainability of effective interventions identified in the analyses listed in 11.B.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate rationale</b> , how those anticipated activities will achieve sustainability of effective interventions identified in the analyses listed in 11.B.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited rationale</b> , how those anticipated activities will achieve sustainability of effective interventions identified in the analyses listed in 11.B.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.
E.	The narrative describes, with <b>significant specific detail</b> , how the LEA intends to maximize the reduced funding to sustain and institutionalize school reforms and improved student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <b>moderate detail</b> , how the LEA intends to maximize the reduced funding to sustain and institutionalize school reforms and improved student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <b>limited detail</b> , how the LEA intends to maximize the reduced funding to sustain and institutionalize school reforms and improved student achievement.	This section is <b>missing</b> OR provides <b>insufficient detail</b> to evaluate.

## Appendix D

### SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (SIG) 1003(G) INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL-LEVEL SIG IMPROVEMENT PLAN SCORING RUBRIC

Each criterion in this section is worth between 10 and 50 points (e.g., 1. Pre-Application Needs Assessment). Within each criterion, reviewers will designate scores of STRONG, MODERATE, LIMITED, or MISSING for each sub-criterion (e.g., I.1.A, I.1.B, I.1.C., and I.1.D.). The sub-criteria scores will all be combined for the criterion to establish the total score. Strong will receive 100 percent of the sub-points possible, moderate will receive 67 percent and limited will receive 33 percent of the sub-points possible for the criterion. If the criterion is worth more than 10 points, the average will be multiplied by the factor (i.e., 2 for criterion worth 20 points or 5 for criterion worth 50 points) necessary to reach the total criterion score.

#### Criterion - 1. PRE-APPLICATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT – Total of 20 Points Possible

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	Section I of the Pre-Application Needs Assessment <i>clearly</i> describes the process used by the district, <i>clearly</i> identifying which stakeholder groups and key district and school individuals contributed to which parts of the needs assessment process. There is representation and participation from a <i>wide array of stakeholders</i> on <i>many occasions</i> .	Section I of the Pre-Application Needs Assessment <i>moderately</i> describes the process used by the district, identifying which stakeholder groups and key district and school individuals contributed to which parts of the needs assessment process. There is representation and participation from <i>all key stakeholders</i> on <i>multiple occasions</i> .	Section I of the Pre-Application Needs Assessment provides a <i>limited description</i> of the process used by the district, identifying which stakeholder groups and key district and school individuals contributed to which parts of the needs assessment process. There is <i>not representation and participation</i> from <i>all key stakeholders</i> OR there were <i>limited opportunities for participation</i> .	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
B.	The core challenges and issues related to turning around the school are <i>clearly supported</i> by the review of data in Section II, the results from the Parent and Community Input Protocol in Section III, AND the District Capacity Analysis in Section IV. Areas of disagreement have been <i>well-analyzed</i> and <i>thoughtfully incorporated</i> into the final decision.	The core challenges and issues related to turning around the school are <i>moderately supported</i> by the review of data in Section II, the results from the Parent and Community Input Protocol in Section III, AND the District Capacity Analysis in Section IV. Areas of disagreement have been <i>analyzed</i> and <i>incorporated</i> into the final decision.	The core challenges and issues related to turning around the school are <i>poorly supported</i> by the review of data in Section II, the results from the Parent and Community Input Protocol in Section III, OR the District Capacity Analysis in Section IV. Areas of disagreement <i>have not been analyzed or incorporated</i> into the final decision.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
C.	Section V provides a <i>strong rationale</i> for why the selected intervention was chosen and <i>clearly shows</i> how it <i>well-aligns</i> with the school’s needs, parent and community input, AND the	Section V provides a <i>moderate rationale</i> for why the selected intervention was chosen and <i>shows</i> how it <i>aligns</i> with the school’s needs, parent and community input, AND the	Section V provides a <i>limited rationale</i> for why the selected intervention was chosen and <i>does not clearly show</i> how it <i>aligns</i> with the school’s needs, parent and community input, OR the research	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.

