

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Texas



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



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

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. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. 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 resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

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 5 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 5 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). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) 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.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

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 School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 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 school improvement 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.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

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 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@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, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
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 December 3, 2010.

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.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, 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.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also 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.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Texas Education Agency	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1701 North Congress Avenue Austin, Tx 78701-1494
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Cory Green Position and Office: Senior Director, Division of NCLB Program Coordination Contact's Mailing Address: 1701 North Congress Avenue Austin, Tx 78701-1494 Telephone: 512.475.3553 Fax: 512.305.9447 Email address: cory.green@tea.state.tx.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Robert Scott	Telephone: 512.463.8985
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date: December 3, 2010
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.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

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: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:

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.

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.)

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.

3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:

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.

Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=2147495549&libID=2147495546>

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

EXAMPLE:

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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 Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

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:

- (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 its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

The state is using the same criteria as FY 2009 with the exception of the changes described below. The changes are due to the Model Selection and Description Report being incorporated into the application for funding rather than being a separate document.

Part 1:

To ensure that LEAs complete the three actions listed in Part I prior to submitting their grant applications, SIRC may provide training on grant intervention model options and conduct a pre-assessment of LEA grantees' readiness, capacity, and commitment to implementing the TTIPS SIG program in eligible Tier I and Tier II campuses before and during the time that the LEA/campus is completing their grant application. The LEA/campus will describe the process it used to complete these three actions in its application for funding submitted to TEA. The application (Attachment 2) will be then be scored by a peer review panel according to the Scoring Rubric (Attachment 3).

Action (1)—LEA Analysis of Needs

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA), which collects the numbers of students enrolled in each grade level on the campus, the data sources to be reviewed as part of the CNA process, the process to be followed by the LEA to conduct the CNA, the groups of participants to be included in the process, and the needs identified by the CNA process. Eligible applicants are advised in the instructions document to consider following the campus CNA process that is provided by TEA through the regional ESCs. The archived webinar of this training on the CNA process is available on the Texas Comprehensive Center (TXCC) web site at <http://txcc.sedl.org/resources/webinars/material/webinar2/index.html>. The campus specific CNA tool referenced in the training is available to LEA/campuses at <http://portal.esc20.net/portal/page/portal/NCLB/CNA.htm>. The CNA schedule will be scored as a part of the competitive grant review process according to the Scoring Rubric.

Action (2)—LEA Capacity to Support School Improvement

The LEA/campus' application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Project Management, which contains multiple questions related to the LEA's capacity to provide adequate resources and support to eligible Tier I, II, and III campuses. Specifically, the LEA/campus will address the question, *"Describe the LEA's capacity to use grant funds to provide adequate resources and related services/support to the campus to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model."* This schedule will be scored as a part of the competitive grant review process according to the Scoring Rubric.

Action (3)—Sufficient Budget for School Improvement

The LEA/campus application for funding also contains Schedule #5—Program Budget Summary and Supporting Budget Schedules 5B-5G. These budget schedules, along with the question, *"Describe the LEA's capacity to use grant funds to provide adequate resources and related services/support to the campus to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model."* will address the sufficiency of grant funds to implement the selected intervention model.

Budget guidance will be provided to applicants and the peer review committee who score the applications with the example budget ranges reflected below. This guidance is for example only and reflects what might be an appropriate range of funding based on the model selected and the size of campus. Applicants may

request any amount between \$50,000 and \$2,000,000 per year based on the model selected, the size of the campus, and the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment process. All budget requests will be reviewed and approved based on the Scoring Rubric. Applicants will determine the amount of their budget request based on the identified needs of the campus and the reform model selected. This is guidance only, such as page 3 of USDE's Attachment A of this state application discusses different funding amounts based on size of campus, and in no way limits or caps the amount an LEA/campus may request in their application.

