SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

An Overview of Fiscal Year (FY) 2010
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)

- Lessons learned from last year
- Overview of FY 2010 SIG
- Changes to the FY 2010 Non-Regulatory Guidance
- Changes to the FY 2010 SIG Application
LESSONS LEARNED FROM LAST YEAR

- Suggestions from the NASTID Conference to improve the FY 2010 SIG competition
SUGGESTIONS FROM THE NASTID CONFERENCE TO IMPROVE THE FY 2010 SIG COMPETITION

- **Do not make major changes to the policy or the new application.**
  - There are no major policy changes for the FY 2010 SIG competition.
  - ED is allowing SEAs to retain large sections of its application from FY 2009.

- **Give LEAs and schools more time to develop a competitive application and plan for implementation.**
  - The guidance and application are being released earlier to allow LEAs and schools more time to develop a competitive application.
  - The pre-implementation period also gives LEAs and schools flexibility to take initial steps and prepare for the implementation of the intervention models.
Provide additional technical assistance to States throughout the application process.

- ED will be holding weekly “office hours” during which States can schedule time to call in to discuss questions on the application and focus on PLA definitions and generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Give additional feedback on the application review process.

- ED is restructuring its staffing to provide more support and consistent feedback to SEAs during the application review process.
SUGGESTIONS FROM THE NASTID CONFERENCE TO IMPROVE THE FY 2010 SIG COMPETITION

- Share best practices of other States, especially with regard to the LEA application process and monitoring.
  
  - SEAs that thought comprehensively from the beginning of the SIG application process about how to structure their LEA competition, set clear selection and evaluation criteria, and developed monitoring protocols had success in ensuring that their SIG funds were used to serve their persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement the four required school intervention models.

- Ensure collaboration and communication among staff working on the PLA definition and those working on the lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to ensure consistency.
THE FY 2010 SIG COMPETITION
OVERVIEW OF FY 2010 SIG

- There are no major policy changes for the FY 2010 SIG competition.
- There are a few changes to the FY 2010 non-regulatory guidance addressing:
  - Flexibility to generate new lists
  - Pre-implementation
  - Parent and community engagement
- Modifications and new questions are noted in the non-regulatory guidance.
- Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application.
  - An SEA will be required to update only those sections that include changes from its FY 2009 application.
  - New section on evaluation criteria for pre-implementation and one new waiver have been added for FY 2010.
LEAs may use FY 2010 SIG funds prior to the 2011-2012 school year (pre-implementation period).

- Examples of how funds may be used include, but are not limited to:
  - holding parent and community meetings to review school performance, discuss the new model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the model selected;
  - recruiting and hiring the incoming principal, leadership team, and instructional staff;
  - conducting a rigorous review process to select, and then contracting with, a charter management organization, an education management organization, or an external provider;
  - providing professional development that will enable staff to effectively implement new or revised instructional programs that are aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional plan and intervention model.
PARENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- There is an increased emphasis in the FY 2010 guidance on consulting with families and community members during the selection, planning, and implementation of a school intervention model.

- The non-regulatory guidance also emphasizes the importance of family engagement activities to support student achievement generally.
CHANGES TO THE SIG NON-REGULATORY GUIDANCE FOR FY 2010

- Generating New Lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Schools
  - Process of generating new lists
  - Newly eligible schools
- Allocating FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds
- Rule of Nine
- Two-Year Flexibility
GENERATING NEW LISTS OF TIER I, TIER II, AND TIER III SCHOOLS

- For FY 2010, each State will fall into one of three categories:
  1. States that are required to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools;
  2. States that voluntarily choose to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools; and
  3. States that choose to request a waiver to retain their FY 2009 lists of schools.

- All States generating new lists must use their most recent achievement and graduation data.
Does your State have 5 or more FY09 Tier I schools not being served by a SIG grant?

No. Required to generate a new list with most recent data.

Yes.

Does the State wish to generate a new list?

No. SEA applies for a “New List” Waiver. Submits FY09 PLA list.

Yes. State submits a new PLA list with most recent data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like last year, Tier I schools are selected from among Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and Tier II schools are selected from among secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds.