	research about school turnaround.	research about school turnaround.	about school turnaround.	
D.	Section V <i>clearly explains</i> why the other intervention models were not selected.	Section V <i>moderately explains</i> why the other intervention models were not selected.	Section V provides a <i>limited explanation</i> why the other intervention models were not selected.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 2. SCHOOL PLANNING AND/OR IMPLEMENTATION BUDGET(S) – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The budget shows, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , that budget costs are <i>clearly tied</i> to school activities that are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.	The budget shows, with <i>moderate detail</i> , that budget costs are <i>tied</i> to school activities that are <i>sufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.	The budget has either <i>limited detail</i> OR budget costs are <i>poorly tied</i> to school activities OR those activities are <i>barely sufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) in the school(s) being served on the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or the activities are <i>insufficient</i> to prepare for the full, effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) by the first day of school of the first year of full implementation.
B.	Budget costs are <i>clearly tied</i> to school actions that are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to <i>fully and effectively implement</i> the selected intervention model in the first year of full implementation.	Budget costs are <i>tied</i> to school actions that are <i>sufficient to fully and effectively implement</i> the selected intervention model in the first year of full implementation.	Budget costs are <i>poorly tied</i> to LEA actions OR those actions are <i>barely sufficient to fully and effectively implement</i> the selected intervention model in the first year of full implementation.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or the actions are <i>insufficient to fully and effectively implement</i> the selected intervention model in the first year of full implementation.
C.	<i>All</i> budgets requests are <i>reasonable and necessary</i> expenditures and are in <i>total compliance</i> with Title I requirements.	The <i>majority</i> of budgets requests are <i>reasonable, all are necessary</i> expenditures, and <i>all</i> are in <i>total compliance</i> with Title I requirements.	Many budgets requests are <i>not reasonable or necessary</i> expenditures OR <i>all are not in total compliance</i> with Title I requirements.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 3. SCHOOL-SPECIFIC PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PREPARATION ACTIVITIES – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The narrative describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , all of the activities <i>well-aligned</i> to the submitted timeline and budgets that the school will undertake in order to <i>strongly prepare for</i> the full and effective	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , all of the activities <i>aligned</i> to the submitted timeline and budgets that the school will undertake in order to <i>prepare for</i> the full and effective implementation of the selected model	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , most of the activities that the school will undertake in order to <i>prepare for</i> the full and effective implementation of the selected model on the first school day of the first year	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.

	implementation of the selected model on the first school day of the first year of full implementation.	on the first school day of the first year of full implementation.	of full implementation OR the description is <i>poorly aligned</i> to the submitted timeline and budgets.	
B.	The narrative describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , how the school's activities are <i>well-aligned</i> to the school(s)'s needs and include, but are not limited to, <i>five or six</i> of the activities listed below:	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , how the school's activities are <i>aligned</i> to the school(s)'s needs and include, but are not limited to, <i>three or four</i> of the activities listed below:	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , how the school's activities are <i>aligned</i> to the school(s)'s needs and include, but are not limited to, <i>one or two</i> of the activities listed below:	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h. Assisting with staff recruiting and selection;</li> <li>i. Assisting with recruiting and assembling the principal and leadership team(s);</li> <li>j. Assisting staff in instructional planning;</li> <li>k. Negotiating changes/amendments to the Collective Bargaining Agreement potentially regarding extended day, staff removal/transfer, procedures, etc.;</li> <li>l. Training for staff in order to implement the model;</li> <li>m. Developing the program monitoring system and/or operationalizing the new governance structures and/or schedule in response to the grant proposal; and</li> <li>n. Other activities as necessary.</li> </ul>			
C.	<i>Five or more</i> letters of support for the school's SIG plan are attached. Each letter <i>specifically identifies</i> which <i>specific elements</i> of the school's implementation plan the authors will support -- <i>and how</i> -- <i>through the planning year into full implementation</i> . At least one letter is from the <i>teachers' union leadership</i> , at least one is from the <i>school board president</i> , and <i>at least three others</i> come from school and community organizations that <i>represent diverse parent and student populations</i> and <i>have large constituencies</i> . <i>All</i> of the letters <i>demonstrate strong familiarity</i> with the elements of the proposed plan.	<i>At least five</i> letters of support for the school's SIG plan are attached. Each letter <i>generally identifies elements</i> of the school's implementation plan the authors will support -- <i>and how</i> -- <i>through the planning year into full implementation</i> . At least one letter is from the <i>teachers' union leadership</i> , at least one is from the <i>school board president</i> , and <i>at least one other</i> comes from a school or community organization that <i>represents a key parent and student population</i> that <i>has a large constituency</i> . <i>Most</i> of the letters <i>demonstrate strong familiarity</i> with the elements of the proposed plan.	<i>Fewer than five</i> letters of support for the school's SIG plan are attached OR more than five letters are attached but <i>fewer than five</i> letters <i>identify elements</i> of the school's implementation plan the authors will support OR fail <i>to say how</i> . Either the teachers' union leadership or the school board president – or both – have failed to send letters and there is a lack of letters from school or community organizations that represent parent and student populations OR <i>few</i> of the letters <i>demonstrate strong familiarity</i> with the elements of the proposed plan.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.



**Criterion - 4. IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT – Total of 50 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The narrative <i>clearly</i> describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , all of the elements of the plan that address SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. It is <i>very clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , all of the elements of the plan that address SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. It is <i>moderately clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>moderate coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , all or only some of the elements of the plan that address SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. It is <i>not clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>met</i> and addressed with <i>sufficient coherence and specificity</i> to make that determination. The elements of the plan are <i>barely sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>all of the model-specific requirements are not met</i> .
B.	The narrative <i>clearly</i> describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , all of the elements of the plan that address TEACHING AND LEARNING. It is <i>very clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , all of the elements of the plan that address TEACHING AND LEARNING. It is <i>moderately clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>moderate coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , all or only some of the elements of the plan that address TEACHING AND LEARNING. It is <i>not clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>met</i> and addressed with <i>sufficient coherence and specificity</i> to make that determination. The elements of the plan are <i>barely sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>all of the model-specific requirements are not met</i> .
C.	The narrative <i>clearly</i> describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , all of the elements of the plan that address STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT. It is <i>very clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , all of the elements of the plan that address STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT. It is <i>moderately clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>moderate coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , all or only some of the elements of the plan that address STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT. It is <i>not clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>met</i> and addressed with <i>sufficient coherence and specificity</i> to make that determination. The elements of the plan are <i>barely sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>all of the model-specific requirements are not met</i> .

