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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

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.
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.

**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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name of Applicant:</th>
<th>Applicant’s Mailing Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State Board of Education</td>
<td>Alzina Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 North First Street – N 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Contact for the School Improvement Grant**

**Name:** Amy Jo Clemens

**Position and Office:** Assistant Superintendent Center for Innovation and Improvement

**Contact’s Mailing Address:** Same

**Telephone:** 1.217.782.2223

**Fax:** 1.217.785.3972

**Email address:** aclemens@isbe.net

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christopher Koch</td>
<td>1-217-782-2223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature of the Chief State School Officer:**

X

**Date:**

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.

The Illinois State Board of Education is requesting a waiver of the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) final requirements.

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.

See attached Priority Schools List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>LEA NCES ID #</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NCES ID#</th>
<th>PRIORITY (if applicable)</th>
<th>TIER I</th>
<th>TIER II</th>
<th>TIER III</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
<th>NEWLY ELIGIBLE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*“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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>LEA NCES ID #</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NCES ID#</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>TIER I</th>
<th>TIER II</th>
<th>TIER III</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
<th>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:**

#### 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. 

   *With assistance from the Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center and Illinois State University, ISBE designed a District Needs Assessment tool to assist LEAs with identifying gaps between their current status and desired results. The completed District Needs Assessment informs the selection of one of the four intervention models. The tool will help an LEA team examine policies, programs, practices, and contextual factors that support or impede the presence of characteristics necessary to support the development of a thriving learning community (The District Needs Assessment tool is included as an attachment of the FY14 SIG RFP.) This tool is grounded in a comprehensive review of the research literature and highlights five key areas that influence the successful implementation of the four intervention models identified by USDE. The District Needs Assessment identifies five leading indicators present in highly successful districts and schools: leadership, evaluating teacher and principal effectiveness, data-driven decision making, instructional programs, and professional development.*

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.

*Through the District Needs Assessment and the LEA application, the LEA is required to describe its*
capacity to successfully implement its selected intervention model. Specifically, Section II of the District Needs Assessment includes a strengths, weakness, opportunity, and threats (SWOT) analyses to help the LEA team determine the extent to which it can effectively implement any of the four intervention models. In the SWOT analysis, the LEA considers whether it can develop the governance structures, meet the human capital considerations, change policies and procedures to prevent barriers to implementation, and alter operational practices to support rapid improvement and full implementation of the four intervention models. In addition, based on the information from “School Restructuring: What Works When? A Guide for Education Leaders” and “The Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants,” there are four checklists included in Part II of the District Needs Assessment that identify requirements for successful implementation.

Another important factor ISBE will consider as it assesses LEA capacity is the LEA’s willingness to work with a Lead Partner to effectively implement the selected intervention model. ISBE is requesting that each LEA screen and select an external partner from the Illinois Approved Provider List (included in an appendix of the RFP). In the RFP, the LEA must describe how they selected the Lead Partner provider(s) and include, where applicable, letter(s) of intent from the partnering organization(s). If the LEA wishes to use a provider not included on the Illinois Approved Provider List, the LEA must obtain approval from ISBE and describe how it recruited and screened the entity to ensure their quality, and then ultimately select the provider.

The LEA is required to include the above information in the District Application. The evaluation criteria and a scoring rubric (appear as appendices in the RFP) will be used to assess the LEA’s capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school identified in the LEA’s application in order to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention in each school.

(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).

The application scoring rubric (an appendix in the RFP) will assess if the LEA has presented a sound approach for the implementation of the selected models. An LEA must create a budget for the full period of availability of the funds, including the period granted by the waiver. The LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use to:

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

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

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

In its application, ISBE requires the LEA to describe how it has or will undertake the above-mentioned criteria. The LEA’s response will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria and scoring rubric. ISBE will also use the LEA’s response as baseline information that will inform future monitoring and oversight of the grant.

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 period to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

Timeline and Budget—The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected school intervention model in each priority school identified in the application. Implementation must begin in Fall 2014 and the timeline should span the grant period and include activities through June 30, 2017. The timeline must include LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of the school-level intervention model. The timeline should also indicate when monitoring will occur. The LEA must submit budgets for LEA-level activities, as well as for school-level activities.

In addition, ISBE will evaluate each school application’s budget. Each school must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected school intervention model and school level activities. Implementation must begin in fall 2014 and the timeline should span the grant period and include activities through June 30, 2017. The timeline must include phases such as pre-implementation, planning, implementation, and monitoring. Activities related to policy, hiring, principal and teacher evaluation, professional development, and monitoring must be included with the appropriate phases. The review process includes a thorough cross-walk between all proposed activities and the budget, to ascertain that all activities are reasonable and necessary, allowable, and fundable.

