

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Tennessee Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: Andrew Johnson Tower Department of Education 6th floor 710 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0379</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Debra E. Owens</p> <p>Position and Office: Associate Executive Director of Federal Programs</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address:</p> <p>Andrew Johnson Tower Department of Education 5th floor 710 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0379</p> <p>Telephone: 615 253-2588</p> <p>Fax: 615 253-5706</p> <p>Email address: Debbie.Owens@tn.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</p> <p>Timothy K. Webb</p>	<p>Telephone: 615 741-2731</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X _____</p>	<p>Date:</p>
<p>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.</p>	

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		
Part I	SEA Requirements	S-1
	A. Eligible Schools	S-1
	B. Evaluation Criteria	S-3
	C. Capacity	S-5
	D. Descriptive Information	S-6
	E. Assurances	S-11
	F. SEA Reservation	S-12
	G. Consultation With Stakeholders	S-12
	H. Waivers	S-13
Part II	LEA Application	L-1
	A. Assurances	L-1
	I. General Information	L-4
	A. Overview	L-4
	B. Funding Priority and Schools to be Served	L-6
	C. Funding	L-7
	D. Timeline and Milestones	L-7
	E. Reporting and Evaluation Requirements	L-8
	F. Application, Application Review and Grant Award	L-8
	II. SIG Schools	L-10
	A. Schools to be Served	L-10
	B. Tier I or III Schools Eligible to be in the State ASD	L-10
	C. Tier III Schools to be Served	L-11
	D. Schools that the LEA will not Serve	L-11
	III. LEA Annual Student Achievement Goals	L-12
	IV. LEA Descriptive Information	L-13
	V. LEA Capacity	L-14
	VI. Budget	L-17
	VII. School Level Descriptive Information	L-19
Appendix A	Tier I, II and III Schools (Determined in 2009-2010)	
Appendix B	Title I School Improvement Grant Rubric 2010-2013	
Appendix C	Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process (TSIPP) Component 4	
Appendix D	What is a Good School (WAGS)? Appraisal Guide & Rubric	
Appendix E	School Improvement Grant (SIG) Final Requirements	
Appendix F	Tennessee Pyramid of Intervention/Model Questions	
Appendix G	Framework for Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (TCSPP) Component 5	
Appendix H	TCSPP 2008 Rating Sheet	
Appendix I	Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process(TSIPP) SIP Planning Rubric	
Appendix J	External Providers Form	
Appendix K	Budget Spreadsheet	

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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.

**Tennessee State Board of Education (SBE) Identification of *Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools* submitted to USED is as follows:**

Two “tiers” of low achieving schools compose the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

- **Tier 1** – Any Title I high priority school (a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as defined in ESEA) that is either in the lowest five percent of all Title I high priority schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts combined achievement or is a Title I secondary school (defined as a high school in TN) with a graduation rate of less than 60% (for two out of the last three years). In Tennessee, there are 10 identified Tier 1 schools in 2009-2010.
- **Tier 2** – Any Title I secondary school eligible but not “served” by Title I that is in the lowest five percent of these schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts combined achievement or has a graduation rate of less than 60% (for two out of the last three years). In Tennessee, there are five identified Tier 2 schools for 2009-2010.

The State of Tennessee has the following process for identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools, referred to as Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools.

The lowest-achieving five percent is calculated by the numerical rank within each pool of schools (Title I high priority schools and Title I eligible but not served high schools). The numerical rank is determined based upon the following series of calculations:

- 1) The current year math score for all students is ranked;
- 2) The current year reading/language arts score for all students is ranked;
- 3) The math and reading/language arts ranks are summed for current year rank;
- 4) Two prior years are ranked using the same method;
- 5) Two prior year ranks are averaged for prior years rank;
- 6) Current year rank and prior years rank are summed to create the combined rank;
- 7) If a school has failed adequate yearly progress (AYP) 6 years or more, the combined rank was multiplied times 6 (lack of progress factor) for the final rank.

**Notes:**

High priority schools are defined as schools with an improvement status or those in improvement, corrective action, or any form of restructuring as specified in ESEA. Elementary and secondary schools are weighted equally.

Schools with N count less than 10 for AYP determinations that are not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have been removed from the school list and are not included in the rankings.

PK-2 schools with no AYP status from a receiving school have been removed from the school list and are not included in the ranking.

For schools serving both grade spans, high school achievement data is used.

Secondary schools are defined as high schools.