<i>Model</i>	<i>1-200 Students</i>	<i>201-500 Students</i>	<i>501-1300 Students</i>	<i>1301+ Students</i>
Turnaround	\$50,000 – 1,000,000 per year	\$1,000,000 – 1,250,000 per year	\$1,250,000 – 1,750,000 per year	\$1,750,000 – 2,000,000 per year
Closure	\$50,000 – 75,000 one year only	\$50,000 – 75,000 one year only	\$100,000 – 150,000 one year only	\$150,000 – 200,000 one year only
Restart	\$50,000 – 1,000,000 per year	\$1,000,000 – 1,250,000 per year	\$1,250,000 – 1,750,000 per year	\$1,750,000 – 2,000,000 per year
Transformation	\$50,000 – 1,000,000 per year	\$1,000,000 – 1,250,000 per year	\$1,250,000 – 1,750,000 per year	\$1,750,000 – 2,000,000 per year
Tier III	\$50,000 – 1,000,000 per year	\$1,000,000 – 1,250,000 per year	\$1,250,000 – 1,750,000 per year	\$1,750,000 – 2,000,000 per year

Part 2

The LEA/campus' description of its commitment to meet the actions in Part 2 will be submitted by the LEA/campus to TEA in the LEA/campus application for funding. After the grants are awarded, TEA will continue to assess the commitment of grantees to these actions by tracking grantee progress toward milestones and critical success factors described later in this section.

Assessment of LEA/campus' Commitment to Part 2 Actions *prior to* Grant Award

Action (1)—Implement Interventions Consistent with Federal Requirements

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4A—Program Abstract; Part 2: Grant Program Summary where the applicant will describe the intervention program to be implemented on the campus. In Schedule #4B—Program Description: Intervention Model; Part 1, the applicant will indicate the intervention model selected for implementation and whether the campus will implement the TEA Designed Model with technical assistance from SIRC or design their own program

model within the parameters mandated by the final federal regulations. The applicant will also describe the process (limited to three pages) conducted to select the intervention model that aligns to the campus' identified needs. Also to be included is a list of the groups who will participate in the intervention selection process and program development.

Model Implementation Options

TEA is offering eligible LEA/campus grantees two options for implementing the selected intervention models. The LEA/campus may choose to implement 1) the TEA Designed Model with technical assistance provided on behalf of TEA by the School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC), or 2) its own intervention design, within the parameters/requirements required by the final federal regulations released by USDE. Tier III campuses may also select The Texas Early College High School (ECHS), Texas Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (T-STEM) or College for All reform initiatives. The LEA/campus will receive priority points for selecting the TEA Designed Model with technical assistance from SIRC and the ECHS, the T-STEM, or the College for All (for Tier III); although, the LEA is not guaranteed selection and funding solely because it selects the TEA designed model.

For an LEA selecting the Restart Model that prefers to utilize a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Educational Management Organization (EMO) as a Restart model provider that is not on the state's approved list of Restart providers, the LEA may submit the provider for state review. The state will request the provider to complete the Restart provider packet and will score the provider using the original selection criteria. If the provider meets the scoring criteria, the provider will be added to the state's approved list of Restart providers and may be utilized by the grantee. If the provider does not meet the scoring criteria, the grantee must select the provider from the state's approved list or submit a second recommendation. The LEA is limited to two recommendations before being required to select from the approved list.

In addition, TEA will implement the flexibility to allow a Tier I, Tier II, Tier III grantee campus that has implemented, in whole or in part, either the Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation models within the last two years to continue or complete the implementation of the intervention model with the SIG grant funds. For example, if a grantee campus has replaced its principal within the last two years (for the 2008-2009 school year or more recently), the LEA/campus will not be required to hire another new principal. An LEA/campus that receives TTIPS SIG funds in accordance with this flexibility must fully implement the selected model as required by the final federal requirements. In other words, if the school had been implementing the model only in part, it must use the funds it receives to expand its implementation so that it fully complies with the federal regulatory requirements.

TEA Designed Models

The TEA Designed Model for Turnaround will be the Texas Turnaround Leader Program (TLP), which is a two-year program in partnership with institutions of higher education. Designed to serve the lowest performing campuses in Texas, the TLP will build LEA and campus-level capacity through the implementation of policies and practices that establish the necessary environment and support needed to effectively turnaround these campuses. Highlights of the program include: establishing a talent pool for the recruitment, selection and development of highly qualified and effective leaders; mentoring and coaching

high-impact principals to develop the knowledge, skills, tools, resources and support necessary to accelerate and sustain dramatic increases in student achievement; and embedding research-based best practices in effective, extraordinary school turnaround resulting in the production of impressive and sustainable increases in student achievement in some of the most chronically underperforming campuses.