(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?

The SEA will review the budgets of schools that have been awarded and may request modifications and/or enhancements to submitted activities and budgets prior to the release of funds. These would include pre-implementation activities.

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]

Please See School Improvement Grant Cohort V Competition Timeline

(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.

As part of the application, LEAs will submit academic achievement goals and information on the school’s status for nine leading indicators. The LEAs will submit an annual report, along with a self-evaluation that will include the nine leading indicators with supporting data needed for the school-level reporting metrics to show progress (appears as an attachment in the RFP)

During the annual review, ISBE will look for dramatic change and rapid improvement in each participating school’s student performance. ISBE will review the annual goals set by the LEA to determine if each school is meeting the goals and making progress on the leading indicators. If an LEA is not meeting these goals, ISBE may intensify technical assistance and / or terminate funding.

(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.

The Illinois State Board of Education is requesting a waiver of the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) final requirements.

(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.

ISBE designed its SIG monitoring processes to ensure that monitoring is a regularly recurring and systematic examination of the administration and implementation of the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant. The purpose of monitoring is to ensure that each LEA is fully supporting the implementation of one of four USDE approved school intervention models in its awarded priority schools. ISBE’s monitoring processes emphasize fiscal responsibility for using resources wisely and includes the following four objectives: 1) Ensure compliance with USDE’s regulations and guidance of SIG implementation; 2) Measure the continuity and fidelity of implementation based on what was approved in the initial application and conditions for funding; 3) Identify areas for corrective action; and 4) Identify technical assistance needs. To do this, ISBE employs a variety of tools to assess the LEA’s progress toward implementation of the intervention model consistent with the final requirements with a specific focus on:

1. Operational Flexibility
2. Governance and Leadership / Lead Partners
3. Teacher and Principal Evaluation
4. Incentives and Support Systems
5. Instructional Practices
6. Extended Time for Learning
7. Family and Community Outreach
8. The alignment of other resources with the interventions.
9. Progress toward modifying practices or policies to enable effective implementation of the intervention model.
10. Evidence of movement toward sustainability.

ISBE staff engage in four types of accountability/monitoring visits.

**New Grantee Orientation** - The first is an introductory visit for new grantees or grantees that have experienced a significant turnover in leadership. ISBE consultants review the requirements of the grant with district and school leadership and teachers to ensure a shared understanding of the expectations associated with the grant. ISBE consultants meet with the local school board during a public meeting to provide a high-level overview of the grant requirements for the board and community stakeholders.

**On-Site Monitoring – Two Day** - The second type of visit is a two-day onsite monitoring visit that includes a desk review of pre-requested artifacts, on-site interviews with a variety of stakeholder groups, and classroom observations. Two day visits are conducted during Implementation Year I to test for compliance with federal grant requirements.

**On-Site Monitoring – One Day** - The third type of visit, is a one-day accountability visit. During these visits, ISBE consultants focus more deeply on one or more of the ten areas listed above.

Finally, ISBE consultants engage in **Rapid Response Visits**, either scheduled or unscheduled, to address issues that may require a more immediate resolution.

The frequency and intensity of on-site monitoring may increase upon recommendation of ISBE Consultants.

(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.

If ISBE decides to provide services directly to any schools, the state superintendent of education will prioritize the school for funding in the grant competition. Otherwise, each priority school application will be evaluated based on the established evaluation criteria identified in the scoring rubrics. The evaluation criteria are described in the “Criteria for Review and Approval of Proposals” section of the LEA RFP and the scoring rubrics are provided in appendices of the RFP. Based on the scoring rubric each LEA will receive a capacity score. Applications with a capacity score of at least 50% or above of the total capacity points possible (95/190) (I.E., moderate and/or strong) will be eligible for funding. Based on the scoring rubric, each school application will receive a readiness score. All applications reaching the minimum capacity score will be ranked from highest to lowest according to "readiness." Priority points will be added to the readiness score for any applicant who has never before applied and for any previously funded eligible applicant if all of the following are true:

- There has been a net increase in the percent of students in that school who met or exceeded standards on the IL state assessment in reading AND math from the baseline year (i.e., the year prior to receiving the grant) to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card;
- The student attendance rate increased from the baseline year to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card; AND
• (if applicable) The four-year graduation rate increased from the baseline year to the final year of the grant, as reported on the Illinois Report Card.

Based upon the individual school readiness score, ISBE will host a Readiness Verification Interview with individual school team finalists and will assign a value not to exceed 15 additional points to the school readiness score based upon the interview criteria. In determining final awards, ISBE will review the funding request of each qualifying proposal to determine the total number of schools that can be funded based upon the amount of funding available.