- 
- **Tier 3** - In addition, Tier 3 schools are any Title I high priority school (a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as defined in ESEA) that is not Tier 1; therefore, did not rank in the lowest 5% of all Title I high priority schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts achievement nor is a high priority high school with a graduation rate of less than 60%.

Tier 3 newly eligible schools only include Title I secondary (TN high schools) who successfully participated in high school School Improvement Grants (SIG) redesign funds in 2008-09 and did not make AYP for two years (2007-08 and 2006-07).

The table with the eligible schools and their qualifying information is in Appendix A.

**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:

A. The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

**RESPONSE: The SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. This rubric ensures that a LEA has determined the needs of the school and selected an appropriate intervention model for Tier I and/or Tier II schools. (Appendix B: SIG Scoring Rubric) Each school is required to complete a Tennessee School Improvement Plan Process. Tennessee has consolidated the planning process so that the Tennessee School Improvement Plan Process (TSIPP) analyzes needs of the school and addresses how various funding sources (SIG, IDEA, CTE, Title I, etc) will be utilized to meet student needs. Exemplary Educators/Achievement Gap Educators, who are highly trained in working with data, are assigned to individual schools to assist the school leadership team with the development of the TSIPP. TSIPP includes: defining each school’s beliefs, common mission, and shared vision and detailed data collection and analysis. From this detailed analysis of data, school and student needs are identified. The information is then distilled into prioritized student needs and prioritized goals. TSIPP Component 4 which include goals, action steps, and implementation plans must match the identified needs supported by the data. Appendix C: TSIPP Component 4 is attached to each application for thorough review. Schools will also be encouraged to complete a ‘What is a Good School’ evaluation (Appendix D: WAGS).**

B. The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

**RESPONSE: The SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. This rubric ensures that a LEA has the capacity to implement their selected intervention model fully and effectively. Items 13-18 on the rubric (Appendix B: SIG Scoring Rubric) are used as primary indicators of LEA capacity. LEAs must score a “Yes” on each item: modifying policies and practices, plans for sustainability, LEA support to implementation, realistic timelines, plans for on-going evaluation/monitoring, and the district leadership support team. In cases where the LEA does not score “Yes”, additional evidence of capacity is required in the revision process.**

C. The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

**RESPONSE: SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. LEA's are required to submit a three year budget for each school including detailed budget justifications which link activities and funds. The SDE will verify that there are adequate funds to implement the selected intervention model for Tier I and Tier II and the school improvement activities for Tier III. The budget includes a section for district activities to support the implementation of the school improvement grants.**

## **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 how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

A. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

**RESPONSE: SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. During the scoring of the application, the required components of each intervention will be reviewed. LEAs are asked to answer a series of questions for the selected model. In addition, the LEAs are provided a copy of the final requirements with highlights covered in webinars/trainings. (Appendix E: SIG Final Requirements). The grant monitor, as well as the school improvement grant coordinator, will oversee the implementation of the model.**

B. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

**RESPONSE: SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. The LEA is required to list the qualifications of external providers and their selection protocols. The protocols may include educators' paper review of provider qualifications, interviews of providers, etc. The LEA must name an external provider and indicate if they are working for the LEA / district office and/or school site/s. The LEA must detail specific protocols for the whole school reform models required for schools in corrective action or restructuring 1. (Tennessee refers to these as Renewal Schools.) LEA will attach Appendix J: External Providers Form as part of the completed application, if applicable.**

C. Align other resources with the interventions.

**RESPONSE: SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. The LEA must identify additional resources that will be used to implement the intervention.**

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

**RESPONSE: The LEA will provide evidence that a review of LEA board policies/procedures and school handbooks have been reviewed to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively. If practices or policies are determined to impose barriers to the implementation of the intervention, the LEA will be required to review the policy or practice in a timely manner for modification. Barrier issues will be addressed with the district staff at milestone visits.**

E. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

**RESPONSE: SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application. The LEAs will sign an assurance stating that the reforms will be sustained.**

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

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

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

**RESPONSE: The SDE will carefully evaluate the sufficiency of any LEA that claims that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models. The SDE will review the LEA capacity on a case by case basis.**

**The LEA will be required to indicate in what area(s) it lacks this capacity: resources or support. The SDE will look at such areas as number of Tier I and Tier II schools, access/proximity to higher performing schools (closure model); recruiting ability for principals, especially for rural areas (turnaround and transformation models) ; EMO/CMO availability and capacity (restart model) ; relationship with teachers union; school board commitment; timeline, etc., in reviewing the LEA's capacity. If the SEA determines that the LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates, the SEA will require that the LEA fulfill the requirements or release that portion of the grant funds. SDE has created a rubric based upon the LEA application.**

