

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Colorado



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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

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

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

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

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@ed.gov.

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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


Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013 (extended to November 22, 2013)

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Colorado Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 201 E. Colfax Ave. Denver, Colorado 80203
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Patrick Chapman Position and Office: Executive Director, Federal Programs Unit Contact's Mailing Address: Colorado Department of Education 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, Colorado 80202-5149 Telephone: 303-866-6780 Fax: 303-866-6637 Email address: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Robert Hammond	Telephone: 303-866-6646
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: 11-21-13
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this definition, as its methodology for identifying its priority schools has already been approved through its ESEA flexibility request.

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority 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.

Directions: SEAs that generate new lists should create this table in Excel using the format shown below. An example of the table has been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS									
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

Colorado has generated a PLA list in accordance with its approved ESEA flexibility request. Colorado defines priority schools as:

The 2013 – 2014 SIG Eligibility list is included in the table (Attachment A):

2013 SIG Eligibility Instructions (Methodology) is included as a separate attachment.

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.

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
Aurora Public Schools	Fulton Elementary School	Remaining funds will be added to FY 2013 funds and awarded to Cohort #5. These funds have been de-obligated due to USDE monitoring finding.	\$1,136,025.00
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			\$1,136,025.00

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

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, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The LEA must demonstrate through its application and the school level Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) that it has analyzed the needs of each Priority school that it plans to serve in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention that responds to the needs analysis for each school.

In order to develop a thorough needs analysis the LEA must gather and organize relevant data generated from a variety of sources as they prepare to plan. Within the unified improvement planning process, data is used to: identify trends and prioritize performance challenges (performance data), determine root causes (process and perception data), set targets (federal, state and local performance expectations), monitor progress towards performance targets (interim measures of student performance) and monitor implementation of major improvement strategies (process and

perception data). To effectively engage in unified improvement planning, planning teams from the LEA and school will need to access both state-provided and locally available data.

An action plan will then be developed in which root causes will be prioritized and addressed (see Attachment D of the RFP).

The following link to the UIP Handbook provides additional information about reviewing current performance, identifying trends, prioritizing performance challenges and identifying root causes.

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/uiip/downloads/unifiedimprovementplanning/uiphandbook.pdf>

The needs analysis will be reviewed and scored against the rubric in the LEA Request for Proposal (RFP).

- (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, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

LEAs will demonstrate their capacity to support sites in Section II of the RFP by detailing specific actions the LEA has taken or will take to: (1) design and implement interventions consistent with the requirements, (2) recruit, screen and select external providers, if applicable to ensure their quality, (3) align other resources with the proposed interventions, and (4) modify practice or policies to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Any activities or strategies the LEA proposes must be clearly outlined in the electronic budget (see rubric, RFP).

In addition, in awarding 1003(g) School Improvement funds, CDE will evaluate each district's commitment according to its dedication to implementing one of four specific interventions in each Priority School that it commits to serve. These interventions include:

- *Restart*: Close and reopen the school under the management of a charter school operator, charter management organization, or educational management organization.
- *Turnaround*: Replace the principal and at least 50 percent of staff, adopt a new governance structure and implement comprehensive, research-based instructional programs.
- *Transformation*: Replace the principal, implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extend learning and teacher planning time, and provide operating flexibility.
- *Closure*: Close the school and enroll students in high-achieving schools in the district.

Demonstrated capacity and readiness

CDE will also consider a district's capacity and readiness to carry out proposed interventions in targeted schools, including supply of leaders, teachers and school providers; detailed dissolution and dispersal plan for school closures; capacity to administer and track interim assessments; capacity to engage in significant mid-course corrections (including by replacing key staff, leadership or external providers) if data do not indicate significant progress toward achievement benchmarks within the first year; and quality of instructional programs and

standards-based curriculum.

Governance reform

CDE will consider a district's commitment and capacity to establish oversight structures for identified schools outside of normal district constraints that will ensure necessary freedom and support, such as a separate district office, staffed by a person that has been given significant autonomy to make critical decisions that impact student achievement, reports to the district superintendent and has contracting and other authorities, or a contract with a Lead Turnaround Partner.

Ensuring flexibility

CDE will consider a district's commitment to ensure necessary flexibility for identified schools. Many of these flexibilities are required elements of the intervention models outlined above. For all schools, they will include flexibility over scheduling of school day and year; principal autonomy over staff hiring, firing and placement; and greater authority over budgeting at the school level. Districts may provide these flexibilities by obtaining innovation school/zone status, converting a school to charter status, or obtaining specific waivers from district policy or negotiated agreements as necessary.

Aligned resources

CDE will consider a district's commitment to align current and future funding sources in support of improvement goals, including its commitment to identify and reallocate existing district funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after federal funds expire.

Performance monitoring

CDE will consider a district's commitment and capacity to hold schools accountable for results. Specifically, districts must include in their application three year student achievement goals in reading/language arts and mathematics. Each Priority school the district commits to serve must be held accountable for meeting or being on track to meet those goals for all students and in each student disaggregated group. In addition, districts must hold schools accountable for progress on leading indicators (see step #4 below). In schools where the district proposes a "restart" model, it must also describe how it will hold the charter school operator, CMO or EMO accountable for meeting or being on track to meet student achievement goals and making progress on leading indicators.

