

School Improvement Grants

# Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name:** Kansas



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

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

### Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

### **Purpose of the Program**

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

### **ESEA Flexibility**

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

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

### **Availability of Funds**

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

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

### **State and LEA Allocations**

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

### **Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners**

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

# FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

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

## SUBMISSION INFORMATION

### **Electronic Submission:**

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

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to [OESE.OST@ed.gov](mailto:OESE.OST@ed.gov).

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

### **Paper Submission:**

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

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

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

### **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

### **For Further Information**

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Legal Name of Applicant:<br>Kansas State Department of Education   | Applicant's Mailing Address:<br>900 SW Jackson Street, Suite 620<br>Topeka, KS 66612-1182 |
| State Contact for the School Improvement Grant<br><br>Name: Sandy Guidry<br><br>Position and Office: Assistant Director, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services<br><br>Contact's Mailing Address:<br>900 SW Jackson Street, Suite 620<br>Topeka, KS 66612-1182<br><br>Telephone: (785) 296-1101<br><br>Fax: (785) 291-3791<br><br>Email address: sguidry@ksde.org |   |
| Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):<br>Dr. Diane DeBacker   | Telephone:<br>(785) 926-3202  |
| Signature of the Chief State School Officer:<br><br>X Dr. Diane DeBacker   | Date: 11/19/2013  |
| The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.   |   |

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

### A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

**Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools):** The Kansas State Department of Education is requesting the priority schools list waiver as its methodology for identifying SIG eligible schools. Kansas Priority schools has already been approved through our ESEA flexibility request.

**Part 2 (Eligible Schools List):** As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list of each priority school in the State. Kansas has no Priority schools listed based on graduation rates.

| USD # | USD Name    | Dist. NCES # | State Bldg |  | School NCES # | School Name                      |
|-------|-------------|--------------|------------|--|---------------|----------------------------------|
|       |             |              | #          |  |               |                                  |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1617       |  | 201299001908  | Marshall Middle School           |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1814       |  | 201299001800  | Hamilton Middle School           |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1627       |  | 201299001919  | Mead Middle School               |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1834       |  | 201299000343  | Truesdell Middle School          |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1817       |  | 201299001800  | Jardine Technology Middle Magnet |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1746       |  | 201299000302  | Mueller Aerospace/Engineering    |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1625       |  | 201299001904  | Gordon Parks Academy             |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1693       |  | 201299001719  | Spaght Multimedia Magnet         |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1650       |  | 201299000265  | Cloud Elementary                 |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1782       |  | 201299000317  | Stanley Elementary               |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1798       |  | 201299001648  | Anderson Elementary              |
| D0259 | Wichita     | 2012990      | 1808       |  | 201299000328  | Curtis Middle School             |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8358       |  | 200795001437  | M E Pearson Elementary           |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8321       |  | 201226001418  | Rosedale Middle School           |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8292       |  | 200795001395  | Grant Elementary                 |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8298       |  | 200795001401  | Mark Twain Elementary            |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8320       |  | 200795001417  | Argentine Middle School          |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8313       |  | 200795001714  | Whittier Elementary              |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8352       |  | 200795001434  | Welborn Elementary               |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8279       |  | 200795001388  | Banneker Elementary              |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8293       |  | 200795001399  | Bertram Caruthers Elementary     |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8316       |  | 200795001414  | Central Middle School            |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8328       |  | 200795001424  | Coronado Middle School           |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8319       |  | 200795001416  | West Middle School               |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      |            |  | 200795001415  | Northwest Middle School          |

|       |         |         |      |              |                             |          |
|-------|---------|---------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| D0501 | Topeka  | 2012260 | 8536 | 201226001476 | Highland Park High School   | priority |
| D0501 | Topeka  | 2012260 | 8444 | 201226001439 | Shaner Elementary           | priority |
| D0480 | Liberal | 2008730 | 7728 | 200873001284 | Liberal South Middle School | priority |