Participating campuses and LEA leadership teams will engage in research-based data analysis, strategic planning, and ongoing professional development and training delivered and supported by the higher education faculty, support teams at each of the twenty regional Education Service Centers (ESC), Texas Center for District and School Support (TCDSS) staff, and contracted partners.

The TEA Designed Model for Restart will support LEAs and campuses through the closure and restart process. Technical assistance and toolkits will be provided to assist LEAs with designing a comprehensive restart plan that includes community input and communication strategies for successful implementation. For LEAs working with individual campuses and those deciding to cluster schools under this model, SIRC will provide guidance and ongoing support for the LEA turnaround team. Partnerships with EMOs (approved through an RFQ process to ensure quality) will support LEAs and campuses choosing this option and will provide tools and resources for recruitment of quality turnaround leaders, including teachers.

By collaborating with multiple partners to support LEAs that select this option, TEA will provide technical assistance as participants address how to improve their readiness to learn, readiness to teach, and readiness to act based upon the research of high-performing high-poverty campuses.

The TEA Designed Model for Transformation is based on three principles: improving student achievement and increasing college and career readiness by building the capacity of campus leaders and teachers; improving campus climate through social and emotional supports; and utilizing district support to transform systems. Key elements of the Transformation model include extensive training on using data and evaluation systems effectively, job-embedded professional development models, comprehensive needs assessment and campus processes, Positive Behavior Support, utilization of community partners, and maximizing extended learning time. Technical assistance will include a professional service provider/case manager, online professional development, ESC partners, and other resources and best practices.

The Texas Designed Model for Tier III contains the applicant's option of the Texas Early College High School (ECHS), Texas Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (T-STEM) or College for All initiatives which all focus on the basic principles and the key elements as required by the TEA Designed Model for Transformation described above. These three models are described below in further detail.

Closure: Based on researched best practices and lessons learned from Pittsburgh, Chicago, Denver, and Portland public schools, TEA has designed a protocol of procedures to guide an LEA through communicating and implementing the closure of a campus and enrolling the students who attended the campus in other, higher-achieving campuses within the LEA. The protocol will provide technical assistance and training to the LEA in developing the following areas:

- Closure criteria based on LEA-wide data analysis
- Criteria for the selection of a closure committee
- Communication criteria and feedback process for the campus community and all stakeholders
- Guidelines for planning an in-depth data analysis for evaluating, selecting and building capacity of higher-achieving campuses

- Guidelines for decision-making processes and consensus
- Procedures and processes for the transition of students and personnel

In Schedule #4C-Model Requirements and Timeline; Part 2: Reform/Improvement Activities of the LEA/campus application, the applicant will describe how it will meet each requirement from the final federal regulations for the intervention model selected and school improvement activities that will be incorporated with the intervention model selected. Applicants will also provide the underlying rationale and supporting research for the improvement activities that were selected. In Part 2, the applicant will provide the timeline for the implementation of the improvement activities to be implemented. Both this schedule and Schedule #4A will be scored by reviewers according to the Scoring Rubric.

Action (2)—Selecting External Providers

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Project Management which contains the question, “*External Providers – Describe how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure their quality.*” The applicant will provide a one-page description describing how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers with whom the LEA/campus will partner. This description will include all external providers and partners and is not limited to the Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Educational Management Organization (EMO) when the Restart Model is selected. This schedule will be scored by reviewers using the Scoring Rubric.

Action (3)—Align Other Resources

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Project Management which contains the question, “*Resource Management – Describe how the LEA/campus will align other resources with the school improvement intervention.*” The applicant will provide a one-page description of how the LEA/campus will align other resources with the intervention model selected and other intervention activities. This schedule will be scored by reviewers using the Scoring Rubric.

Action (4)—Modifying Practices

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Project Management which contains the question, “*Management of Grant Activities – Describe how the LEA and campus will modify its practices and/or policies, as necessary, to ensure its implementation of the intervention(s) fully and effectively.*” The applicant will provide a one-page description of how the LEA/campus will modify existing practices or policies in order to fully and effectively implement the intervention model selected as required by the final federal regulations. This schedule will be scored by reviewers using the Scoring Rubric.