District and community support

CDE will consider a district's demonstrated backing for necessary changes to accompany dramatic reform, as evidenced through involvement and support in the decision making process from the school board, superintendent, the local teachers' union, and parents.

Sustainability

Finally, CDE will consider evidence of the district's plan to sustain gains in student achievement beyond three years; and to commit one-time funds strategically to enable future interventions in other low-performing 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, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Each LEA will submit to the CDE a budget with detailed expenditures for each of the schools in which it will intervene. The budget will be scored against the RFP's rubric. An LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each participating school. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen and SEA guidelines. Grants are renewable for 2 additional 1-year periods except in the cases of school closure. The district's rationale and justification for the grant amount request will be reviewed by CDE staff and external stakeholders, with final approval from the Deputy Commissioner of Education. If CDE staff and external stakeholders and the Deputy Commissioner disagree with the LEA's rationale and activities, the LEA will be required to revise and resubmit their proposed budget.

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

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;

LEAs will develop a 1003(g) action plan for each site including interventions consistent with the final 1003(g) requirements which will be judged against a rubric (see RFP page 20). LEA's will also complete an Addendum (see RFP page 29) to their Unified Improvement Plan that provides a description of how each requirement will be met.

- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;

CDE will provide guidance through (noted in the application, timeline, and attachments):

1. Webinars to be held for all eligible applicants.
2. CDE-provided technical assistance, support for needs assessments, and support for planning to eligible applicants.
3. Guidance, resources, and support developed and offered by the USDE, Comprehensive Centers, Regional Labs, and other organizations.

- Align other resources with the interventions;

In the RFP districts will be required to describe the specific actions they have taken to align other resources (e.g., Title I, II, III, Local grants, state and local funds) with the proposed interventions. Answers will be scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).

- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,

In the RFP districts will be asked to describe specific actions they have taken (or will take) to ensure flexibility, modify practices, policies, oversight structures, outside formal restraints, if necessary to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively (e.g., flexible scheduling, principal autonomy over staff

hiring/firing and placement, budget autonomy, obtaining innovation school/zone status, teacher/union agreements). Answers will be scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).

- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
In the RFP, districts will be asked to describe specific actions they have taken (or will take) to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends (e.g., professional development, trainer of trainer models, district commitment of continuation of resources). Districts will also be asked to describe how they will align current and future funding in support of improvement goals and sustainability (e.g., specific funds identified, how existing funds will be reallocated to sustain the grant after federal funding ends). Answers will be scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).

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:

- (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? Have Martin check.

School sites that desire to use 1003(g) funds for pre-implementation activities will be required to describe the associated activities in their grant narrative and budget.

Budgets will include a drop-down menu for LEAs to indicate if expenditures are part of the pre-implementation period. For any expenditures noted as pre-implementation, grant reviewers will review proposed budgets for to ensure costs are reasonable, necessary, and aligned to planning and preparation necessary prior to full implementation. All costs must still meet allowable use of funds under federal guidance. CDE staff will review and approve each proposed budget.

- (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?

CDE will refer to the SIG 1003(g) Non-Regulatory Guidance, OMB Circulars and other resources concerning allowable use of funds to ensure costs are reasonable and necessary during pre-implementation. Examples of potential costs include, but are not limited to: meetings with community, staff, parents, etc.; costs associated with additional time for planning with staff; recruitment and retention strategies; district level policy changes.

Guidance pertaining to allowable costs is provided in Attachment C of the LEA RFP.

² “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

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

[Insert the SEA’s timeline for the FY 2013 SIG competition here] The following timeline is included in the local RFP for School Improvement Grant funds:

Tiered Intervention Grant Timeline

February 10, 2014	Release of Tiered Intervention Request For Proposal (RFP) via the CDE weekly communication "The Scoop" and posted to the CDE Web site at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/NCLB/tia.asp (Dependent upon approval of plan by USDOE – the RFP will not be released until approval is final)
Feb. 10 – 28, 2014	CDE Performance Managers provide support at local stakeholder meetings as well as guidance for turnaround planning.
Feb. 19, 2014	CDE will conduct an informational webinar for applicants.
Feb. 28, 2014	Letter of Intent to Apply due to CDE
March 14, 2014	Applications due to CDE on or before 4:00 p.m.
April 3, 2014	Review of proposals by CDE Teams of CDE staff and external experts with background in School Improvement and federal grants administration will review and score proposals against the attached rubric. CDE's Grants Fiscal Management staff will review proposed budget expenditures. (See scoring rubrics on pages 16 – 21 of the Tiered Intervention Grant RFP). Reviewer comments will be shared with applicants. In some cases, reviewer comments may necessitate proposed plan or budget revisions in order for an LEA to receive approval. The review of the Tiered Intervention Grants will be a standards based process. LEAs will not be funded unless they meet all criteria in each section of the application. This approach will prevent a proposal that has deficiencies in one section of the plan from compensating for those deficits in other sections. In this way, the review process will ensure that funded Tiered Intervention Grants address all the critical components in a manner that results in a comprehensive plan. LEAs may be asked to submit revisions in any deficient sections to bring specific sections up to standard.
April 11, 2014	Scores, feedback (may include rewriting of specific sections) will be released sent to sites.
April 25, 2014	Award notification to sites from the Office of Competitive Grants and Awards

May, 2014

Begin implementation of intervention model for the 2014 – 2015 school year.