States are generating lists from Title I schools that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

However, States that generate new lists for the FY 2010 competition need to consider two factors when taking into account currently served Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were funded through the FY 2009 competition:

1. whether such currently served schools must be included in the pool of schools from which the SEA identifies the bottom five percent of schools (or five schools) for Tiers I and II; and

2. whether such currently served schools may be counted toward the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the SEA must identify as the bottom five percent of schools (or five schools) for the purposes of the FY 2010 competition.
TIER I SCHOOLS

Determining the Pool

- Exclude currently served Tier I schools that received a school improvement timeline waiver from the pool because they are no longer identified for improvement.
- Include all other currently served Tier I schools that did not receive the school improvement timeline waiver or have not otherwise exited improvement status in the pool.

Identifying Bottom Five Percent or Five Schools

- Exclude currently served Tier I schools when counting the bottom five percent or five schools.
- If a currently served Tier I school continues to fall into the bottom five percent or five schools based on the most recent achievement data, the State must go further up its list to identify its bottom five percent or five schools.
TIER II SCHOOLS

Determining the Pool

- Include currently served Tier II schools in the pool as long as they continue to be eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds.

Identifying Bottom Five Percent or Five Schools

- Exclude currently served Tier II schools when counting the bottom five percent or five schools.
- If a currently served Tier II school continues to fall into the bottom five percent or five schools based on the most recent achievement data, the State must go further up its list to identify its bottom five percent or five schools.
EXAMPLE 1: IDENTIFYING BOTTOM FIVE PERCENT OR FIVE SCHOOLS FOR FY 2010

- An SEA identified 11 Tier I schools in FY 2009 and served five of those schools (Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe) with FY 2009 SIG funds.

- The SEA voluntarily chooses to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

- The SEA had an increase in the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, and now must identify 12 schools as Tier I for FY 2010.

- If any of the State’s currently served Tier I schools continue to fall into the bottom five percent based on the most recent achievement data, the SEA must go further up its list to identify a total of 12 schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds, as shown on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottom 5% - List of Tier I Schools for FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not in bottom 5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Counted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENTLY SERVED TIER III SCHOOLS

Determining the Pools

- Include currently served Tier III schools in the pool from which Tier I schools are selected as long as the Tier III schools remain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

- Include currently served Tier III schools in the pool from which Tier II schools are selected if the Tier III school is a secondary school that is no longer receiving Title I funds, but remains eligible to receive Title I funds.

Identifying Bottom Five Percent or Five Schools

- An SEA may count a currently served Tier III school toward the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the SEA must identify in the bottom five percent or five schools for the purposes of the FY 2010 SIG competition if the currently served Tier III school falls within the bottom five percent (or five) schools in the pool of schools for Tier I or Tier II.
Currently served Tier III schools identified in the bottom five percent or five schools in FY 2010 can only be served as a Tier I or Tier II school. It cannot continue to receive SIG funds as a Tier III school beyond the 2010–2011 school year.

If the LEA in which such a school is located wishes to continue receiving SIG funds for that school, it must apply for SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition to serve the school as a Tier I or Tier II school, as appropriate.

**Exception:** A Tier III school that is using SIG funds to implement one of the school intervention models beginning in the 2010–2011 school year may continue to receive FY 2009 SIG funds over the full three years of its grant to support that implementation.
EXAMPLE 2: IDENTIFYING BOTTOM FIVE PERCENT OR FIVE SCHOOLS FOR FY 2010

- An SEA identified six Tier I schools in FY 2009 and served all six of those schools (Cedar, Dogwood, Evergreen, Maple, Oak, and Pine) with FY 2009 SIG funds. The SEA also served two Tier III schools (Birch and Cherry).

- The SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools.

- After examining its pool of schools, the SEA determines it must identify six schools as Tier I for FY 2010.