D.	The narrative <i>clearly</i> describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , <i>all</i> of the elements of the plan that address FAMILY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT. It is <i>very clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>beyond sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , <i>all</i> of the elements of the plan that address FAMILY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT. It is <i>moderately clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>clearly met</i> and addressed with <i>moderate coherence and specificity</i> . The elements of the plan are <i>sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , <i>all or only some</i> of the elements of the plan that address FAMILY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT. It is <i>not clear</i> which elements were required or permissible. All model-specific requirements are <i>met</i> and addressed with <i>sufficient coherence and specificity</i> to make that determination. The elements of the plan are <i>barely sufficient</i> to transform the school and improve student achievement.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>all of the model-specific requirements are not met</i> .
E.	Evidence, in the form of an attached, <i>signed MOU or MOA</i> between the LEA and the teachers' union, that states that <i>all parties</i> either <i>have negotiated</i> or will commit to <i>negotiate before the end of the school year</i> an MOU for the school that includes language that <i>directly and specifically</i> agrees to implement, <i>fully and with fidelity</i> , <i>ALL</i> the individual plan elements that are in compliance with the requirements of the selected intervention model.	Evidence, in the form of <i>an attached letter of intent</i> signed by the <i>superintendent and union president</i> , that states that <i>all parties</i> will commit to <i>negotiate before the end of the school year</i> an MOU for the school that includes language that <i>directly and specifically</i> agrees to implement, <i>fully and with fidelity</i> , <i>ALL</i> the individual plan elements that are in compliance with the requirements of the selected intervention model.	Evidence, in the form of <i>an attached letter of intent</i> signed by the <i>superintendent and union president</i> that states that <i>all parties</i> will commit to <i>negotiate, without a designated timeframe</i> , an MOU for the school that includes language that <i>directly and specifically</i> agrees to implement, <i>fully and with fidelity</i> , <i>ALL</i> the individual plan elements that are in compliance with the requirements of the selected intervention model OR this intent is only <i>stated in the narrative</i> .	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or <i>all of the model-specific requirements are not agreed to</i> .

**Criterion - 5. USE OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	STRONG	MODERATE	LIMITED	MISSING
A.	The narrative describes, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , <i>all</i> the evidence-based practices included, to the extent practicable, in the school's implementation plan.	The narrative describes, with <i>moderate detail</i> , <i>some or all</i> of the evidence-based practices included, to the extent practicable, in the school's implementation plan.	The narrative describes, with <i>limited detail</i> , <i>some or all</i> of the evidence-based practices included, to the extent practicable, in the school's implementation plan.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
B.	The narrative describes a <i>strong</i> rationale for selecting the evidence-based practices identified or provides a <i>strong</i> reason it was not practicable to do so, given the selected intervention model.	The narrative describes a <i>moderate</i> rationale for selecting the evidence-based practices identified or provides a <i>moderate</i> reason it was not practicable to do so, given the selected intervention model.	The narrative describes a <i>limited</i> rationale for selecting the evidence-based practices identified or provides a <i>limited</i> reason it was not practicable to do so, given the selected intervention model.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.

**Criterion - 6. 5-YEAR SCHEDULE OF SCHOOL ACTIVITIES – Total of 10 Points Possible**

	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>LIMITED</b>	<b>MISSING</b>
A.	The timeline shows, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , that no more than half of Year 1 is used for planning and at least half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.	The timeline shows, with <i>moderate detail</i> , that no more than half of Year 1 is used for planning and at least half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.	The timeline has either <i>limited detail</i> OR shows that <i>more</i> than half of Year 1 is used for planning or <i>less than</i> half of Year 1 is used for implementation preparation activities.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
B.	The timeline shows, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , both <i>strong</i> school planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and <i>strong</i> school sustainability activities in Year 5.	The timeline has either <i>moderate detail</i> OR contains <i>reasonable</i> school planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and <i>reasonable</i> school sustainability activities in Year 5.	The timeline has either <i>limited detail</i> OR contains <i>limited</i> school planning and implementation preparation activities in Year 1 and <i>limited</i> school sustainability activities in Year 5.	This section is <i>missing</i> OR provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate.
C.	The timeline shows, with <i>significant specific detail</i> , that the school will implement the selected intervention model, fully and with fidelity, for no less than three years.	The timeline shows, with <i>moderate detail</i> , that the school will implement the selected intervention model, fully and with fidelity, for no less than three years.	The timeline shows, with <i>limited detail</i> , that the school will implement the selected intervention model, fully and with fidelity, for no less than three years.	This section is <i>missing</i> , provides <i>insufficient detail</i> to evaluate, or indicates that the model will be fully implemented for <i>less than</i> three years.