Action (5)—Sustaining the Reforms

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Project

Management which contains the question, *“Program Continuation and Sustainability – Describe how the LEA will sustain the campus reforms after the funding period ends.”* The applicant will provide a one-page description of how the LEA/campus will provide continued funding and support to sustain the interventions and student performance that resulted from the implementation of the TTIPS SIG grant program. This schedule will be scored by reviewers using the Scoring Rubric.

After the peer review panel scores the applications and awards grants to LEAs/campuses, TEA will continue to assess the LEA’s commitment to the actions listed in Part 2 of this section by tracking progress toward Critical Success Factors (CSF) and milestones through the Quarterly Implementation Reports (QIR).

CSFs reflect behavioral changes that must be demonstrated by students at the campus or by adults working on their behalf. CSFs are essential for the TTIPS SIG program to succeed in meeting the goals and objectives defined for the program. Each CSF is monitored using measurable indicators, and these indicators enable TEA to determine whether grantees are on track to successfully achieve the desired outcomes:

- Improve Academic Performance
- Increase Teacher Quality
- Improve School Climate
- Increase Leadership Effectiveness
- Increase the Use of Quality Data to Drive Instruction
- Increase Parent/Community Involvement
- Increase Learning Time

Milestones are the key strategies that establish the foundation on which the CSFs are built. The applicant must develop activities that ensure each of the milestones is met. The milestones for each CSF include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Improve Academic Performance
 - Data-driven instruction
 - Curriculum Alignment (both horizontal and vertical)
 - On-going Monitoring of Instruction
- Increase Teacher Quality
 - Locally Developed Appraisal Instruments
 - On-going Job Embedded Professional Development
 - Recruitment/Retention Strategies
- Improve School Climate
 - Increased Attendance
 - Decreased Discipline Referrals
 - Increased Involvement in Extra/Co-Curricular Activities
- Increase Leadership Effectiveness
 - On-going Job Embedded Professional Development
 - Operational Flexibility
 - Resource/Data Utilization
- Increase the Use of Quality Data to Drive Instruction
 - Data Disaggregation /Training

- Data-driven Decisions
- On-going Communication
- Increase Parent/Community Involvement
 - Increased Opportunities for Input
 - Effective Communication
 - Accessible Community Services
- Increase Learning Time
 - Flexible Scheduling
 - Instructionally-focused Calendar
 - Staff Collaborative Planning

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:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(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? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

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.

Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:

The LEA/campus application for funding contains 2 sections that identify the pre-implementation activities to be conducted with a timeline for those activities and a designated budget column for all pre-implementation activities. The applicant will provide a one-page description of the timeline of allowable activities to be conducted in the spring and/or summer prior to full implementation of the TTIPS SIG grant program. These 2 sections will be scored by reviewers using the Scoring Rubric.

After the review committee, grants preliminarily selected to be awarded will be reviewed by state staff. Staff will ensure the pre-implementation activities approved are consistent with the allowable activities in the USDE guidance and align to activities needed for the LEA/campus to be ready for full implementation with the start of the 2011-2012 school year.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section C Capacity here:

The state is using the same criteria as FY 2009 as indicated above. The FY 2009 response is reflected below.

The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4B—Program Description: Project Management which contains multiple questions related to the LEA's capacity to provide adequate resources and support to eligible Tier I, II, and III campuses. Specifically, the LEA/campus will address the question, "Describe the LEA's capacity to use grant funds to provide adequate resources and related services/support to the campus to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model." In the question, "LEA Support – Describe how the LEA will structure and implement an individual or office with responsibility for supporting the campus' school improvement efforts." the applicant will describe how the LEA will designate an individual or office with primary responsibilities for supporting the LEA/campus' school improvement efforts. This individual/office will have primary responsibility and authority for ensuring the effective implementation of the grant option approved by TEA; serve as the district liaison to TEA and those providing technical assistance and/or contracted service to the LEA/campus as part of the approved grant.