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

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

In the overarching strategy for supporting dramatic improvement in the state’s lowest-achieving schools, the Colorado Department of Education will develop detailed performance goals and specific timelines for improvement to which all turnaround schools will be held. A Unified Improvement Plan for each individual school site will be monitored and updated annually. The unified plan must include the following components:

- A thorough needs assessment
- Prioritized Performance challenges
- Root Cause analysis of performance challenges
- The schools’ short-term and long-term goals and objectives
- How schools’ program activities will lead to the attainment of objectives.

Goals, timelines and indicators will be encompassed in a each schools Unified Improvement Plan that will include the following:

- *A common, ambitious but achievable goal that every turnaround school will be expected to meet within 3-5 years after beginning its turnaround effort.* The CDE will define a school turnaround a “success” when the school has increased in at least one plan type by the third year of the grant. Schools will be required to meet achievement levels in the core academic subjects that equal or exceed the average level for the state’s non-low-income schools. High schools will also be required to achieve graduation rates, dropout rates, college-going rates and other key high school metrics that are equal to rates among Colorado’s higher-income high schools.
- *School-specific timelines and benchmarks for reaching these goals.* Rather than expecting all schools will follow a simple improvement trajectory from their current achievement to the goals outlined above, in the schools’ Unified Improvement Plan, the CDE will collaborate with districts with participating schools to develop timelines and benchmarks that are individualized based on each school’s current achievement, turnaround strategy, and particular needs. Some schools identified for turnaround are further behind than others, and may require more ambitious targets, as well as time to meet the state’s performance goals. CDE will work with districts to address these unique challenges.

Research shows that successful turnarounds typically involve a focus on a few key goals in the first few weeks and months of the effort. This focus will be reflected in each school’s individualized benchmarks. For example, if an elementary school decides to invest heavily in year one in third and fourth grade reading, its first-year benchmarks will reflect that by setting more ambitious targets for growth in reading achievement in third and fourth grade than for other grades and subjects. All schools will be required to show sufficient achievement growth in all grades and subjects by year five, but initial benchmark goals will help foster the intense focus common to successful turnarounds by setting school- and year-specific targets.

A set of leading indicators will be used to inform the district and state whether each school is on-track to meet its benchmarks and ultimate goals for student achievement.

- The CDE will invest in the creation and refinement of a research-based set of leading indicators to measure success or failure in turnaround schools. The CDE has started with three initial sets of indicators (see below), which were developed in mid 2010 and will begin collecting from the first cohort of turnaround schools in early 2011. Mid-year collection and analysis of as many indicators as possible will enable the CDE, local districts and school leaders to initiate mid-course corrections or more dramatic shifts in strategy for the next school year. Consistent with Colorado's overall approach of building and collecting knowledge about what works in improving student outcomes, these indicators and results from the first cohort of turnaround schools will thereafter inform research and analysis to develop more accurate and refined sets of leading indicators for future cohorts of turnaround schools.

Leading indicators to be collected will include:

- a. Title I Section 1003(g) required indicators: the number of minutes within the school year; student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup; dropout rate; student attendance rate; number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes; discipline incidents; truants; distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and teacher attendance rate.
- b. Other quantitative indicators that supplement those required under 1003(g), such as: results on interim assessments of student performance; the percentage of students taught by teachers who, in prior years, achieved above average or exceptional growth with their students; other measures of time allocated to learning; and others likely to be highly-correlated with successful improvement efforts
- c. Qualitative indicators that arise from cross-sector research about successful turnarounds. The extent to which the school leader and staff have prioritized a few key goals that will lead to visible early wins; whether the school leader is engaging staff in regular and transparent sharing of data about student performance; and evidence of positive community involvement in the turnaround effort or the leader's successful efforts to influence those who oppose dramatic change.

Every Priority School will be expected to increase by at least one performance level on the Colorado School Performance Framework by year three. If a school is not on track increase by one performance level based on leading and lagging indicators, CDE will not renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant. Summative (lagging) performance will be established using Colorado's School Performance framework pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009 (Article 11 of title 22, Colorado Revised Statutes). Non-summative performance under a turnaround plan will be established using leading indicators. These leading indicators will include: meeting interim performance targets and meeting implementation benchmarks. Interim targets and implementation benchmarks are established as part of Colorado's unified planning process and reflect both state and local measures and design-specific implementation activities.