**Schools Continuing SIG 1003g Grants for FY 2013**

| USD # | USD Name    | Dist. NCES # | State  |               | School Name                   |
|-------|-------------|--------------|--------|---------------|-------------------------------|
|       |             |              | Bldg # | School NCES # |                               |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8285   | 200795001393  | Douglass Elementary School    |
| D0500 | Kansas City | 2007950      | 8309   | 200795001490  | New Stanley Elementary School |
| D0501 | Topeka      | 2012260      | 8494   | 201226001459  | Quincy Elementary School      |
| D0501 | Topeka      | 2012260      | 8465   | 201226001447  | Ross Elementary School        |
| D0501 | Topeka      | 2012260      | 8499   | 201226001115  | Scott Dual Language Magnet    |

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

No LEA in Kansas has had SIG funds terminated and all previously awarded SIG grants are eligible for renewal.

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

**Background Information**

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has in place a Kansas system of school and district support which provides technical assistance to districts and schools. Components of the system include The Kansas Learning Network, the Technical Assistance System Network (TASN), the Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) and the Kansas School Improvement Process. The KSDE will continue utilizing the processes and procedures that are in place in Kansas as well as establishing new practices when working with Priority schools.

With the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in place, KSDE has developed a new system of accountability for districts and schools in Kansas with a focus on the transition to 21st Century Skills using Kansas College and Career Ready Standards, appropriate assessments and effective evidence-based interventions to ensure students are college and career ready when they graduate from school. The school improvement plan that was used prior to the Flexibility Waiver was abandoned so that Kansas could work with Indistar® to develop a web-based tool for documenting data around the implementation of the Turnaround Principles.

The prior work of the Kansas Learning Network (KLN) has been adapted to assist the new requirements of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. As part of the understanding with the previous

KLN provider (Cross & Joftus), KSDE transitioned control of the KLN work to two Kansas service centers (KLN Request for Proposal, Appendix A). The first responsibility of the new KLN was to orchestrate a District Needs Assessment (DNA) in the 19 districts, 33 Priority and 66 Focus Schools. By February 1, 2013, all needs assessment visits had been conducted. All district and buildings received a Needs Assessment Report. The reports included data from focus groups, classroom observations, and McRel's Changing the Odds survey. Demographic and achievement data was also included in the report. (Sample DNA can be found in Appendix 2.)

The DNA report was organized around the seven Turnaround Principles. It included strengths and challenges under each principle and recommendations from the Menu of Meaningful Interventions referenced in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Priority Schools were assigned an implementation coach whose responsibilities included addressing the challenges and recommendations in the District Needs Assessment. To assist schools and coaches, Kansas, working with Indistar® staff, developed a list of Indicators of Effective Practice, proven through research, to turnaround schools rapidly. This list, along with the research and web-based tools, is what Kansas has dubbed, KansaStar. Implementation coaches help schools select and implement indicators that align with their school and district improvement efforts as well as the DNA challenges and recommendations, and the interventions from the Menu of Meaningful Interventions. (Refer to *Implementation Coach Responsibilities*, Appendix 3.)

## **Kansas School Improvement Process**

### **KansaStar**

#### **School Improvement Plan – KansaStar Implementation**

In August of 2012, the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) began planning conversations with Indistar® staff members Sam Redding and Lois Myran. A KSDE Indistar® workgroup was established for the purpose of designing the Kansas Indistar® process. As a result of this preliminary work which spanned several months, the decision was made to have Priority, Focus and SIG school leadership teams use the Indistar® process (KansaStar) for their school improvement work.

A major portion of the KSDE workgroup's work was creating a list of KansaStar Indicators of Effective Practices and designing the KansaStar Reporting Requirements and Timelines document. The workgroup decided upon a total of 114 indicators based on the seven turnaround principles. Of these 114 indicators, 42 indicators were identified as Key indicators or those that would provide the most rapid improvement in the Priority and Focus Schools. Eleven turnaround indicators (TA) were identified under the Leadership and Decision Making category. The other turnaround principles were addressed through Key indicators in the remaining categories (Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning; Classroom Instruction; Parent, School, and Community). Within each of these categories there are sections that specifically identify Key indicators for the remaining turnaround principles. Please reference the *KansaSTAR Indicators of Effective Practices* in Appendix 4.