Grant peer reviewers and TEA staff will review the responses provided by the applicant LEA to the two above questions in the application for funding along with the response to the question, "Lack of Capacity -- If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school (is not applying for grant funding for each Tier I school), provide a detailed explanation of why the LEA lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school." If the LEA has not submitted an application for funding (indicating the capacity to serve) for each of its Tier I campuses, the applicant LEA will provide a detailed one-page description of why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each eligible Tier I campus within the LEA at the time the LEA submits the LEA/campus applications for funding.

The peer review committee scoring the grant applications for TEA will use the Scoring Rubric to evaluate the responses of each LEA/campus applicant. In the event that the agency determines that an LEA has

more capacity to serve Tier I schools than it demonstrates in its application for funding, then TEA staff will negotiate either 1) reducing the awarded LEA/campus budgets by an appropriate amount, or 2) requiring the LEA to submit additional LEA/campus grant applications for funding for additional Tier I campuses in the next cycle (USDE Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations) of grant awards.

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.

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Grant Process Activity</i>
December 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency Submits State Application to USDE • Agency Releases Draft Grant Eligibility List
January—March 2011 <i>Note: Timeline based on early January approval by USDE. Each week later delays the LEA Application Availability by a week, thus delaying the entire timeline.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USDE Awards Grant to State • LEA Application and Eligibility List Available, date contingent upon USDE approval of state application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant announced via the Texas Register and Texas Online • Technical Assistance: Overview Sessions • Technical Assistance: Four Models • Technical Assistance: Application • Application due 6-8 weeks after posting. • LEA Submits LEA/campus application for funding • Pre-screening of applications. (1-2 weeks) • Reviewing & Scoring of applications (1-2 week) • Ranking of applications
April—May 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEA Awards LEA Grants • TEA Negotiates Awarded Grants • TEA issues Notice of Grant Awards (NOGAs) for 100% of three-year grant award; pending continuation funding availability • TEA makes available 100% of first year grant award for pre-implementation and Year 1 Activities
August 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA/campus begins full implementation of grant • On-going Technical Assistance
October 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
January 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
April 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
August 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Year 1 Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
August 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEA evaluates LEA/campus performance on annual goals and

	meeting grant requirements and, as applicable, releases 100% of second year grant award
October 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
January 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
April 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
August 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Year 2 Implementation Report due to TEA
August 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEA evaluates LEA/campus performance on annual goals and meeting grant requirements and, as applicable, releases 100% of third year grant award
October 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
April 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Implementation Report due to TEA • On-going Technical Assistance
June 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA grant end date
July 31, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Implementation Report due to TEA

The process follows the Competitive Grant Process outlined by the Division of Discretionary Grants (Attachment 4).

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:

The state is using the same information as FY 2009 with the exception of the Tier III changes described below.

(2) and (3)—Reviewing Goals for Tier I and II and Tier III Schools

TEA will follow the same procedure for reviewing the LEA's annual goals for student achievement for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III campuses. The LEA/campus application for funding contains Schedule #4D—Performance Assessment and Evaluation. In Part 1, the applicant will describe the following:

- (1) LEA/campus' process for providing on-going monitoring of grant activities to ensure continuous improvement;
- (2) LEA/campus' process for formative evaluation, including how the results of the evaluation will be used to improve the grant program; and
- (3) The data collection methods to be implemented by the LEA/campus and how the data will be disaggregated and used to improve instruction and obtain continuous improvement results.

In Part 2, the LEA/campus will submit the LEA's process for developing the annual performance goals, and in Part 3, the applicant will submit the approved Annual Performance Goals to which the LEA is holding the campus accountable and the Progress Targets for each of the three years of the grant program.

TEA will require the submission of corresponding actual performance data for Part 3 of the Performance Assessment and Evaluation Schedule each August as a condition for the releasing of year two and year three funding awards. TEA will review the achievement data annually and use the following criteria to determine whether the next year's funding award will be released.

- (1) The grantee has met the year's annual performance target for student achievement or made a minimum of 70% progress toward the targeted goal in the year of the grant period; and
- (2) The grantee has met the year's annual performance targets for the state's identified critical success factors and milestones or made a minimum of 70% progress toward the targeted goal in the year of the grant period; or
- (3) LEA's awarded a Tier III Transformation model that implement an ECHS, T-STEM or College for All model will have met a minimum of 70% of the design principles based on the guidelines/blueprint for that model and apply for designation status if ECHS or T-STEM.