An application will not be funded if it does not meet the minimum School Improvement Grant requirements outlined in the RFP. In order to ensure an equitable distribution of grants across the state, ISBE has divided the state into 10 geographic areas based on the state’s current Statewide System of Support. No single district residing in any of the 10 contiguous areas will be awarded more than 50 percent of the available funds. Funding prioritization will be based on the highest-ranked applications. The state will continue to fund eligible applications, resources permitting, so long as the district has satisfied all of the School Improvement Grant requirements.

(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.

The Illinois State Board of Education is requesting a waiver of the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) final requirements.

(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.

At this time, ISBE does not plan to take over any priority schools; however, ISBE retains the authority to take over a school, as provided in state and federal law. Section (E)(1) of the Illinois School Code provides the state superintendent of education with a full array of interventions that can be applied in underperforming schools and LEAs. If ISBE decides that takeover is necessary, the agency has established its capacity for this work through its prequalification process for Lead Partners, which also meet the state procurement requirements for ISBE to contract directly with several entities, if necessary, to undertake a direct state intervention. If and when the need for a direct state intervention arises, ISBE can act quickly to engage Lead Partners to provide on-the-ground resources for implementation of the most appropriate intervention, as determined by ISBE. Additionally, ISBE has established The Illinois Center for School Improvement to oversee the Statewide System of Support in the following core reform areas: 1) implementation of standards-aligned instructional systems, 2) use of data for continued improvement, 3) educator effectiveness and support, and 4) LEA and school innovations and interventions. The Illinois Center for School Improvement includes a specific unit dedicated to priority services / turnaround. ISBE will coordinate state intervention planning with the Illinois Center for School Improvement and establish timelines for action in specific LEAs that have not responded to the need for intervention in the state’s persistently lowest achieving schools.
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.

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.

ISBE is engaged in the state oversight of two districts, North Chicago and East St. Louis. At this time, no other districts are identified for state level interventions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.
ISBE will use its administration funds to pay for additional staff, evaluate the LEAs and the state 1003(g) program, and provide professional development training to the staff and contractors in order to provide additional technical assistance that is meaningful to the LEAs to assist them in the intervention models and other school improvement efforts. ISBE has also created the Illinois Center for School Improvement. (IL-Csi)

ISBE and IL-Csi staff will share accountability and responsibility for overseeing and coordinating targeted and coordinated services in the following areas:
1. Standards-aligned instructional systems,
2. Data-driven decision making for continued improvement,
3. Educator effectiveness,
4. Continuous LEA and school improvement, and
5. Interventions for the lowest performing schools.

IL-Csi personnel will design and support the use of a connected set of tools and resources to improve instructional practice and student performance on a continuing basis. IL-Csi will help articulate a systemic and coherent approach to improving LEAs and schools not just for the short term, but by helping to change fundamental structures, processes, and core functions that will lead to sustainable improvement. Additionally, the IL-Csi will designate a specific unit to supporting the implementation of effective turnaround strategies. IL-Csi staff will help translate evidence-based research into practice and train school improvement teams, coaches, and regional providers across the state in these effective practices. In these ways, the Illinois Center for School Improvement will bring coordination and coherence to the statewide system of support and provide training, professional development, tools, and resources for school improvement coaches, teams, and service providers throughout Illinois to better support the state’s lowest performing schools.

ISBE will generally use its 1003(a) School Improvement funds and state funding to establish, operate, and evaluate the effectiveness of the SSoS operated by IL-Csi in partnership with ISBE.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

X 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.

The State of Illinois 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.
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
X□ 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
X□ 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

Illinois 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.

X 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.
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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>NCES ID #</th>
<th>PRIORITY TIER</th>
<th>TIER I</th>
<th>TIER II</th>
<th>TIER III</th>
<th>INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY ONLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>turnaround restart closure transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA XX BUDGET</th>
<th>Year 1 Budget</th>
<th>Year 2 Budget</th>
<th>Year 3 Budget</th>
<th>Three-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-implementation</td>
<td>Year 1 - Full Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I ES #1</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
<td>$1,156,000</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I ES #2</td>
<td>$125,500</td>
<td>$890,500</td>
<td>$846,500</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I MS #1</td>
<td>$304,250</td>
<td>$1,295,750</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier II HS #1</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$1,470,000</td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
<td>$1,775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA-level Activities</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$6,279,000</td>
<td>$5,981,500</td>
<td>$5,620,000</td>
<td>$17,880,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>COHORT #</th>
<th>PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 awards\(^2\) 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.