The KansaStar Reporting Requirements and Timelines document was developed for the purpose of providing school leadership teams with specific dates for submission of their school improvement work over the three years of the ESEA Waiver implementation. Again, the timeline was customized for each group of schools (Priority, Focus and SIG). It was determined that the first submission date would be February 25, 2013 due to the fall 2012 implementation of the KansaStar system. All schools were required to assess, plan for, and begin implementing a minimum of four Key indicators under the School Leadership and Decision-Making category. The KSDE Indistar® workgroup chose these indicators because there was a strong belief that if there wasn't a highly functioning school leadership team in these schools, this needed to be established first before other indicators could be implemented. There were two more submission dates for the first year of the ESEA waiver implementation, March 31, 2013 and June 20, 2013. For the March 31<sup>st</sup> submission date Priority and SIG schools were required to assess all 11 turnaround indicators, plan for, and begin implementing a minimum of five turnaround indicators. For the June 20<sup>th</sup> submission date Priority and SIG schools had to assess a minimum of 10 key indicators, two from each of the turnaround principle areas and plan for and begin to implement a minimum of five key indicators, one from each of the turnaround principle areas. The decision was made that schools must have ten active indicators at all times. Active indicators are indicators that are assessed, planned for with assigned tasks, and the implementation process begun. School leadership teams were also informed that the prioritized challenges and recommendations from the needs assessment report were to guide the discussion and selection of indicators that would be used to create their school improvement plan.

It was determined by the KSDE Indistar® workgroup that Priority and SIG schools' KansaStar school improvement work would be based on the ESEA waiver timeline which states that full implementation of each school's action plan (SAP) would include all seven turnaround principles. This was to occur by August of 2013.

Based on feedback from the 19 district superintendents, principals and implementation coaches, the indicator list was reduced to 58 Key indicators and adaptations were made to the KansaStar timeline for the 2013 - 2014 school year. The necessity for Priority schools to be implementing interventions around all seven of the turnaround principles continues.

Four indicators were added to the list of effective practice indicators. These indicators are focused around tiered instruction and support the Kansas MTSS.

### **Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) and School Improvement**

Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) is a term used in Kansas to describe how schools provide supports for each child in their building to be successful and the processes and tools school staff use to make decisions. MTSS is a coherent continuum of evidence-based, system-wide practices to support a rapid response to academic and behavioral needs, with frequent data-based monitoring for instructional decision-making to empower each Kansas student to achieve to high standards.



The Kansas Learning Network will assist schools that will be applying for the new SIG Grant competition and the district in assessing their capacity utilizing the MTSS Innovation Configuration Matrix (ICM) as part of the needs assessment (school effectiveness appraisal). This tool will assist the district and schools in understanding the structures and processes necessary to implement a sustainable system. More information about the MTSS process in Kansas is found at [www.kansasmtss.org](http://www.kansasmtss.org). The ICM, which will help assess building and district capacity is found in Appendix 5.

### **Needs Assessment**

The Kansas State Department of Education will utilize the Kansas Learning Network's process that is currently in place and also KSDE developed tools to work with districts and schools as they implement the requirements of the grant.

*Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature* by Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, and Wallace discusses six steps of implementation which will guide the KSDE, KLN and districts and schools through this change process.

1. Exploration and Adoption,
2. Program Installation,
3. Initial Implementation,
4. Full Operation,
5. Sustainability, and
6. Evaluation.

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

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.***

### **Needs Assessment**

The KLN and the KSDE will provide a District and School Needs Assessment and consultation through the implementation coaches in the Priority Schools. This consultation will provide support to the district and schools to help them analyze their needs assessment results, along with other district and school data, around the seven Turnaround Principles.