CDE expects that all Priority Schools' annual performance evaluations will show improvement such that following year 1 the school's performance trajectory is on target to improve by at least one performance

level above their benchmark year (the SPF category) by the end of the third year of the grant.

(2) 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. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

NA

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

CDE's Office of School and District Performance will conduct monthly onsite visits of each turnaround school and will prepare a summary report for the, the building principal and the district superintendent (see attachment B for the onsite visit protocol). Additionally, in cases where schools are using the services of an external provider, CDE will conduct monthly achievement calls for the purpose of reviewing current benchmark and formative assessment data, address current issues and identify next steps.

CDE will also require that LEAs with schools implementing a SIG model have an LEA representative assigned to the school who will oversee the implementation of the SIG model to ensure that the intervention is being implemented with fidelity and that the 1003(g) SIG model requirements are being met.

During the second year of implementation of the SIG model, CDE will conduct a formal monitoring visit to each SIG school using the Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) Monitoring Plan for schools receiving 1003(g) funds. CDE will use the monitoring indicators in SASA to determine the fidelity of implementation of SIG model and activities administered by LEAs. The SIG monitoring procedures and protocols concentrate on the following indicator areas: application process, technical assistance, monitoring process, fiscal responsibilities, data collection, and implementation. A formal SASA monitoring report will be provided to the LEA and LEAs that are out of compliance will be asked to develop a corrective action plan to come into compliance with the model requirements.

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

In the event that the Colorado Department of Education lacks sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA apply, schools will be prioritized from lowest-achieving to highest-achieving . Note that the SEA does not expect to have sufficient funds to fund all schools that are identified on the attached eligibility list. Indicators of demonstrated commitment and readiness include an agreement to implement the selected

intervention model with fidelity and demonstration of community and parent engagement in the reform process, Board actions, and a commitment of other federal, state, and local resources to the turnaround effort.

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

NA

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

The State will not take over any Priority Schools in the 2014-2015 school year.

(7) 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, or for priority schools, as applicable, 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.

The SEA does not intend to provide intervention services directly to Priority Schools.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain

the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

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

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

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

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

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

CDE will reserve 5% of the State's School Improvement grant funds in support of administrative services, fiscal services, and support services to school districts and schools as delineated in the following list of activities:

- Data collection and analyses associated with the identification and progress of low performing schools.
- Administration of school improvement grants to LEAs. Develop state and local SIG applications. Release the local RFP, provide training and technical assistance to school districts. Conduct grant reviews. Develop a data base of subgrantees, release funds and track expenditures, collect end of year reports. Maintain programmatic and fiscal records.
- Development and implementation of Diagnostic Reviews. Develop informational materials, protocols and rubrics used for the Diagnostic Reviews. Conduct orientations. Support community stakeholder meetings as necessary. Facilitate de-briefings and reports.
- Technical assistance and support to LEAs and low performing schools in the planning and implementation of intervention models. Ongoing support of partnerships with districts and low performing schools. Ongoing collection of progress data related to the implementation and impact of turnaround strategies. Development and implementation of performance indicators.
- Facilitation of partnerships between low performing LEA schools and external providers and CMOs. CDE will assign performance managers who will fill that role for districts, schools, and external providers and management companies.
- CDE will evaluate the impact of grant awards and intervention strategies. CDE will also continue to conduct research and evaluations as part of its statewide system of accountability and support.
- Tracking of school progress.
- Meeting all data collection and reporting requirements tied to the funds. Quarterly and end of year reports.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

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

Waiver 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 2013 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.

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 2013 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.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

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

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Colorado requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

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 2014–2015 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 the 2014–2015 school year 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.

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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

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 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.

I. 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. (See attachment D)

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs.

Colorado’s LEA Application Form is included as a separate attachment.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses 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.

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, or each priority school, as applicable, the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school, or in each priority school, as applicable.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY 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, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

- Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority 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;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - 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, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
- Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (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 or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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, or each priority 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, or priority 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 or priority 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, or the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school 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, or each priority 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, or priority 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, or priority 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) 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 school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that

does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

CDE is not applying for Continuation Awards

Continuation Awards Only Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2013 SIG funds:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	COHORT #	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:			

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocating those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction).

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards² to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]'s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If 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.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

By submitting the assurances and information above, [State] agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a new FY 2013 SIG application; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the full application package (page 3).

² A "new award" is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

ATTACHMENTS - Table of Contents:

ATTACHMENT A: PLA list

ATTACHMENT B: Progress Monitoring Tool

ATTACHMENT C: Opportunity for Public Comment Regarding 1003(g) Waiver Requests

ATTACHMENT D: Budget Form

Separate Attachments:

2013 SIG Eligibility Instructions (Methodology)

2013 SIG Eligibility List Cohort 5

LEA Application Form

Attachment A: Schools that are Eligible for Cohort 5 of SIGs

District Number	District Name	School Number	School Name	EMH Level Eligible	Eligibility in 2013-2014 based on Original Specs
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	0418	ASHLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	9496	CASTRO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0030	ADAMS COUNTY 14	1426	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	1528	CHELTENHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	1748	COLORADO HIGH SCHOOL	H	Low grad rate - Title I Served
8001	CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	1877	COLORADO PROVOST ACADEMY	H	Low grad rate - Title I Served
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	1846	COLUMBINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	1948	CRAWFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0900	DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	5405	EDCSD: COLORADO CYBER SCHOOL	H	Low grad rate - Title I Eligible
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2789	ESCUELA TLATELOLCO SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2789	ESCUELA TLATELOLCO SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2789	ESCUELA TLATELOLCO SCHOOL	M	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	2880	FAIRVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	3426	GILPIN MONTESSORI PUBLIC SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement (Current Priority)
0030	ADAMS COUNTY 14	6534	HANSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement (Current Priority)
0900	DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	3995	HOPE ON-LINE	H	Low grad rate - Title I Eligible
2862	JULESBURG RE-1	4369	INSIGHT SCHOOL OF COLORADO AT JULESBURG	H	Low grad rate - Title I Eligible
1420	JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	4422	JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	4656	KEPNER MIDDLE SCHOOL	M	Lowest 5% Achievement
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	5995	MONTBELLO HIGH SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement (Current Priority)
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	6728	PARIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	7558	SABLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0123	SHERIDAN 2	7842	SHERIDAN HIGH SCHOOL	H	Low grad rate - Title I Served
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	8145	SUMMIT ACADEMY	H	Lowest 5% Achievement / Low grad rate

8001	CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	4699	THE NEW AMERICA SCHOOL	H	Lowest 5% Achievement / Low grad rate
0880	DENVER COUNTY 1	9050	VALVERDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement
0180	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	9514	WHEELING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	E	Lowest 5% Achievement

2014-
2014

Attachment B

Progress Monitoring of TIG School Implementation



LEA/Charter Holder Contact Information

LEA Name:	NCES ID#	Entity ID#
------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Mailing Address:	Phone:	Fax:
-------------------------	---------------	-------------

LEA Contact & Position:	Email:
------------------------------------	---------------

LEA Superintendent:	Email:
----------------------------	---------------

LEA Federal Programs Director:	Email:
---------------------------------------	---------------

LEA Fiscal Representative:	Email:
-----------------------------------	---------------

TIG (Priority) School(s)

Name of School & Cohort	School Code	Principal	Email

Monitoring Dates:

Baseline:	Mid Year:	End of Year:
------------------	------------------	---------------------

Monitoring Completed by:

--	--	--

School Background, Performance Data and Context

Instructions. Use this space to provide 1-3 paragraphs about the school context, including school demographics, performance history, and specialized programs. Update this section with leading indicator data after each visit: including average daily attendance, chronic absenteeism, behavior data, and interim assessment data.

LEA and School(s) Implementation of Model requirements and interventions

Schools that participate in the Tiered Intervention Grant and selected the Transformation or Turnaround Model must implement the full model requirements, outlined in the table below. The schools original plan addressed these requirements in order to be approved for this grant. As a part of the Improvement Planning process, schools are encouraged to weave these strategies into their overall school improvement plan. The monitoring tool below will help districts and schools monitor the implementation and effectiveness of school improvement strategies, while also ensuring schools are fully meeting model requirements.

TIG Model Requirement	Description	Notes Regarding Implementation of Model Requirements
Operational Flexibility & Targeted Support	Describe how the LEA has granted the school sufficient operational flexibility in the following areas: Staffing, Calendars/Time, and budgeting.	
	Describe how the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	
Teacher and Leader Effectiveness	Describe the process for replacing the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model (e.g., use of competencies to hire new principal).	
	Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that: (1) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors (e.g., multiple observation-based assessments) and (2) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.	
	Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	
	Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	
	*** Turnaround Model Only. Describe how locally adopted competencies are used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students. Include (a) how all existing staff were screened and not more than 50 percent rehired and (b) how new staff are selected.	
Curriculum and Instruction	Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;	

	Describe the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	
Extended Learning Time	Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time for all students.	
Community-Oriented Schools	Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	

Monitoring Tool

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 1	Summarize Major Improvement Strategy Here
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ... 2. ... 3. ... 4. ...
How are TIG funds used to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •

support this MIS	•	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; background-color: #e67e22; color: white; padding: 5px;"> Evaluate Plan Implement </div>		
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps	Next Steps for LEA and School
Beginning of Year		
Mid Year		
End of Year		

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 2		Summarize Major Improvement Strategy Here	
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish robust PD system 2. Establish classroom walkthrough protocol 3. Provide job embedded teacher coaching 		
How are TIG funds used to support this MIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Evaluate		Plan	Implement
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps		Next Steps for LEA and School
Beginning of Year			

Mid Year		
End of Year		

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 3	Summarize Major Improvement Strategy Here	
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. ... 3. ... 	
How are TIG funds used to support this MIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Evaluate Plan Implement </div>		
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps	Next Steps for LEA and School

Beginning of Year		
Mid Year		
End of Year		

UIP Major Improvement Strategy 4		Describe Strategy Here
Key Action Steps and Related TIG Model	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. ... 3. ... 	