TEA will review grantee performance data that is submitted to TEA to ensure that grantees have met the applicable criteria above. TEA will also monitor the implementation of the intervention model by assessing the grantee's progress toward the critical success factors and milestones for the grant. Decisions regarding renewal of grant funding will be based on both grantee progress toward performance targets and effective and full implementation of the grant.

(4) Monitoring

For all applicants, Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III, TEA will follow the same procedure for monitoring the grantees' implementation of the intervention model. TEA will require the submission of Quarterly Implementation Reports (QIR) which will be reviewed upon submission. These implementation reports, which align with the 90-day strategies/plans utilized by the technical assistance providers working with grantee campuses, will assess grantee progress toward the critical success factors and milestones for the grant. (See above for a list of critical success factors and milestones.) FY 2009 grantees will also use the updated QIR form that has been aligned for FY 2010. TEA staff will review the QIRs and will identify grantees that are not making adequate progress toward milestones and critical success factors. Grantees that are not making progress will be required to submit Program Improvement Plans. Also, in the program requirements and assurances to the LEA/campus application for funding, the LEA/campus will agree to provide access for onsite visits to the LEA and campus by TEA, SIRC, its contractors, or other TEA required technical assistance providers

for Tier III ECHS, T-STEM, or College for All models. Grantees may receive onsite visits (prioritized based on risk factors) from TEA, SIRC, or its contractors each year of the grant award. Staff from SIRC, or their contractors, or other TEA-required technical assistance providers for Tier III ECHS, T-STEM, or College for All models will validate the implementation reports during annual site visits. Staff will also conduct interviews and complete implementation checklists to measure progress toward critical success factors and milestones. The completed implementation checklists will become part of the LEA's application file.

(5) Prioritization of School Improvement Grants

If the agency has insufficient SIG funds to serve all eligible campuses for which each LEA applies, the agency will not award SIG funds to an LEA for any Tier III campuses unless, and until, the agency has awarded funds to support the full and effective implementation of grants in Tier I and Tier II campuses. The agency will also give priority to Tier I and Tier II campuses by adding 10 priority points to the total score (100 points possible, awarded by the peer review committee) to each LEA/campus application for funding that is properly submitted for consideration in the discretionary competitive review process.

TEA will further ensure that the funded LEAs have implemented the required LEA priorities as listed below.

If an LEA has one or more eligible ...	In order to receive TTIPS SIG funds, the LEA <u>must</u> commit to serve ...
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school ²
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school ¹ Note that the number of Tier I schools an LEA has capacity to serve may be zero if, and only if, the LEA is using all of the capacity it would otherwise use to serve its Tier I schools in order to serve Tier II schools.
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

² The number of Tier I schools an LEA has capacity to serve may be zero if, and only if, the LEA is using all of the capacity it would otherwise use to serve its Tier I schools in order to serve Tier II schools.

TEA is prioritizing Tier I and Tier II campus, Tier III regular instructional campuses, campuses incorporating Supplemental Educational Services (SES) into their intervention model, and the use of the TEA Designed Model in the application for funding. TEA will award the following priority points (maximum of 18 points allowable) to applications that implement school improvement models for the following eligible campuses.

<i>Point Value</i>	<i>Eligible LEA/campus</i>
10 points	Tier I or Tier II campus
5 points	Tier III traditional or charter school regular instructional campus
5 points	Implementing the TEA Designed Model with technical assistance provided by SIRC on behalf of TEA (Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, including Tier III Transformation or an Early College High School, T-STEM Academy or College for All model submitted by a Tier III regular instructional campus)
3 points	Incorporating SES into the intervention model or enhancing and expanding current SES program (Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III)

(6) Prioritization of Tier III

Tier III campuses will be prioritized based on the scores the LEAs/campuses receive from the peer review committee as a result of the competitive review process. In addition, the agency will give priority to traditional and charter campuses implementing an Early College High School, T-STEM Academy or College for All model in awarding grants to Tier III campuses by adding 5 priority points to the total score (100 points possible, awarded by the peer review committee) to each LEA/campus application for funding that is properly submitted by a Tier III regular instructional campus for consideration in the discretionary competitive review process.

Early College High Schools (ECHS) are autonomous, small schools designed to create a seamless transition between high school and college. ECHS provide a course of study that enables students to receive both a high school diploma and either an associate’s degree or at least 60 credit hours towards a baccalaureate degree. Strong collaborative partnerships between schools and the IHE are developed to ensure the ECHS design elements are met. Schools implementing the ECHS model must apply for designation status through the Early College High School designation process. The pre-implementation period is required to design, develop and prepare for implementation with the guidance of the state approved technical assistance provider.

Texas Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (T-STEM) academies are rigorous secondary schools focusing on improving instruction and academic performance in the STEM areas. T-STEM Academies use the Design Blueprint to build and implement STEM schools that address the seven benchmarks: 1) mission driven leadership; 2) school culture and design; 3) student outreach, recruitment, and retention; 4) teacher selection, development and retention; 5) curriculum, instruction, and assessment; 6) strategic alliances; and 7) academy advancement and sustainability. Schools implementing the T-STEM model must apply for designation status through the T-STEM designation process. The pre-implementation period is required to design, develop and prepare for implementation with the guidance of the state approved technical assistance provider.

College for All infuses college-ready reforms into an LEA model that enables every student to graduate with a minimum of 12 college-level credits and prepared to earn a postsecondary credential or degree. Design elements/strategies for this model include: 1) comprehensive district approach; 2) college-ready curriculum and instruction program; 3) strong P-16 partnerships; 4) comprehensive academic and social supports; and 5) college-going culture. The pre-implementation period is required to design, develop and prepare for implementation with the guidance of the state approved technical assistance provider.

(7) and (8) State Take Over and State Direct Services

At the time of this submission of the state application, the agency does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II campuses. The agency has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover. However, if the agency later decides that it will provide such services, it agrees to amend this application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- 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 that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- 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.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final 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.

Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:

The SEA is using the same information as FY 2009 with the exception of the changes described below.

TEA will reserve the allowable five percent of SIG funds for state level administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. Of the five percent reservation, one percent will be used for TEA administrative costs, one percent will remain at TEA currently unbudgeted, and three percent will be allocated to the School Improvement Resource Center (SIRC) housed at Region XIII Education Service Center in Austin, Texas, and any other Technical Assistance providers for Tier III ECHS, T-STEM, or College for All models selected by the state.

The one percent for TEA administration will be expended to maintain the additional staffing and costs to administer and monitor the SIG grant program in the state. The one percent in unbudgeted funds will be allocated either to SIRC, other Technical Assistance providers for Tier III ECHS, T-STEM, or College for All models, TEA program evaluation staff, or a contractor for program evaluation services. Once the method of evaluation and amount of needed funding is determined, the remainder of the funds will be used as needed for TEA administration and additional technical assistance provided on behalf of TEA.

SIRC is TEA's Title I-funded technical assistance provider to campuses identified as needing improvement. SIRC exists as part of the Texas Center for District and School Support which provides support and technical assistance to campuses staged in intervention status in both the state and federal accountability systems. On behalf of TEA, SIRC will provide assistance in ten basic areas to TTIPS grantees, funded from the three percent allocation provided to SIRC.

1	Provide technical assistance to all grantees regarding their capacity and commitment to implement TTIPS grant.
2	Provide technical assistance to all grantees regarding their LEA level of support and capacity to implement a TTIPS grant.
3	Provide technical assistance to all grantees regarding communications, marketing, and stakeholder and community involvement of school reform options selected.
4	Provide technical assistance to all grantees regarding LEA and campus leadership capacity to implement a TTIPS grant.
5	Provide technical assistance to Tier I or Tier II grantees selecting to implement the Turnaround Model of school reform.
6	Provide technical assistance to Tier I and Tier II grantees selecting to implement the School Closure Model of school reform.
7	Provide technical assistance to Tier I and Tier II grantees selecting to implement the Restart Model of school reform.
8	Provide technical assistance to Tier I and Tier II grantees selecting to implement the Transformation Model of school reform.