KSDE will require the following documentation of LEA's Needs Assessment evaluation:

#### Data Analyzed

##### Achievement

- School AMO Data (including ELLs, Students with Disabilities and other subgroup populations)
- School Report Card Data (including ELLs, Students with Disabilities and other subgroup populations)
- Perception Data (including ELLs, Students with Disabilities and other

- subgroup populations)
- Contextual (school processes/ programs)
- Demographic Data (including ELLs, Students with Disabilities and other subgroup populations)

#### Innovation Configuration Matrix

#### School Leading Lagging Metrics Report

Included in the analysis will be the School Leading/Lagging Metric Annual Report which will be used to hold schools accountable that are receiving the School Improvement Grant funds. These metrics will be utilized not only to serve as benchmarks for the beginning of the process but also to measure progress over time on the school improvement grant. The School Leading Indicator Report, which is part of the local application, is shared in Appendix 6.

The school will also continue to review the most recent KSDE School and District Report Card (Appendix 7) and other KSDE assessment reports.

#### **Prescriptive Root Cause Analysis**

Based on the District and School Needs Assessments, the LEA will conduct prescriptive root cause analysis as part of the process.

After the data has been analyzed each LEA is required to determine the root causes for the results of the needs assessment. The root causes are identified in the following areas:

- ✓ Administrators and teachers
- ✓ Curriculum and materials
- ✓ Master schedule, classroom schedules and classroom management/discipline
- ✓ Student and parents

#### **Selection of Model**

The LEA, using baseline data from the School Leading Lagging Metrics Report, will then collaborate with the KSDE Kansas Integrated Innovations Team (KIIT) to select the appropriate intervention model utilizing the Intervention Model Selection Rubrics. These tools describe the expectations of KSDE for fidelity of implementation of the model, and will guide the district in the selection of an intervention model. These rubrics are contained in Appendix 8.

ELLs, Students with Disabilities and other subgroup populations should be considered in selection of an appropriate model.

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

Capacity, as used here, is defined as the ability of the district to support the school in achieving progress on the School Leading/Lagging Metrics Annual Report, addressing issues in the school(s) and district needs assessment and implementing with fidelity the chosen model.

The KSDE will determine the LEA capacity through an evaluation of the district’s ability to plan, implement and target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process. Each LEA must complete a self-analysis of the capacity it can provide to assist the low performing schools in the implementation of the selected intervention model. This will be determined utilizing a scale of 1 to 3 ranking from poor (1), satisfactory (2) and commendable (3) for the following criteria:

**Capacity Rubric**

| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Poor<br/>1 Point</b>                          | <b>Satisfactory<br/>2 Points</b>                          | <b>Commendable<br/>3 Points</b>                  | <b>Points Earned</b> |
|---|--|---|--|----------------------|
| <b>Prior KLN Interventions</b>  | Entered KLN as Cohort 1 or 2.                    | Entered KLN as Cohorts 3-5                                | Entered KLN in 2012-2103 with Priority School(s) | .                    |
| <b>Title I Monitoring Results</b>   | Findings in areas requiring a repayment of funds | Findings in areas noted – repayment of funds not required | No Findings in the Fiscal area                   |                      |
| <b>LEA Overall Achievement Ranking</b>  | Bottom 5% = 19 districts                         | Middle 70% = 272 districts                                | TOP 25% = 97 districts                           |                      |
| <b>Approval of District Action Plan by SEA</b>                                  | Not approved by the SEA.                         | Approved by the SEA with revisions.                       | Approved by the SEA without revisions.           |                      |
| <b>In each LEA, Percentage of Title I Schools that Met the Achievement AMO.</b> | 0-51% of Title I schools met Achievement AMO.    | 51-75% of Title I schools met Achievement AMO.            | 76-100% of Title I schools met Achievement AMO.  |                      |
| <b>Development of Tiered Intervention</b>                                       | The school has not yet begun to address the      | A critical mass of staff has begun to engage              | The practice of a tiered intervention            |                      |