Requirements		
How are TIG funds used to support this MIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
	Evaluate	Plan
	Implement	
Implementation Benchmarks	Evidence/ Examples/ Artifacts of Implementation of Strategies and Action Steps	Next Steps for LEA and School
Beginning of Year		
Mid Year		
End of Year		

Key Takeaways from School Walkthroughs and Next Steps for LEA Support of School

Summary of Classroom Observations

Summary of Classroom Observations	
Beginning of Year	
Mid Year	
End of Year	

LEA Support and Monitoring for School

LEA Support and Monitoring for School	
Beginning of Year	

Mid Year	
End of Year	

ATTACHMENT C: Opportunity for Public Comment Regarding 1003(g) Waiver Requests

Announcement in the Scoop

[View this email in your browser](#)



Wednesday, October 16, 2013

** Action Item

This Week in *The Scoop*

- [Accountability & Improvement](#)
- [Data Systems](#)
- [Educator Effectiveness & Licensing](#)
- [Exceptional Student Services](#)
- [Federal Programs](#)
- [Health, Wellness & Nutrition](#)
- [News & Notes](#)
- [Standards & Assessments](#)
- [State Board of Education](#)

Accountability & Improvement

Attend "Going Beyond TCAP Data for Improvement Planning," a Training on the Western Slope

The Going Beyond TCAP Data for Improvement Planning training session is coming to Grand Junction on Wednesday, Oct. 30. This session will focus on how planning teams will use data sources other than TCAP as part of the Unified Improvement Planning process.

Provided by CDE in partnership with the Center for Transforming Learning and Teaching, participants will get a head start on using the K-3 literacy assessment data (currently used to identify students with significant reading deficiencies for the READ Act). Participants will also get support in incorporating additional data related to post-secondary and workforce readiness into data analysis, analyzing ACCESS data and using TELL survey results as part of root cause analysis.

School and district level planning teams can register at <http://svy.mk/15l0sqx>. The deadline to register is Friday, Oct. 25.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Erin Loften

Improvement Planning

Phone: 303-866-6642

Email: loften_e@cde.state.co.us

**** Submit Your Accreditation Category; Submissions are Past Due**

The deadline for districts to submit an accreditation category for each of their schools to CDE was Tuesday, Oct. 15. If districts have not yet accredited their schools this is past due and should be completed as soon as possible. The online accreditation and request to reconsider system is located at <http://bit.ly/1bw9A28>. A username and password are required. The online submission form must also be accompanied by signed approval from the local school board president.

For More Information, Contact:
Jessica Knevals
Accountability and Data Analysis
Phone: 303-866-6778
Email: knevals.j@cde.state.co.us

Data Systems

Attend a Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing Collaborative Training

Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing Collaborative will present three trainings on the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Lourdes M. Rosado, associate director of the Juvenile Law Center in Philadelphia, PA will speak on FERPA and also discuss the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and 42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), rules about substance abuse and confidentiality.

These free trainings will be held on the following dates:

Wednesday, Oct. 23 from 9 a.m. - noon at the Pueblo Convention Center, 320 Central Main Street in Pueblo. Register at <http://conta.cc/1bw8tzo>

Thursday, Oct. 24 from 9 a.m. - noon at the Aurora Summit Conference and Event Center, 411 Sable Blvd in Aurora. Register at <http://conta.cc/15Fy34j>

Thursday, Oct. 24 from 1 – 4 p.m. at the Aurora Summit Conference and Event Center. Register at <http://conta.cc/1hUGLxV>

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Jan Rose Petro

Data Services

Phone: 303-866-6838

Email: petro_j@cde.state.co.us

Educator Effectiveness & Licensing

Register to Attend the Educator Effectiveness Webinar Series

To support districts as they navigate the new evaluation process, the Educator Effectiveness team is offering a series of webinars on timely topics. The next webinar is on Tuesday, Oct. 22 from 3:45-5:15 p.m. and will highlight how to establish a process for using student learning objectives in educator evaluation and how to use the Assessment Review Tool. To register for this webinar and view

upcoming webinar topics, visit the link below.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Tricia Majors

Educator Effectiveness

Phone: 303-866-6678

Email: Majors_T@cde.state.co.us

Exceptional Student Services

Register to Attend the Level 2 Autism Training on Transition

This comprehensive training will focus on Autism Spectrum Disorder specific transition assessments, planning and preparing the individual with Autism Spectrum Disorder for employment and living environments. Writing meaningful and attainable transition plans for secondary students on the autism spectrum will be covered along with individual education programs that meet Indicator 13 transition requirements for Colorado. The training will also cover individual education programs that focus on autism specific best practices and educational programming for school and transition-aged students with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

The trainings are from 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. and registration opens at 8 a.m. There is no cost to attend.

To register for the Tuesday, Nov. 5 training in Denver, visit <http://svy.mk/1cV168w>.