- If any of the State’s currently served Tier III schools fall into the bottom five percent based on the most recent achievement data, the SEA may count a currently served Tier III school toward the number of Tier I schools that the SEA must identify for the purposes of the FY 2010 SIG competition, as seen on the right.

| Bottom 5% - List of Tier I Schools for FY 2010 |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | Redwood | Not served in FY 2009 |
| 5 | Walnut | Not served in FY 2009 |
| 4 | Sycamore | Not served in FY 2009 |
| 3 | Willow | Not served in FY 2009 |
| 2 | Elm | Not served in FY 2009 |
| 1 | Birch | Served Tier III school in FY 2009 |

| Not Counted | Maple | Served Tier I school in FY 2009; Still in bottom 5% |
| Not Counted | Evergreen | Served Tier I school in FY 2009; Still in bottom 5% |
| Not Counted | Dogwood | Served Tier I school in FY 2009; Still in bottom 5% |
| Not Counted | Cedar | Served Tier I school in FY 2009; Still in bottom 5% |

| Not in bottom 5% |
|---|---|---|
| Not Counted | Oak | Served Tier I school in FY 2009 |
| Not Counted | Pine | Served Tier I school in FY 2009 |
| Not Counted | Cherry | Served Tier III school in FY 2009 |
QUESTIONS TO ASK WHEN GENERATING NEW LIST OF TIER I SCHOOLS

1. Did the State accurately determine the pool of schools from which the bottom five percent (or five schools) is calculated?
   ✓ Are all Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring included?
   ✓ Are currently served Tier I schools with school improvement timeline waivers excluded?
   ✓ Are currently served Tier III schools that remain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring included?
   ✓ If the State wanted to exclude schools with an assessed student population of less than __ students from its pool, did the State apply for an n-size waiver?

2. Did the State accurately identify the lowest-achieving five percent (or five schools) from the pool of schools?
   ✓ Did the State exclude currently served Tier I schools from its list?
   ✓ Did the State include a currently served Tier III school if it falls within the bottom five percent (or five) of the pool of schools for Tier I?
QUESTIONS TO ASK WHEN GENERATING NEW LIST OF TIER II SCHOOLS

1. Did the State accurately determine the pool of schools from which the bottom five percent (or five schools) is calculated?
   - Are all secondary schools that are eligible for, but not receiving, Title I funds included?
   - Are currently served Tier II schools included?
   - If the State wanted to exclude schools with an assessed student population of less than ___ students from its pool, did the State apply for an n-size waiver?
   - If a State wanted to include secondary schools that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined in its pool, did the State apply for a Tier II waiver?

2. Did the State accurately identify the lowest-achieving five percent (or five schools) from the pool of schools?
   - Did the State exclude currently served Tier II schools from its list?
   - Did the State include a currently served Tier III school if it falls within the bottom five percent (or five) of the pool of schools for Tier II?
ALLOCATING FY 2009 CARRYOVER AND FY 2010 SIG FUNDS: IMPLEMENTATION

- In the FY 2009 competition, SEAs generally provided a full three years of funding from their SIG allocations to each LEA receiving a SIG award (i.e., SEAs “frontloaded” their SIG awards).

- For the FY 2010 SIG competition, in order to maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools their LEAs can serve while enabling schools to implement models over three years:
  - SEAs should “frontload” FY 2009 SIG carryover funds to make three-year awards to LEAs.
  - SEAs should use FY 2010 funds to award only the first-year awards of a three-year SIG grant, with continuation awards in years two and three coming from subsequent SIG appropriations.

- If SEAs use FY 2009 carryover funds to make the first year of three-year awards, in most cases there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.
MAXIMIZING THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SERVED

EXAMPLE – A STATE HAS $36 MILLION IN FY 2009 CARRYOVER SIG FUNDS AND $21 MILLION IN FY 2010 FUNDS

### Frontloading Only FY 2009 Carryover Funds

- If a State awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of $1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (i.e., the $36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools).
- Additionally the State could serve 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (i.e., the $21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations).
- Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools.

### Frontloading All Funds

- If a State awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of $1 million per year over three years and elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would have to divide $57 million by $3 million per school over three years.
- Thus, the State would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools.
RULE OF NINE

- An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, including both schools that are being served with FY 2009 SIG funds and schools that are eligible to receive FY 2010 SIG funds, may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

- **Example 1:** For FY 2009, an LEA has seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools for a total of nine Tier I and Tier II schools. Using FY 2009 SIG funds, it implemented the transformation model in four of those schools. For FY 2010, the LEA has two additional Tier I schools and two additional Tier II schools for a total of 13 Tier I and Tier II schools.