	Model of school reform.
9	Provide technical assistance to Tier III grantees implementing the agency's approved Tier III model of school reform.
10	Provide technical assistance to Tier III grantees selecting to implement either the Turnaround Closure, Restart, Transformation, or Texas Designed Tier III models of school reform.

Specifically, SIRC will provide the following activities and assistance tied to the ten areas above.

Ongoing technical assistance and support to grantees including but not limited to, the following (Areas #1, 2, 3, 10 above):

- Provide training on grant intervention model options
- Provide training, assistance, and support to grantees implementing the four improvement models and the Tier III program
- Support implementation of grantee's LEA-level efforts of reform
- Provide on-site technical assistance via a Professional Service Provider (PSP)
- Conduct pre-assessment of LEA grantees' readiness, capacity, and commitment
- Establish needs assessment of LEA's systems of support, formative assessment processes, use of data, and professional development
- Assist grantees with marketing and communications around the school intervention model selected
- Conduct on-going technical assistance to LEA and campus grantees, including, but not limited to, phone communication, online resources, face to face mentoring/training, webinars, teleconferencing or discussion boards

Closure (Areas #2, 3, 6, 10 above)

- Conduct extensive training on Closure Option
- Provide onsite technical assistance via PSP
- Provide public relations/communication processes and protocols for Closure
- Implement processes and protocols for implementation of Closure model based on research
 - Checklists/Rubrics
 - Communication time line
 - Human Resources (HR) issues
- Create 90 day action plans with the LEA to support Closure process
- Offer support to the LEA, school board, campus and community in the form of presentations about the Closure process and implementation
- Conduct on-site technical assistance and site visits to support the LEA during the Closure process

Restart (Areas #2, 3, 7, 10 above)

- Conduct extensive training on Restart Option
- Provide onsite technical assistance via PSP
- Provide public relations/communication processes and protocols for Restart
- Assist grantees in establishing processes and protocols for implementation of Restart
 - Selecting quality CMO/EMO
 - Setting benchmarks
 - Developing authorization agreements

- Community outreach-communication toolkits
- Create 90 day action plans with the LEA to support the new campus
- Support the application process for selecting an approved CMO/EMO
- Provide training on facilitating effective communication between the LEA and the CMO/EMO
- Conduct on-site technical assistance and site visits to both the LEA and the new Campus to support the Restart process
- Establish evaluation and monitoring processes
- Provide orientation for CMO/EMO

Turnaround (Areas #2, 3, 4, 5, 10 above)

- Conduct extensive training on Turnaround Option
- Provide onsite technical assistance via PSP
- Provide comprehensive two year executive training model for LEA and Campus
- Support recruitment and selection of an effective turnaround principal
- Provide tools, checklists, programs to help with Turnaround implementation
- Provide SIRC specialists for support
- Provide training to assist LEA with developing 90 day action plans to establish systems and sustain Turnaround efforts
- Conduct on-site technical assistance and site visits to both the LEA and Campus to support Turnaround option
- Establish evaluation and monitoring processes

Transformation (Areas #2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10 above)

- Conduct extensive training on Transformation Option
- Provide in-depth training in systems, professional development and organization for LEA and campus staff
- Support implementing positive behavior support systems
- Assist in identifying teacher leaders and building the capacity of these leaders on the campus to improve the quality of instruction
- Help LEAs establish data and evaluation systems to monitor progress toward Critical Success Factors, milestones, and performance targets
- Facilitate cohort groups of principals/leaders to create networking opportunities for participating campuses
- Support community outreach and involvement
- Provide data and research to best utilize the extended instructional time
- Conduct site visits to both the LEA and campus to support the Transformation process
- Provide case management for Tier I and II schools, including site visits
- Establish extended learning opportunities for Tier I and II schools

SIRC or other TEA selected Technical Assistance Providers will provide similar technical assistance to Tier III grants.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including conducting two webinars for interested LEAs.

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.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here 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.

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

Assurance

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

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 I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** .

Assurance

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

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.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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.

Assurance

The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Texas 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.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement 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.

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.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

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 Texas 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
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - 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 its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II 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 may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

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