To register for the Thursday, Nov. 7 training in Pueblo, visit <http://svy.mk/17tGptk>.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Shannon Pfeiffer

Exceptional Student Services

Phone: 303-866-6969

Email: pfeiffer_s@cde.state.co.us

Federal Programs

** Attend a Comparability Webinar

No Child Left Behind requires districts that receive Title IA funds to demonstrate that their Title I schools are comparable to non-Title I schools in the same grade span and that Title I funds supplement, but do not supplant, state and local funds.

The online comparability system will open soon, pre-populated with 2011-2012 data. Authorized respondents will need to update the system with 2012-2013 data.

Webinars are scheduled for those involved in comparability data collection and reporting. Pre-registration is not necessary. The dial-in number is the same for all three webinars: 1-866-684-8605.

Wednesday, Oct. 30, 2 p.m., <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r87mmdjiccm/>

Friday, Nov. 1, noon, <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r1yjfeiq29h/>

Monday, Nov. 4, 4 p.m., <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r4kh2q0mkmc/>

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Donna Morganstern

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6209

Email: morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us

**** Comment on State Waiver for 1003g Title I School Improvement Grants**

CDE is requesting public comment regarding four waiver requests it is submitting to the U.S. Department of Education as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The state believes the waivers will increase the quality of instruction and improve academic achievement in Colorado's lowest performing schools.

Summary of Waivers:

1. Extend the period of availability of school improvement funds to Sept. 30, 2016.
2. Permit local education agencies to implement a Title I schoolwide program in a Title I participating school if that school does not meet the requisite 40 percent poverty threshold.
3. Replace its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of "priority schools" that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility.
4. Allow Colorado to utilize a minimum N of 20 or fewer students in the

identification of schools to increase the validity and reliability of the list of lowest performing schools by excluding schools with very small student populations.

Submit comments or concerns by 5 p.m. on Wednesday, Oct. 30.

For More Information, Contact:

Patrick Chapman

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6780

Email: Chapman_P@cde.state.co.us

Attend the 2013-2014 Supplemental Education Services Reallocation of Unrequested Funds Webinar

This Title IA webinar provides information and support to school districts that are required to offer supplemental educational services during 2013-14. The webinar will be held Friday, Oct. 18 from 10 - 11 a.m. and cover the procedure that school districts need to follow to reallocate supplemental education services set-aside funds, once it has met all the requests for this tutoring.

Title IA personnel involved with supplemental education services are encouraged to attend. To join the meeting: <http://bit.ly/H1pvfm>. Dial in: 866-601-0566

Note: The webinar will be recorded and be available on the website within a few days following the event.

For More Information, Contact:

Kathryn Smukler

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6842
Email: smukler_k@cde.state.co.us

Attend a 2014-2015 E-rate Training

CDE is offering beginner and advanced training sessions for the 2014-15 E-rate funding year. Training is available for all E-rate applicants and service providers.

The beginning training session is designed to introduce new applicants to the E-rate process. This training will go over the history of E-rate, application process, and form completion. Applicants are encouraged to bring forms completed in previous years and documentation to complete the form 470.

The advanced session will cover new proposed forms 470 & 471 in addition to eligible services, contracts, funding issues, appeals and Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA). If there is a specific topic of interest, be sure to add that topic when completing the registration form.

Training dates and locations:

Colorado Springs - Pikes Peak BOCES

Wednesday, Oct. 30 - beginners

Thursday, Oct. 31 – advanced

Greeley - High Plains Library

Thursday, Dec. 12 – beginners

Friday, Dec. 13 – advanced

Metro - Mile High United Way
Founders Room

Monday, Dec. 16 – beginners

Tuesday, Dec. 17 - advanced

Grand Junction-Basil T. Knight Building

Tuesday, Jan. 28 – beginner

Wednesday, Jan. 29 – advanced

To register for a training, visit <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/72G7X2H>.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

DeLilah Collins

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6850

Email: collins_d@cde.state.co.us

Health, Wellness & Nutrition

Receive Guidance on Ensuring Accuracy of School Employee School Meal Applications

Recently, there have been incidents in some areas of the U.S. where school

district employees allegedly misrepresented their incomes in order to receive free or reduced price school meals for their children. In order to assist state and local school officials with addressing this problem, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and CDE are offering guidance on ways to ensure the accuracy of the income information provided by school district employees.

In the school meals programs, local educational agencies are required to verify any questionable application on a case-by-case basis via a household submitting proof of the information they provided on the application. This is known as “verification for cause.” LEAs can use verification for cause to review approved meal benefit applications when known or available information indicates school district employees may have misrepresented their incomes on their applications.

Verification for cause must not be used automatically in this situation, but school employee applications can be included among the list of questionable applications.

The USDA recommends that an LEA consult with legal counsel and the state agency in establishing the parameters of verification for cause for school district employees.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Jennifer Otey

School Nutrition

Phone: 303-866-6450

Email: Otey_J@cde.state.co.us

News & Notes

Participate in Family and School Partnership in Education Month

Gov. John Hickenlooper designated October as Family and School Partnership in Education Month. The goal of this special month is to actively share information and support families and educators working together to ensure learning success for every student, from pre-school to postsecondary and workforce readiness and including higher education.