|   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Model, like MTSS</b></p>  | <p>practice of a tiered intervention model, like MTSS, or an effort has been made to address the practice of tiered instruction but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.</p> | <p>a tiered intervention model, like MTSS. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.</p>                       | <p>model, like MTSS, is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.</p>    |  |
| <p><b>Development of Schools as Professional Learning Communities</b></p>                   | <p>The school has not yet begun to address the practice of a PLC or an effort has been made to address the practice of PLCs but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.</p>     | <p>A critical mass of staff has begun to engage in PLC practice. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.</p> | <p>The practice of PLCs is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Identification of District Leadership Team and Assignment of Responsibilities</b></p> | <p>No district leadership team, or identified personnel, have been assigned for monitoring implementation.</p>  | <p>Lacks specific identification of personnel and roles and responsibilities for the district leadership team and for monitoring implementation.</p>   | <p>A specific district leadership team is identified with specific roles and responsibilities identified. One or more persons are assigned for monitoring</p>   |  |

|                                 |  |  |   |  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|                                 |  |  | implementation  |  |
| <b>Building Leadership Team</b> | Building leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver have been met. | Building leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver have been met. | Building leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders (e.g., families, representatives of institutions of higher education; representatives of educational service centers or external providers. Evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver have been met. |  |
| <b>Budget Analysis</b>          | The LEA has little or no capacity to support the selected intervention model and there is little or no analysis of state and federal funds.  | The LEA has some capacity to support the selected intervention model with a budget that does some analysis and examination of state and federal funds utilized in the building.              | The LEA has the capacity to support the selected intervention model with a detailed budget analysis, examining all state and federal funds utilized in the building.  |  |

|                            |   |   |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Sustainability Plan</b> | No sustainability plan exists or the plan is not likely to sustain SIG efforts. | Plan is likely to sustain some SIG efforts. | Plan is likely to sustain most SIG efforts. |  |
|                            |   |   | <b>Total Points</b>                         |  |

In addition, KSDE KIIT will utilize the following instruments to determine the capacity of the district to support the schools:

- Capacity of District
  - Capacity Appraisal using Innovation Configuration Matrix for Districts
  - KLN District Action Plan (Appendix 9)
  - Sustainability Plan (Appendix 10)
- LEA Application
- LEA Conference Call around SIG Application

If it is determined that the district does not have the capacity to support the school during this process, the school improvement grant request will be denied. However, further technical assistance will be provided by the KLN and the KSDE to build capacity for the LEA to implement interventions around the seven Turnaround Principles.

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

*The LEA will provide an analysis of all federal and state funds that the school has received and how staff is planning to utilize these funds for implementation of the intervention model. The LEA will also provide a detailed narrative on each budget line item submitted in the LEA application.*

KSDE staff will discuss with the district and the building staff the specific recommendations about the budget and how the grant will support implementation of the model following the SIG grant conference call. The district will be asked to sign an assurance that the resources will be spent to support fidelity of implementation of the model in each SIG School. (Refer to LEA Application, Appendix 11.)

- Budget Review and Negotiation with KSDE

- Grant Award Letter with Assurances (See Appendix 12.)

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

An LEA's budget for each year must be a minimum of \$50,000 and may not exceed \$2,000,000 per school per year it commits to serve or no less than \$150,000 and no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

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

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

During the SIG conference call, the LEA will share in depth information on the Needs Assessment they have completed using the Innovation Configuration Matrix (ICM) for Schools, the LEA Capacity Index, their process for selection of the Intervention Model(s), their capacity to implement the selected intervention model, the goal setting process and their sustainability plan.

Finally, included in this process will be an explanation of the actions the district has taken to:

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

### **Design and Implement Interventions Consistent with the Final Requirements (Appendix 14)**

LEA will choose a model using the Intervention Model Selection Rubric. A narrative around each requirement of the chosen model will be required. The KSDE, during the review process, will use the LEA Grant Scoring Form to determine LEA capacity to implement chosen model. (Appendix 13)

During the KSDE conference call with the LEA, the LEA will share in depth information on the Needs Assessment they have completed using the Innovation Configuration Matrix (ICM) for

Schools, their process for selection of the Intervention Model(s) referring to the School Improvement Model Selection Rubrics, their capacity to implement the selected intervention model referencing the LEA Capacity Index, the goal setting process and their sustainability plan.