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

(1) Describe the SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

**RESPONSE: The SEA's process for approving LEA applications is as follows:**

- A. SEA consultants will work with LEA and school staff during a Webinar and regional technical meetings regarding the application process, school intervention models, allowable uses of funds, etc. Approvable school improvement strategies based on their data must contribute to their achieving their annual measurable objectives to meet AYP and exit from improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status. The Exemplary Educators/Achievement Gap Educators/STAT will meet with the LEA and/or individual schools to assist with the selection of the intervention model.**
- B. The SDE will put out RFI or providers for school support services for Tier III schools, corrective action and restructuring 1, called Renewal Schools in Tennessee. (Appendix F: Tennessee Pyramid of Intervention)**
- C. Each school improvement grant application will be reviewed and evaluated for funding by an Exemplary Educator and an NCLB Field Service Consultant for grant compliance and quality of proposed interventions. Grants that reflect strong commitment to implementation of school improvement strategies will be funded as funds allow. Approval of grant applications will be done in a timely manner.**

**The SDE Tennessee SIG timeline is on the next page.**

### Tennessee SIG Timeline

Event	Dates
Informational Webinar for state staff and LEAs	November 2009
Preparatory Webinars for state staff and LEAs	February 8,12,16, 2010
State Department of Education (SDE) issues Request for Information (RFI) for Providers for School Support Services for Tier III Schools in corrective action or restructuring 1	March 2010
Posting of application to SDE/Federal Program website	March 15, 2010
Technical assistance meetings held by region	March-April, 2010
Applications due to the SDE	May 1, 2010
Grants reviewed and evaluated	May 15-30, 2010
Grant award notification letters sent to LEAs	June 1-July 1, 2010
Grant awards posted to state website	July 1, 2010
Implementation Year I	School Year 2010-11
Milestone Visits	Sept. 2010, Nov. 2010, Mar. 2011, May 2011
Evaluation of Year 1 for Year 2 funding by SDE	May-June 2011(dependent on student achievement data and SIG indicators)
LEA submission of updated budget/grant for Year 2/3	July 2011
New 2011-12 Tier 1, 2, 3 schools identified and beginning of new grant cycle (while continuing with prior grant cycle). A school may only be in one grant cycle.	Aug 2011
Implementation Year 2	School Year 2011-12
Milestone Visits	Sept. 2011, Nov. 2011, Mar. 2012, May 2012
Evaluation of Year 2 for Year 3 funding by SDE	May-June 2012(dependent on student achievement data and SIG indicators)
LEA submission of updated budget/grant for Year 3	July 2012
New 2011-12 Tier 1, 2, 3 schools identified and beginning of new grant cycle (while continuing with prior grant cycle). A school may only be in one grant cycle.	Aug 2012
Implementation Year 3	School Year 2012-13
Milestone Visits	Sept. 2012, Nov. 2012, Mar. 2013, May 2013
Grant evaluation reporting	July 2013

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

**RESPONSE: The SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for Tier I and Tier II schools will be done as follows:**

- A. LEAs will submit their district and school plans [Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (Appendix G: TCSPP, Component 5) and the Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process (TSIPP)], respectively, for review on an annual basis in their respective SEA Field Service Centers. These plans contain their annual goals for student achievement, which will also be required to be incorporated into their School Improvement Grants.**
- B. Any Tier II school that did not have an improvement status and thus not required to submit its TSIPP will be required to do so this year. The TSIPP will be reviewed and approved prior to the renewal or approval of the full grant award amount. Tier II schools in good standing will be awarded partial School Improvement Grant funding based upon their goals and the improvement plan submitted with the School Improvement Grant application.**
- C. Verification of approval of the goals will be part of the LEA grant application.**
- D. Achievement School District is a SDE takeover option and is considered an LEA for this purpose.**

**If one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those annual student achievement goals and making progress on the leading indicators, the SDE will determine whether to renew an LEA's SIG based on grant implementation as well as the progress of the other schools toward meeting their goals.**

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

**RESPONSE: The SDE's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for Tier III schools will be done as follows:**

- A. LEAs will submit their district and school plans [TCSPP and the TSIPP, respectively,] for review on an annual basis in their respective SDE Field Service Centers. These plans contain their annual goals for student achievement, which will also be required to be incorporated into their School Improvement Grants.**
- B. Any newly eligible Tier III school is required to submit its plan this year and have the plan reviewed as a condition to receive the grant.**
- C. Verification of approval of the goals will be part of the LEA grant application.**
- D. If one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals, the SDE will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant. The SDE may reduce the amount of the grant for the school(s) not being renewed.**

Refer to Appendix H for the TCSPP Rating Sheet and Appendix I for TSIPP Scoring Rubric.