- This means the LEA may implement the transformation model in a total of six schools, or two schools in addition to those that are being served with FY 2009 funds.
RULE OF NINE

- **Example 2:** In FY 2009, an LEA had four Tier I schools and four Tier II schools, so it was not affected by the rule of nine (because it only had eight Tier I and Tier II schools). Using FY 2009 SIG funds, it implemented the transformation model in all four Tier I schools and two Tier II schools. For FY 2010, the LEA has three additional schools identified as Tier I, so it now has a total of 11 Tier I and Tier II schools, which means the rule of nine would apply. As a result, it may implement the transformation model in only five of its schools.

- Under these circumstances, the LEA would not be required to stop implementing the transformation model in one of its schools, but it would not be permitted to implement the transformation model in any additional Tier I or Tier II schools that it seeks to serve.
TWO-YEAR FLEXIBILITY

- An SEA may award SIG funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, a turnaround model, restart model, or transformation model within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete the intervention being implemented.

- For FY 2010, the earliest an LEA could have begun to implement one of the school intervention models including the replacement of a principal or school staff is the start of the 2008-2009 school year.

- This means, for example, that an LEA or school implementing the turnaround or transformation model in the 2011-2012 school year must replace a principal hired prior to the 2008-2009 school year.
CHANGES TO THE FY 2010 APPLICATION

School Improvement Grants
Application
Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Fiscal Year 2010
CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name:

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

OMB Number: 1810-0652
Expiration Date: 

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0652. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather and maintain data, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate and suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4117.
FY 2010 SIG APPLICATION CHANGES

- The FY 2010 application is, in most respects, identical to the FY 2009 SIG application with the exception of the following new and modified sections.
  - Section B-1: Additional Evaluation Criteria has been added.
  - Section D on Descriptive Information has been reformatted into two separate sections.
  - Section H: Waivers has been expanded.

- Other than new sections, SEAs will be required to update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 SIG competition.
  - SEAs will be required to resubmit sections of their FY 2009 applications that contain no changes for the FY 2010 competition.

- A checklist has been added to provide a roadmap for completing the FY 2010 application.
UPDATING ONLY SECTIONS THAT INCLUDE CHANGES FROM THE FY 2009 APPLICATION

- The Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

- However, we recommend that States review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure that sections that are not changed align with any revisions made in updated sections.
SEAs should note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.
School Improvement Grants
Application
Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Fiscal Year 2010
CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: [ ] Form Field

Do not click on the page or the application will jump to the next form field.
NEW SECTION B-1: EVALUATION CRITERIA ON PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:</th>
<th>In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA’s budget and application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA’s proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? <em>(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.
D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Insert response to Section D (Part 1) Timeline here:
D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools 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 in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(4) 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 the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) 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.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

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

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA’s approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.³

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

| SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009. | SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010. |

Insert response to Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information here:
**EXPANDED SECTION H ON WAIVERS**

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enter State Name Here</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Waiver 1: Tier II Waiver
In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section IA.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section IA.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

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

**Note:** An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

#### Waiver 2: N-size Waiver
In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section IA.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section IA.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

**Assurance**
The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.
Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiver 3: New list waiver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

**Enter State Name Here** 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, and 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 4: School improvement timeline waiver**

- Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Note:** An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

**Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver 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 improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

☐ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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

☐ The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.
WAIVERS INCLUDED IN THE FY 2010 SIG APPLICATION

- **Tier II waiver**
  - Offered during the FY 2009 competition, but was not included in last year’s application.

- **n-size waiver**
  - Offered during the FY 2009 competition, but was not included in last year’s application.

- **New list waiver** (New waiver for FY 2010)
  - This waiver is only available to States that have five or more unserved schools remaining on their FY 2009 Tier I lists.

- **School improvement timeline waiver**

- **Schoolwide program waiver**

- **Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver**
# SIG CHECKLIST

## SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009</td>
<td>Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</td>
<td>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver)</td>
<td>SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA elects to generate new lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lists, by LEA, of State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same as FY 2009</td>
<td>Revised for FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION C: CAPACITY

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same as FY 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same as FY 2009</td>
<td>Revised for FY 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION E: ASSURANCES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section E: Assurances provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION H: WAIVERS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section H: Waivers provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DRAFT**
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION


- FY 2010 SIG Non-Regulatory Guidance & Application
- Final Requirements
- Approved SEA Applications