Included in this process will be an explanation of the actions the district has taken to:

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

The LEA Application Scoring Form (Appendix 13), will be utilized by KSDE staff to rate each of the above-mentioned areas. In addition, the KSDE will utilize the implementation research of Fixsen as referenced on page 5 and the LEA's implementation timeline. The Intervention Models Rubrics (Appendix 8) which the LEA is to complete during the Exploration and Adoption phase of the Implementation Process, and prior to the conference call, will be used in conjunction with the scoring form to provide the LEA with focused and meaningful feedback. An integral part of the conference call discussion will be for the KSDE and district staff to have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and to negotiate changes in the plan and budget.

In order to complete the Exploration and Adoption Phase of the Implementation Process, the school would be expected to complete and update the School Action Plan using the KansaStar tool by October 31, 2014. All school staff and KSDE KIIT will review and provide input throughout the grant implementation.

The LEA application is provided in Appendix 11. The LEA Application Scoring Form used to evaluate the written application and to be used in the oral presentation is in Appendix 13.

### **Recruit, Screen, and Select External Providers, if applicable, to Ensure their Quality**

LEAs will recruit, screen and select external providers using the External Provider Toolkit. This toolkit will help a district identify external providers, determine whether an external provider's model fits with the district's school improvement strategy, assess the quality of the services that an external provider offers, and evaluate whether an external provider's services continue to meet the needs of the district it serves over time. The SEA will ensure that the LEA is committed to utilizing the process outlined in the toolkit and will document the LEAs commitment using the LEA Application Scoring Form. The External Provider Toolkit can be found in Appendix 15.

- “External providers\*\*”: If applicable, describe how the district will recruit, screen, and select external providers with the requisite quality and expertise necessary to support and provide assistance to the district or to schools in implementing redesign plans. If the district has identified external providers who will assist it in implementing the intervention models, provide the credentials, experiences, and qualifications of the provider for the relevant task.”
- \*\*If a district is using an external provider, the district must submit a narrative response. Districts may reference a tool provided by the SEA to hold external providers



accountable.

### **SIG Requirements Related to Sustainability**

The SEA will consider the extent to which an LEA's application demonstrates that an LEA has taken action, or will take action, to address each of the following using the LEA Application Scoring Form and the Sustainability Index. (Refer to Appendix 10.)

#### **Align other resources with interventions**

- Other local, state, or federal funds, including: 1003(a); Title I, Part A; Title II; Title III and IDEA funds
- Community resources and wraparound services to address academic, health, and mental health needs
- Coordinating or integrating programs and activities (breaking down silos)

#### **Modify practices and policies to more fully and effectively implement interventions**

- Governance structures
- Business processes
- Union and board agreements
- Hiring and staffing practices
- Flexibilities in budgeting, time/schedules, curriculum

#### **Sustain reforms after SIG funding ends**

- Cost/benefit analysis and return on investment
- Building staff capacity
- Repurposing staff
- Resource reallocation
- Reevaluating partner agreements
- Meaningful stakeholder engagement (policymakers, service providers, community partners, parents, families)

To meet the above requirements related to sustainability, the LEA will complete the Sustainability Index as part of the LEA Grant Application. See Appendix 10.

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

In a conference call with the LEA, during pre-implementation (March-April 2014), the KSDE will work with the LEA to ensure that the LEA has budgeted funds to successfully implement activities that will help the LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The KSDE will evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether or not proposed activities are allowable. Possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation could include:

Family and Community Engagement  
 Rigorous Review of External Providers and Selection  
 Staffing, Recruiting, Hiring, Evaluating  
 Instructional Programs  
 Professional Development and Support  
 Preparation for Accountability Measures

SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities. See Section J of SIG Guidance, 2010.

The KSDE will consider whether the activities proposed to be carried out during pre-implementation:

- Are directly related to the selected model;
- Are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;
- Are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA’s needs assessment;
- Represent a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years;
- Are research-based; and
- Represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.

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

| Implementation Steps   | SEA Timeline  | LEA Timeline and Explanation |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| <p><b><u>EXPLORATION AND ADOPTION</u></b><br/>           Needs Assessment using the Innovation Configuration Matrix (ICM) for Schools</p> <p>1.Achievement Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ School Leading Indicator</li> <li>▪ Report</li> <li>▪ School AMO Data</li> <li>▪ School Report Card Data</li> </ul> <p>2.Perception Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contextual (school</li> </ul> | <p>SEA grant application is submitted November 2013.</p> <p>LEAs with Priority schools will receive notification of SIG eligibility.</p> <p>SEA grant application and LEA grant application is approved in January 2014.</p> <p>LEA grant application is distributed in February 2014.</p> <p>KSDE offers technical assistance to LEAs on grant</p> |                              |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>processes/ programs)</p> <p>3. Demographic Data</p> <p>Selection of Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ School Improvement Model Selection Rubrics</li> </ul> <p>Capacity and Commitment of District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity Appraisal using Innovation Configuration Matrix (ICM) for Districts</li> <li>▪ LEA Capacity Index</li> <li>▪ Sustainability Index</li> </ul> <p>Budget Review &amp; Negotiation</p> <p>Approval of LEA Application by KSDE</p> | <p>competition in February and March 2014.</p> <p>LEA 3 year SIG grants due March 14, 2013.</p> <p>LEA 3 year SIG grants evaluated and technical assistance conference calls March – April 2014.</p> <p>LEA 3 year SIG grants awarded at KSDE Board of Education meeting April 2013.</p> |  |
| <p><b>*Program Installation and Initial Implementation –</b></p> <p><b><u>PRE-IMPLEMENTATION</u></b></p> <p>Family and Community Engagement Meetings</p> <p>Rigorous Review of External Providers</p> <p>Staffing</p> <p>Instructional Programs (remediation and enrichment programs begin)</p> <p>Professional Development</p> <p>Aligning Accountability Measures for Reporting</p> <p>(*See Pre-Implementation information in SIG Guidance on School Improvement Grants, November 1, 2010,</p>           | <p>Funds available to LEAs in April 9, 2014.</p> <p>Pre-Implementation activities begin at school site in April 2014.</p>  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Section J.)  |  |  |
| <p><b><u>FULL OPERATION</u></b></p> <p>SIG orientation with all stakeholders, including staff, students and parents.</p> <p>Continuation of Professional Development Activities</p> <p>Continuation of Family and Community Orientation Sessions on School Changes<br/>Technical assistance monitoring by KSDE staff</p>   | <p>August 2014</p> <p>August 2014 – May 2017</p> <p>August 2014 – May 2017</p> |  |
| <p><b><u>INNOVATION</u></b></p> <p>Analysis of Yearly Data</p> <p>Continuous implementation of the School Action Plan using KansaStar.</p> <p>Full implementation of all requirements in the chosen model, including family and community engagement.</p> <p>Continuation of staff professional development.</p> <p>Successful completion of two KSDE monitoring visits.</p> | <p>June 2014 – May 2017</p>  |  |
| <p><b><u>SUSTAINABILITY</u></b></p> <p>Modify practices and policies to more fully and effectively implement interventions</p> <p>Align other resources with interventions</p> <p>Completion of Sustainability</p>   | <p>August 2014</p>   |  |

|      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| Plan |  |  |
|------|--|--|

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

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

KSDE will make grant renewal decisions for each school based on whether the school has satisfied the following requirements in regards to its annual performance targets for leading and lagging indicators:

- *Leading Indicators*—A school must meet 5 of 9 leading indicator goals.
- *Lagging Indicators*—The school must also meet a minimum of 25% of applicable achievement indicators.

KSDE may grant exceptions to this rule only if extenuating circumstances occur.

---

**Leading Indicators**

- Number of minutes within the school year and school day;
- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- Dropout rate;
- Student attendance rate;
- Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truants;
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and
- Teacher attendance rate.

**Lagging Indicators**

- Percentage of students at or above proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by both grade level , and by student subgroup;
- Average scale score on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup;

- Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency;
- School improvement status and AMO targets met and missed;
- College enrollment rates; and
- Graduation rate.

In addition, the KSDE will review annually the district and building report cards to determine if Annual Measureable Objectives have been met in the following 4 areas:

- Increasing Achievement
- Growth
- Closing the Gap
- Reducing Non-Proficient

The KSDE has calculated annual goals for each district and building for the 4 AMOs over the next five years.

***(2) Kansas has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver that allows KSDE to identify Priority Schools eligible for the 1003g School Improvement Grant. KSDE no longer identifies Tier I, II, and III schools.***

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

Three times per year the Kansas Integrated Innovation Teams examine the work done in KansaStar for assigned schools. The KIITs are comprised of Education Program Consultants from across the KSDE Division of Learning Services. Education Program Consultants have, at minimum, a Master's degree and most have years of experience in the education field. KIITs use a feedback form within the tool three times per year. This feedback can be accessed by the building leadership team, the implementation coaches and district facilitators as well as the district leadership.

The SIG monitoring process includes spring and fall monitoring visits to ensure that turnaround and transformation model requirements are fully and effectively implemented. SIG grantees are required to complete the Intervention Form for Federal Requirements and the Leading/Lagging Metrics Annual Report. These reports are reviewed and feedback is provided by the KIIT.

Technical assistance is provided during the monitoring visits to address any of the final SIG requirements where further assistance is needed to fully implement. Many resources are made available to the SIG grantees along with information on how to access and utilize the assistance. KSDE consultants, TASN, and the Directory of Resources are all potential technical assistance

resources.

KSDE has made the decision within the ESEA Flexibility Waiver to integrate SIG and Priority around the monitoring process. Therefore, all SIG and Priority schools receive monitoring visits where discussions around progress on the Turnaround Principles and future actions around the work of full implementation are documented within a monitoring report. Support and technical assistance is discussed, specific actions needed by the district, the implementation coach, and the KSDE are noted.

Finally, as part of the monitoring visit, in order to measure instructional impact, a standardized walkthrough process occurs during each visit. The walkthroughs provide an opportunity for the KIIT, the building leadership team, implementation coaches and district staff to see the impact of the turnaround principles on instruction and student learning. It also provides an opportunity for all involved to come to consensus around what constitutes quality instructional practices.

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

The following criteria will apply:

- Priority schools that have not received a SIG grant in the past will be given priority over past SIG grantees.
- When a district applies for multiple schools, the school with the lowest achievement performance index that was used to identify as Priority status will be used.

The Kansas State Department of Education does not intend to take over any Priority school. KSDE does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of take over.

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

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

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

X Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.

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

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

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

X Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.

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

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

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

KSDE will reserve 5% to assist with state activities. The School Improvement Grant will require monthly monitoring and KSDE will be required to add additional support to their school improvement staff. Every Priority school will be assigned an implementation coach (IC), employed by the Kansas Learning Network, that will work with the principal and leadership team to insure implementation of the school improvement plan and school improvement grant.

Every Priority school will be assigned a Kansas Integrated Innovations Team, comprised of KSDE administrators and consultants, that will monitor via desktop three times per year and will monitor via site visit two times per year.

Implementation coaches will visit each school eight times per year and provide the KSDE a technical report. A portion of the 5% will be used to conduct an outside evaluation of The Kansas System of School and District Support, including the Kansas Learning Network. The purpose of the evaluation will be to evaluate the technical assistance that the KSDE and the Kansas Learning Network are providing to districts and schools on improvement.

Currently, KSDE has templates, resource books, handbooks and training modules to support schools and districts on improvement. KSDE is using KansaStar, a web-based school improvement tool, which will help to integrate all improvement initiatives at the KSDE, including school improvement, Title III, and IDEA. We envision KansaStar as the tool for schools and districts and would integrate different federal timelines and expectations.

**G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS**



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

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

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

**Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver**

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

Assurance

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

**Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver**

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

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

**WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

**Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver**

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

**Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver**

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

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

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