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

**RESPONSE:** State education consultants, fiscal consultants, and support staff will be assigned to coordinate the distribution, oversight of grant awards, and provide technical assistance throughout the grant period. The monitoring of LEAs that receive SIG grants is a three pronged process:

1. **Quarterly milestone visits** – A grant monitor will be assigned to each school to make milestone visits to the school to meet with the principal and other appropriate school and district personnel. Milestone visits will review programmatic implementation and uses of SIG funds to ensure that expenditures are contained in the grant proposal. The grant monitor will coordinate necessary grant addenda or budget amendments.
2. **Annual fiscal and programmatic monitoring** – State NCLB consultants, who typically monitor Title I programs, will monitor each LEA receiving SIG grant funds. The monitoring process will include:
  - a. **Documentation of how LEA TCSP and school(s) improvement plans were amended to incorporate activities, timelines and milestones for implementation of the intervention model or evidence-based school improvement strategies identified in the application.**
  - b. **Appropriate use of SIG funds.**
  - c. **Implementation of strategies according to time line proved in the LEA and school level descriptive information.**
  - d. **Increased achievement in the ALL or subgroup category where the school did not meet the LEA or SDE benchmarks.**

**Annual performance reports** – LEAs receiving SIG grants will be required to submit annual performance reports to the SEA.

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

**RESPONSE:** If the SDE does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies, priority will be given to LEAs seeking funds for either Tier I or Tier II schools. Tier I and Tier II schools will be given priority for receipt of funds. If funds are available after Tier I and Tier II schools, Tier III schools will be funded.

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

**RESPONSE: The SDE intends to use the following criteria to prioritize Tier III schools:**

- A. Tier III schools that are in restructuring 2 or beyond (heading for ASD)**
- B. Tier III schools that are renewal schools (schools in corrective action or restructuring I status,**
- C. Tier III high schools currently implementing High School ReDesign,**
- D. Tier III high schools not currently implementing High School ReDesign,**
- E. Tier III middle schools,**
- F. Tier III elementary schools.**

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

**RESPONSE: SEA plans to create a state Achievement School District (ASD) as authorized by Tennessee Code Annotated. The ASD can be composed of schools in Tier I or a school with the status of restructuring 2 and beyond. In March/April of 2010, a decision will be made as to which schools will be in the ASD for the following year. During 2010-2011 the SDE will implement the restart model with each school enrolled in the ASD. Schools will remain in the state ASD for 4 years (this is based upon the Race to the Top plan). Schools may be allowed to present an alternative to the ASD to the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner of Education will decide which schools will be entered into the ASD during the school year. Please refer to Appendix A for the list indicating those schools eligible for ASD. The state does not have the authority to take over any Tier II schools unless they are in restructuring 2 or beyond.**

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.<sup>1</sup>

**RESPONSE: N/A**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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:

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

**F. SEA RESERVATION: An 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 the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

**RESPONSE:** The 5% reservation will support the administration of the School Improvement Grants and be will be consolidated with the other NCLB funds. State educational consultants, fiscal consultants, and support staff will be assigned to coordinate the distribution, oversight of the grant awards, and provide technical assistance throughout the grant period. These funds will provide for a grant monitor to be assigned to every Tier 1, 2, or 3 school who receives funding. The grant monitor will schedule the quarterly milestone visits with the appropriate school and district personnel. Milestones visits will review programmatic implementation and uses of SIG funds to ensure that expenditures are contained in the grant proposal. The grant monitor will coordinate necessary grant addenda or budget amendments. In addition, fiscal and programmatic annual monitoring will be done with each LEA receiving SIG funds with state NCLB consultants who typically monitor the LEA Title programs.

Funds will also be used to provide webinars, trainings on how to complete and implement the LEA SIG application. SDE staff and Exemplary Educators or Achievement Gap Educators will be available to consult with the LEAs on their application and intervention model or strategies.

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

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

- The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application on February 3, 2010.

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

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including the Tennessee State Board of Education.

**H. WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must list in its application those requirements for which it is seeking a waiver.**

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

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

- Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- 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 or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.
- Waive to exclude schools below a minimum N and from the schools identified as persistently lowest achieving schools.

The SDE assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

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

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

The SDE assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, 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, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.