During the month, the State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education highlights partnering resources to support stakeholders as they work together. This week's highlighted resource is the Family, School and Community Partnering Network Bulletin from the Office of Learning Supports and Exceptional Student Services.

Available at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/rti/family>, the bulletin lists trainings and resources to support effective partnering practices focused on student success. This edition describes S.B. 13-193, concerning increasing parent engagement in public schools, and invites interested stakeholders to participate in a monthly Community of Practice. Interested persons may subscribe to the bulletin by contacting Kim Watchorn at watchorn_k@cde.state.co.us.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Cindy Dascher

Exceptional Student Services and CDE SACPIE Representative

Phone: 303-866-6876

Standards & Assessments

Provide Feedback on School Readiness Assessment Recommendation

CDE seeks feedback on a recommendation to extend the implementation timeline for the school readiness provisions of Colorado's Achievement Plan for Kids (CAP4K) in advance of the Nov. 13 state board of education meeting. The board voted at their December 2012 meeting to offer districts a menu of school readiness assessments and approved Teaching Strategies GOLD as the first assessment tool for the menu. Over the past year, CDE guided districts in implementing the initiative in either the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school year. This summer, the state solicited additional assessments for consideration for the menu. The School Readiness Assessment subcommittee met to review submissions and found no assessments that met the criteria established in CAP4K for a school readiness assessment.

CDE plans to recommend to the state board of education extending the implementation timeline by one year to allow for more assessment options to be available to districts. This would give districts additional time to support kindergarten teachers with implementation of the new standards and the READ Act while thoughtfully planning for the school readiness work in advance of full implementation in the 2015-16 school year.

Please send your feedback to Suzanne Rougier at rougier_s@cde.state.co.us by
Friday, Nov. 1.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Melissa Colman

Teaching and Learning

Phone: 303-866-6737

Email: colman_m@cde.state.co.us

State Board of Education **State Board Meeting December Date Change Impacts DPF/SPF** **Release**

The board voted to approve moving their December 2013 meeting dates from Dec. 4 & 5 to Dec. 11 & 12. As a result of the meeting change, the 2013 School and District Performance Frameworks will be approved and released on Dec. 11, instead of the previously reported Dec. 4 date. The board also approved the 2014 proposed board meeting dates.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Office of the State Board of Education

Phone: (303) 866-6817

Email: state.board@cde.state.co.us



COLORADO DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION

View previous issues of The Scoop at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/scripts/thescooparchive/TheScoopArchive.asp>

For more information, contact the CDE Communications Division, 303-866-4247.

(<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Communications/index.html>).



Facebook



Twitter



Website

Copyright © 2013 Colorado Department of Education, All rights reserved.

You received this message because you signed up to receive The Scoop from the Colorado Department of

Education.

Our mailing address is:

Colorado Department of Education

201 E Colfax Ave

Denver, CO 80203

[Add us to your address book](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

Link to Scoop Announcement: <http://www2.cde.state.co.us/scripts/thescooparchive/TheScoopArchive.asp>

See the Wednesday, October 16, 2013 issue

Document sent to the Colorado Committee of Practitioners

To: Colorado Committee of Practitioners

From: Brad Bylsma

Re: FY 2013 1003g School Improvement Grant Application Waiver Request

CDE is asking for comment from the Colorado Committee of Practitioners regarding four waiver requests it plans to submit to the U.S. Department of Education as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The state

believes the waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Colorado's lowest performing schools.

CoP members will have an opportunity to provide comments during the CoP meeting on November 14th, 2013. Otherwise, please submit comments or concerns via email to Brad Bylsma at bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us by 5 p.m. on November 14th, 2013. The four waivers are summarized below:

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 2013 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].

Priority schools list waiver

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

Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

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

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

Schoolwide poverty threshold waiver

Waiver to permit local education agencies to implement a Title I schoolwide program in a Title I participating school if that school does not meet the requisite 40 percent poverty threshold.

Stakeholder comments received regarding the Waiver Requests:

No written comments or concerns were received by CDE.

The Colorado NCLB Committee of Practitioners reviewed the waiver requests at the November 14, 2013 meeting and after discussing the purpose and benefits of each waiver, the committee voted unanimously in support of these requests.

ATTACHMENT D: Budget Form

**TIERED INTERVENTION GRANT
FY2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16**

District number:

School District Name:

School Name:

Budget Report:

Revision number:

Date:

Model

Please Check the year(s) you are applying for:

Year 1

Year 2

Year 3

Name of person completing this information

Name:

Phone No.:

E-mail:

Submit this excel file to : electronic_budget@cde.state.co.us; petrov_m@cde.state.co.us

Grants Fiscal Contact : Martin Petrov: (303) 866-6389, petrov_m@cde.state.co.us

Program Contact: Brad Byslma: (303) 866-6937, bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us

CDE use only

Funding Summary

School/District	Request-Year 1	Request-Year 2	Request-Year 3	Approved-Year 1	Approved-Year 2	Approved-Year 3
#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Indirects	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -