





Item #2 - School Improvement Grant

Background: Section 1003(g) of NCLB allows a state to apply for additional school improvement funds to assist Vermont's most struggling schools by providing funds and technical assistance. This specific program sunsets upon the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act in the 2017-18 school year but the United States Department of Education (USED) has made the last 2 years of funds available. Vermont has decided to apply for the funds as the goals and requirements closely align with our plan to assist struggling schools under ESSA. If successful, the grant will provide an additional 2.2 million dollars for this work with the bulk of the funds granted to LEAs for the schools. USED has allowed a waiver with the grant that would give us up to 5 years to use the funds.

Part of the work of the Committee of Practitioners is to review and comment on Title grants submitted to USED. Please review the attached proposal before the meeting. There will be a presentation of the proposal and time allowed to discuss and comment on the proposal.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Vermont Agency of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 219 North Main Street Suite 402 Barre, VT 05641
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Josh Souliere Position and Office: Assistant Director, Education Quality Contact's Mailing Address: 219 North Main Street Suite 402 Barre, VT 05641 Telephone: (802) 479-8660 Fax: (802) 479-4360 Email address: josh.souliere@vermont.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Rebecca Holcombe	Telephone: (802) 479-1030
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.	

School Improvement Grants

Application for Fiscal years 2015 and 2016

New Awards Competition

Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left
Behind Act of 2001

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Vermont



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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (authorized under section 1003(g) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by No Child Left Behind (ESEA). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by No Child Left Behind (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. The Department published final requirements for the SIG program in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). In 2015, the Department revised the final requirements to implement language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, and the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, that allows LEAs to implement additional interventions, provides flexibility for rural LEAs, and extends the grant period from three to five years. The revisions to the requirements also reflect lessons learned from four years of SIG implementation. Finally, since the final requirements for the SIG program were published in 2010, 44 SEAs received approval to implement ESEA flexibility, pursuant to which they no longer identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. To reflect this change, the revised requirements make an LEA with priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools, and focus schools, which are generally the schools within a State with the largest achievement gaps, eligible to receive SIG funds. The SIG final requirements, published on February 9, 2015, are available at <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, provided approximately \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 provided approximately \$450 million in FY 2016.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas is eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2015 and FY 2016 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2015 and FY 2016 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. The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2015/2016 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

Each SEA should submit its FY 2015/2016 application to its individual State mailbox address at: [OSS.\[State\]@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.[State]@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:

Michael Wells, Group Leader
Office of State Support, OESE
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W103
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 no later than May 27, 2016.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact your OSS State contact or Michael Wells at (202) 453-6689 or by e-mail at Michael.Wells@ed.gov. Additional technical assistance, including webinars for State staff, will be provided in the spring.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Vermont Agency of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 219 North Main Street Suite 402 Barre, VT 05641
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Josh Souliere Position and Office: Assistant Director, Education Quality Contact's Mailing Address: 219 North Main Street Suite 402 Barre, VT 05641 Telephone: (802) 479-8660 Fax: (802) 479-4360 Email address: josh.souliere@vermont.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Rebecca Holcombe	Telephone: (802) 479-1030
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

The directions below indicate information an SEA must provide in its application for a School Improvement Grant. Where relevant, these directions distinguish between the information that must be provided by SEAs that have approved requests for ESEA flexibility and those that do not. For any section that is not applicable to a particular SEA, the SEA should write “Not Applicable.”

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

For SEAs not approved for ESEA Flexibility: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools and Eligible Schools: As part of its FY 2015/2016 application, an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. 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.

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.

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

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2015/2016 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years.

For SEAs approved for ESEA flexibility: Eligible Schools List: Each SEA should provide a link to the page on its Web site or a link to the specific page(s) in its approved ESEA flexibility request that includes a list of its current priority and focus schools. That list should clearly indicate which schools are SIG-eligible (*i.e.*, meet the definition of priority or focus school in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*). Not Applicable

For all SEAs: Awards not renewed, or otherwise terminated: 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 2016-2017 school year. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, reason for nonrenewal or termination, the amount of unused remaining funds, and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds. **If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart: Not Applicable**

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:					

B. STATE-DETERMINED MODEL (OPTIONAL)

An SEA may submit one State-determined model for the Secretary’s review and approval. Submission of a state-determined model is not required. An SEA that previously submitted, and received approval for, a State-determined model need not re-submit that model. (*Check applicable box below*)

- SEA is submitting a State-determined model for review and approval. (Please attach to the application.)
- SEA is not submitting a State-determined model.

To be approved, a State-determined model must meet the definition of whole-school reform model:

A whole-school reform model is a model that is designed to:

- (a) Improve student academic achievement or attainment;
- (b) Be implemented for all students in a school; and
- (c) Address, at a minimum and in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, each of the following:
 1. School leadership
 2. Teaching and learning in at least one full academic content area (including professional learning for educators).

3. Student non-academic support.
4. Family and community engagement.

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

The actions listed in this section are ones that an LEA must take to receive 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 these criteria.

If applicable, the SEA should attach an LEA application review rubric that it will use to evaluate each of the actions listed below. If a rubric is attached, provide relevant page numbers below and a description if needed. If a rubric is not attached, provide a description of the evaluation criteria to be used.

Check here if an LEA application review rubric is attached.

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school that is designed to meet the specific needs of the school, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the school improvement needs identified by families and the community, and takes into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention for each school.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 1

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (2) The LEA has designed and will implement interventions consistent with the SIG requirements.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Pages 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (3) The LEA has demonstrated it will use the School Improvement Grants funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 6, 8, 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:

(4) The LEA has demonstrated how it has, or will, recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

(5) The LEA has demonstrated how it will align other resources with the selected intervention.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 8, 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

(6) The LEA has demonstrated how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

(7) The LEA has demonstrated how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school that it proposes to serve, such as by creating an LEA turnaround office.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 1

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

(8) The LEA has demonstrated how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 7, 8

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (9) The LEA has described how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 8, 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (10) The LEA has demonstrated how, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), it will implement one or more evidence-based strategies.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number in rubric: Page 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

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

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 1, 4, 8, 9

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (12) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that proposes to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA has described how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Page 1

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria:

- (13) An LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a whole school reform model developer, an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in a school, must demonstrate that (a) the evidence supporting the model includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the school to be served; and (b) it has partnered with a whole school reform model developer that meets the definition of "whole school reform model developer" in the SIG requirements.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria: The evaluation for this will be based on the entire rubric as well as an analysis of the proposed model and review of the model developer. A conversation would be held with the LEA to determine the depth of evidence being presented and the plan for implementation. That conversation, and the preparedness of the LEA to do the work, would determine the final decision on funding.

- (14) For an LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA has demonstrated that it will conduct a rigorous review process, as described in the final requirements, of the charter school operator, charter management organization (CMO), or education management organization (EMO) that it has selected to operate or manage the school or schools.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric:

The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide description of evaluation criteria: Charter schools are not a form of school operation that is utilized in the state of Vermont so it is highly unlikely that any of the identified schools will choose this model as their selected intervention. If that were to occur, the VT AOE would thoroughly review the application and meet with the LEA to discuss how to proceed.

D. LEA BUDGETS: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section C, the SEA must describe how it will evaluate an LEA's budget and application.

The SEA must describe how it will review each LEA's budget, including a description of the processes the SEA will use to determine if it is appropriate to award an amount different than that requested in the LEA's budget request.

*Please note that an SEA may make a SIG award to an LEA for up to five years for a particular school, of which the LEA may use one school year for planning and other pre-implementation activities and up to two school years for activities related to sustaining reforms following at least three years of full intervention implementation. The LEA budget should address the entire grant period. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding for a particular school.

VT AOE requests that the LEA describe proposed funding allocations and budget narrative indicating how the LEA will allocate SIG funds over three years with separate budgets for each participating school. In the narrative section they will describe how they will align their proposed budget with their pre-implementation and implementation activities and timelines. SEA will assess to ensure the narrative explicitly addresses the required components from the chosen intervention model and that budgets are sufficient in size to accommodate the aligned scope of work. Ongoing progress monitoring will occur to ensure fidelity to proposed plan and actions.

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

LEA application timeline (proposed)

August 26, 2016	Application and instructions released to the field
October 14, 2016	Applications due to AOE
October 17 – November 11, 2016	Review period
November 18, 2016	Notifications made
December 1, 2016	Awards made to LEAs (these will be multi-year awards)

At a minimum, the timeline should include information regarding when the:

- (1) SEA will notify LEAs about the SIG competition;
- (2) LEA applications are due to the SEA;
- (3) SEA will conduct its review of LEA applications;
- (4) LEAs will be notified about their award status; and
- (5) SEA will award FY 2015/2016 SIG funds to LEAs.

Additionally, the SEA should specify if it is using FY 2015/2016 funds to make two-year awards or multi-year awards, through a waiver of the period of availability of funds, to grantees.

F. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information below.

- (1) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority and focus schools, as applicable, and describe 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 or focus schools, in an LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.
- (2) Describe the SEA’s process for renewing the SIG award of an LEA that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities for a school, including the SEA’s process for reviewing the performance of the school against the LEA’s approved application to determine whether the LEA will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention for the school beginning the first day of the following school year.

Vermont Agency of Education (VTAOE) will be engaged with the LEA and school during the planning and pre-implementation phase of the SIG grant as part of the technical assistance and monitoring process. Through this work, the VTAOE team will be able to ascertain the school leadership and LEA’s ability (readiness and capacity) to support the school going into the first full year of implementation based upon the criteria built into the technical assistance and monitoring protocol. The point of this process and the VTAOE involvement is to ensure that the LEA and the school are ready to implement fully when the time comes. By supporting the LEA and the school leadership, VTAOE staff can assist with planning, implementation and review allowed by Vermont’s small state status. Because VTAOE will be giving out

a small number of grants (likely no more than 6), the Agency has the capacity to manage technical assistance and monitoring to ensure each LEA can move into the implementation phase of the award period.

- (3) Describe how the SEA will monitor, including the frequency and type of monitoring (*e.g.*, on-site, desk, self-reported) 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 priority and focus schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.
- (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.
- (5) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.
- (6) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable 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.

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

By submitting this application for new awards, the SEA assures that it will do or has done the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Consult with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in this application.
- 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 or focus school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Award each School Improvement Grant to an LEA based on an individual review of each application and a case-by-case determination of the amount needed to plan for implementation, as applicable, to fully implement a model, and sustain the model, as applicable, rather than make grant awards based on a formula.
- 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, including charter school operators and CMOs, to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- 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.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or CMO 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 each LEA's 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 or priority and focus school, as applicable. An SEA must post all LEA applications, including those of applicants that did not receive awards, as well as applications to serve Tier III schools. Additionally, if an LEA amends an application, the SEA will post the amended application.

Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, seek and obtain approval from the LEA to have the SEA provide the services directly prior to providing services.

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

H. 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 (e.g. funding staff positions, supporting statewide support, etc.) that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grants allocation.

The Vermont AOE will allocate administrative funds to the following priorities:	
Planning	Costs associated with the development of supporting documents for effective implementation (estimated 20% of funds allocated)
Technical Assistance and Support	Costs associated with the planning and delivery of regional professional learning sessions and networked improvement community sessions (estimated 40% of funds allocated)
Monitoring and Evaluation	Costs and salaries associated with progress monitoring checks and evaluation processes and documentation (estimated 40% of funds allocated)

I. 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.

Vermont requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. The SEA 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 and focus schools, as applicable, or will allow any 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.

Part 1: Waivers Available to All States

Waiver 1: Period of availability of FY 2015 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2015 funds for the purpose of making three- to five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2017, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2015 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2021.

Waiver 2: Period of availability of FY 2016 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2016 funds for the purpose of making three- to five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2018, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2016 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2021.

Part 2: Waivers Available Only to States Not Approved for ESEA Flexibility

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 2015/2016 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2015/2016 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: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2014 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2015/2016 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a SIG model in the 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I or Tier II title I participating schools that will fully implement a SIG model beginning in the 2016–2017 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 a SIG model beginning in the 2016–2017 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 and Tier II 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 4: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2014 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2015/2016 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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 and is fully implementing one of the seven school intervention models.

Assurances

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of School Improvement Grant funds to eligible LEAs. SEAs should attach their LEA application.

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 and focus 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 and focus school, as applicable.

The models the LEA may include are: (1) turnaround; (2) restart; (3) closure; (4) transformation; (5) state-determined model, if approved; (6) evidence-based whole school reform model; and (7) early learning model.

Example (LEAs in an SEA approved for ESEA flexibility):

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY	FOCUS (if applicable) ²	INTERVENTION
Priority School ES #1	xxxxx	X		turnaround
Priority School HS #1	xxxxx	X		state-determined model
Priority School MS #1	xxxxx	X		transformation
Priority School ES #2	xxxxx	X		turnaround

Example (LEAs in an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility):

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II only)
Tier I ES #1	xxxxx	X			turnaround
Tier I ES #2	xxxxx		X		early learning model
Tier I MS #1	xxxxx	X			transformation
Tier II HS #1	xxxxx	X			state-determined model

²An LEA in which one or more priority schools are located must serve all of these schools before it may serve one or more focus 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 and focus 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, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for

each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.

- (2) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, early learning model, or state-determined model.
- (4) 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 and focus 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 on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.
- (5) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- (6) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.
- (7) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.
- (8) The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve (for example, by creating an LEA turnaround office).
- (9) The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.
- (10) The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (11) The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.
- (12) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that receives school improvement funds including by
 - a. Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - b. Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (13) An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.
- (14) For an LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the

activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.

- (15) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.
- (16) For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will
 - a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and
 - b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.
- (17) For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.
- (18) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA's application.
- (19) 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.
- (20) 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.

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 and focus school, it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use in each school it proposes to serve and the funds it will use to —

- 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 and focus schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application (SEAs without ESEA flexibility only).

Note: An LEA's budget should cover all of the years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I, Tier II, priority, or focus 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 budget plan. Additionally, an LEA's budget may include up to one full academic year for planning activities and up to two years to support sustainability activities. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding to serve a single school.

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 and focus schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

Example: LEA Proposing a Planning Year for One or More Schools

LEA XX BUDGET

Note:
to imp
serve.
the LE

An LE
to serv

	Year 1 Budget (Planning)	Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five- Year Total
Priority ES #1	\$150,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,100,000	\$750,000	\$4,356,000
Priority ES #2	\$119,250	\$890,500	\$795,000	\$750,000	\$500,750	\$3,055,500
Priority HS #1	\$300,000	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$650,000	\$5,245,750
Focus MS #1	\$410,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,775,000	\$1,550,400	\$550,000	\$5,755,400
LEA-level Activities			\$150,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$400,000
Total Budget	\$879,250	\$4,812,250	\$5,520,000	\$4,950, 400	\$2,550,750	\$18,812,650

Example: LEA Proposing to Implement a Model in One or More Schools on the First Day of the Upcoming School Year

LEA XX BUDGET							
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 (Full Implementation)					
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$650,000	\$450,000	\$5,038,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$2,907,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$5,550,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$800,000	\$550,000	\$7,085,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$1,000,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$2,200,000	\$1,500,000	\$21,580,500

Note: An LEA may fill out both charts if it is applying for a planning year for some, but not all, of the schools it proposes to serve.

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 and focus 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 and focus 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) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- (4) Ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus 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.

E. WAIVERS: If an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility 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. **NOTE:** Only LEAs in SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility may request the following waivers.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a SIG 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 Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/2016 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2015 and/or FY 2016 SIG funds. If no continuation awards will be made with FY 2015 and/or FY 2016 funds, indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	YEAR SCHOOL BEGAN SIG IMPLEMENTATION	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 15/FY 16 ALLOCATION
		(e.g. 2013-14 school year)	
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 15/FY16:			

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 date of nonrenewal or termination, description of reason for nonrenewal or termination, 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). If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:					

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2015/2016 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2015/2016 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards³ to its LEAs unless the SEA has an approved new awards application.
- Use the renewal process described in Section II(C) of the final requirements 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 and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- 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 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.
- If the SEA approves any amendments to an LEA application, post the LEA's amended application on the SEA website.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

For states planning to use FY 2015 and FY 2016 SIG funds for continuation awards only: By submitting the assurances and information above, the SEA agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a FY 2015/2016 SIG application for new awards; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the application for new awards (page 3).

³ 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 2016–2017 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2015 or FY 2016 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

VT SIG Eligible Schools

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ^[1]
Barre SU	5000007	Barre City Elementary/Middle	500201000055	X				X
Burlington SD	5099915	Edmunds Middle School	500282000066	X				X
Caledonia North SU	5099908	Lyndon Town School	500531000436	X				X
Franklin Central SU	5099923	St. Albans City Elementary School	500756000304	X				X
Franklin Northwest SU	5099921	Missisquoi Valley UHSD #7	500562000195	X				X
Milton Town SD	5099910	Milton Elementary School	500561000437	X				X
Rutland City SD	5099940	Rutland Senior High School	500705000271	X				
Rutland City SD	5099940	Rutland Intermediate School	500705000075	X				X
Rutland City SD	5099940	Rutland Middle School	500705000468	X				X
Rutland Northeast SU	5099936	Otter Valley UHSD #8	500630000234	X				X
Southwest Vermont SU	5099905	Mt. Anthony Middle School	500581000463	X				X
Southwest Vermont SU	5099905	Mt. Anthony UHSD #14	500581000208	X				X
St. Johnsbury SD	5099911	St. Johnsbury School	500765000181	X				

The schools on this list have spent 8 or more years making less than adequate yearly progress. The newly eligible schools moved from Tier III in 2010 to Tier I in 2016.

^[1] “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years.

The following model for whole school reform will be applied by all schools receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds. These funds can be used only by those eligible schools with approved SIG applications and not by other *non-SIG schools* within the SU/SD (LEA). SIG funds cannot be used for LEA level activities. By accepting these funds, SIG schools must commit to implementing the Vermont Model for Whole School Reform—or comparable approved model—with fidelity, for all students in the school. In working toward each quality criterion, schools must implement improvement strategies for all five areas of the plan, including all requirements within each component.

Vermont Model for Whole School Reform Education Quality and Continuous Improvement Model

This model represents Vermont’s system of support for education quality and continuous improvement, serving to:

- help LEAs effectively implement the [Vermont Education Quality Standards](#) (EQS) which serves as the State’s definition of a well-rounded education;
- help LEAs identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement;
- promote inquiry and internal accountability focused on personalized, proficiency-based learning and high levels of achievement;
- support educators in making effective improvement planning decisions;
- build coherence in and across LEAs; and
- advance continuous improvement efforts that positively influence students’ college and career readiness.

LEAs and schools that select the *Education Quality and Continuous Improvement Model* must commit to the following requirements:

I. School Leadership

The LEA will demonstrate in its application how it will ensure strong leadership at participating schools. Grant funds will be used to support mentorship and professional learning. Specifically, participating SIG schools must commit to the following actions:

- participation in a mentoring program, sponsored by VTAOE, Vermont Principals Association or other similar body;
- participation in the VTAOE sponsored Principal Professional Learning Communities; and
- engagement in all regional professional learning sessions offered by VTAOE Education Quality Team.



The LEA must develop a timeline for progress monitoring and indicate specific school and professional performance goals to determine retention or replacement of leadership. The LEA must justify these decisions in order to extend the grant funding.

1. The LEA must collaborate with a systems coach to assess and improve operational and organizational procedures, processes, and structures. These assessments and improvements must consider site-based needs and allow for flexibility in organizational structure and scheduling across schools in order for schools to customize innovations and strategic plans appropriately. The LEA will partner with the VTAOE Education Quality team to:
 - strengthen principal leadership competencies;
 - complete comprehensive needs assessments;
 - develop needs-based plans for continuous improvement;
 - apply rapid cycles of learning for implementing innovations and evidence-based strategies for improvement;
 - implement a collaborative inquiry approach for analyzing multiple sources of data (including student work and instructional practice); and
 - implement an instructional coaching program, using the VT AOE guidelines, *Coaching as Professional Learning: Guidance for Implementing Effective Coaching Systems*, in order to deepen professional learning and practice for the requirements under section II. Incumbent coaches must participate in the VTAOE sponsored Professional Learning Network Coaches' Professional Learning Communities.
2. The LEA must monitor the progress of all participating SIG schools. VTAOE technical assistance and support will occur in the form of in-person meetings and teleconferencing. LEA leadership teams must collaborate with the VT AOE Education Quality team at least quarterly; additional, ongoing support will be provided as needed.

EQS Quality Criteria for School Leadership:

3.2 The LEA and participating school staff must demonstrate a shared explanation of the vision and mission, how they were developed, and the relationship to instructional practices.

Schools must align instruction and practices with the vision and/or mission.

3.3 The LEA must provide evidence of processes and practices designed to deepen educators' understanding of the curriculum and refine instruction to improve and sustain student learning.

Schools must apply high-leverage, culturally responsive pedagogical practices daily; these practices must be aligned to student standards, curriculum, and assessments.

3.4 The LEA must develop or strengthen their comprehensive plan to develop educator and administrator professional learning and regularly review the plan to ensure alignment with needs with fidelity.

Schools must develop their own professional learning plans, both for school-wide needs and for educator needs; these plans must be aligned to this model, as well as the specific content area instructional needs of the school/the educators.

- 3.5 The LEA must provide professional learning, for educators and administrators, which is systemic, data-driven, ongoing, embedded, and evidence-based; professional learning builds capacity, contributing to a culture of learning.

Schools must engage in data-based collaborative inquiry during regular professional learning community meetings; these sessions should occur at least monthly.

II. Teaching and Learning

3. The LEA must develop and use a shared instructional framework and coordinated curriculum that is aligned with standards, instruction, and assessment. Participating schools must enact the shared instructional framework and curriculum on a daily basis. This practice must include the use of formative, interim, and summative assessments for the core academic areas of English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, and Science.
4. The LEA must develop, strengthen, and/or streamline (depending on current state) their local comprehensive and balanced assessment system, which must be aligned to EQS, curriculum, and instruction. This system must include formative, interim, summative and diagnostic measures for each of the core academic areas (ELA, Math, and Science) that are cognitively demanding. Schools will use achievement data and a multi-tiered system of supports to identify gaps, determine student needs, and make instructional and programmatic decisions, to accommodate all students equitably, based on student needs and learning preferences.
5. The LEA must help schools develop needs-based professional learning plans. Professional learning must be data-driven, ongoing, embedded, and related to the individual and collective needs of educators and administrators. LEAs must develop these plans in collaboration with principals, school leaders, and educators. All professional learning must be designed to deepen learning and build collective capacity within and across schools. Schools must devote a minimum of 2 hours per month to professional learning communities.

EQS Quality Criteria for Teaching and Learning:

- 1.1 Assessment is connected to the standards and curriculum, and results are used to inform decisions about instruction and interventions.

Schools must select or develop assessments that are directly aligned to student standards and curriculum; using a collaborative inquiry approach, educators must use results to adjust instruction and apply appropriate interventions.

1.2 The LEA must provide evidence of a comprehensive, balanced assessment system aligned to standards, curriculum, and instruction and including formative, interim, summative and diagnostic measures that are cognitively demanding.

Schools must strengthen and streamline their comprehensive assessment system, using the *Vermont Guidelines for Strengthening and Streamlining Comprehensive Assessment Systems*.

1.3 A clear emphasis of high levels of performance/achievement is evident across all core academic areas, **specifically Mathematics, ELA, and Science**. The LEA has a shared understanding of, and expectations for, high-quality instruction, as well as processes for setting clear, cognitively demanding goals for student achievement.

Schools must apply consistent processes and protocols for engaging in **collaborative inquiry** for **setting proficiency criteria and levels, examining student work, and examining pedagogy** by implementing:

- the Data Wise inquiry method for analyzing data (Boudett, City, and Murnane, 2013);
- developed, purpose-driven protocols for examining student work and consulting on problems of practice (from the [National School Reform Foundation](#) and the [School Reform Initiative](#));
- VT protocol for setting proficiency levels;
- Lesson Study (Lewis and Hurd, 2011), using VTAOE guidelines and vetted resources; and
- school-based instructional rounds (Teitel, 2013).

1.4 Learning is deepened through collaborative dialogue, inquiry, innovation and authentic, relevant learning experiences. Pedagogy is informed by evidence from research and is aligned to standards.

Schools engage in collaborative inquiry in professional learning communities and networked improvement/learning communities to test improvement innovations/interventions (using rapid learning cycles), continuously calibrate instructional practices, and learn from each other.

1.5 Students demonstrate a wide range of transferable skills in authentic learning experiences.

Schools must specifically teach transferable skills across the curriculum; these goals must be clearly stated in the instructional framework and/or coordinated curriculum.

1.6 The LEA must develop coordinated, written curriculum that is aligned with standards, instruction, and assessment and that builds knowledge on a continuum; this intended curriculum is enacted in participating schools.

Schools must develop and enact coordinated, written curriculum maps, including a full scope and sequence for all core academic areas (i.e., Math, ELA, and Science).

1.7 The LEA enacts a shared instructional framework including evidence-based, high-leverage practices, used appropriately in varied contexts.

Schools must apply the common instructional framework on a daily basis; evidence-based, high-leverage practices are embedded in instructional practice.

3.4 The LEA must develop a comprehensive plan for educator and administrator professional learning and regularly review the plan to ensure alignment with needs driven by student data and outcomes.

Schools must develop their own professional learning plans, both for school-wide needs and for educator needs; these plans must be aligned to this model, as well as the specific content area

instructional needs of the school/the educators; these plan will be reviewed by the VT AOE Education Quality Team.

- 3.5 The LEA must provide professional learning, for educators and administrators, which is systemic, data-driven, ongoing, embedded, evidence-based, and builds capacity.

Schools must engage in data-based collaborative inquiry during regularly professional learning community meetings; these sessions should occur at least monthly; documented meeting summaries and actions must be submitted to VT AOE Education Quality Team

- 3.6 A coherent system is in place for LEA and school teams to collaboratively use appropriate data sets to evaluate existing programs and instruction for effectiveness, modifying and adjusting in response to need(s).

Schools must apply a consistent method for analyzing data (i.e., Data Wise to make instructional and programmatic decisions).

III. Student Non-Academic Support

6. The LEA must appropriately and consistently apply the multi-tiered system of supports framework to identify student social-emotional needs and ensure sufficient and appropriate supports. These supports must include the following:

- Counseling and/or advisory services
- Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) and Restorative justice strategies
- Partnership services
- Trauma -sensitive training

EQS Quality Criteria for Student Non-Academic Support:

- 2.1 The LEA provides evidence of comprehensive personalized learning plans which meet the learning needs, interests, and aspirations of all students.

Schools must develop (in collaboration with students, parents, and community members) personalized learning plans for all students; these plans must be based on students' needs, interests and aspirations. Plans must be used during the learning process and reviewed on an ongoing basis.

- 2.2 The LEA provides all students, parents, families, and educators a shared understanding of the full ranges of pathways, programs, options and supports that are available.

Schools must construct and disseminate explicit, written communication to students and families, explaining the range of flexible pathways offerings and related supports.

- 2.3 The LEA demonstrates how students build on in-school and out-of-school experiences to further explore and reflect upon their interests, strengths, skills and education and career/life aspirations.

Schools must establish advisory structures to help students connect learning experiences with the skills, goals, interests, and aspirations indicated in their personalized learning plans.

2.4 The LEA demonstrates implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports framework in which educators differentiate instruction, adapt content and utilize digital tools and resources to create personalized learning opportunities that meet the diverse needs of students.

Schools must, on a daily basis, apply a multi-tiered system of supports to meet students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs.

4.2 Timely and tiered interventions, supported by a team approach, respond to individual student learning needs and well-being.

Schools must select and apply evidence-based, targeted and intensive interventions (or instructional adjustments) equitably, for all students, based on the data analyzed within the multi-tiered system of supports.

IV. Family and Community Engagement

7. The LEA, recognizing the integral role of family and community in supporting student academic success, must work systemically to include family and community as a necessary component for school improvement.

8. LEAs must develop or strengthen their plan for engaging families and community members, and post the plan on the school and LEA website. Schools must:

- educate family and community members about the Vermont Education Quality Standards by offering information sessions;
- develop community-based partnerships to strengthen their methods for engaging families and community members;
- Build or strengthen strategies for home-school communication and parent/family feedback, including newsletters, websites, and other forms of appropriate communication for their context; these strategies should be accessible to all; and
- promote family and community involvement in school-based initiatives and practices by organizing at least one event which engages families and community members in the academic and one event for non-academic practices within the school (e.g, curriculum night; math/literacy night; Saturday academies; science project night; Parent-led student conferences, and other strategies as determined through needs assessment and/or surveys.

EQS Quality Criteria for Family and Community Engagement:

4.3 Ongoing communication about school policies and practices is in place to allow students, educators and parents to monitor and support student learning.

Schools must develop regular, predictable methods for communicating with students and families (e.g., newsletters; email correspondence; website maintenance). These methods should be easily interpreted and accessible to all.

4.4. Staff, students, parents and school community promote and sustain student well-being and positive student behavior in a safe, accepting, inclusive, healthy learning environment.

Schools must adopt a positive behavior support approach (pbis) and clearly communicate the inherent processes and expectations to students, families, and community members.

4.5 The LEA must actively engage families and community members in building a shared vision and fostering supportive culture.

Schools must include families and community members in developing and/or enacting the school vision and mission for supporting student academics and well-being.

4.6 The LEA must actively promote a shared vision/theory of action for equity, continuous improvement and high expectations for all students and staff; this vision is effectively communicated to families and community members. The LEA must apply family and community-oriented recommended school strategies appropriately based on student needs.

4.9 The LEA must use a multi-tiered system of supports to provide appropriate academic, behavioral, and social-emotional interventions including counseling/trauma services, positive behavior supports and restorative justice strategies. LEAs must provide necessary professional learning for educators to implement strategies appropriately.

Schools must offer sufficient counseling services for all students and apply a consistent version of PBIS across grade band levels (i.e., consistent procedures for grades K-4/5, consistent procedures for grades 5/6-8; consistent procedures for grades 9-12.); Schools must also provide training in methods of restorative justice.

V. Monitoring Progress and Evaluating Results

9. SIG participating schools must identify goals for improvement directly connected to each of the five component areas of EQS:
 - Academic Proficiency (the core academic areas—ELA, Mathematics, and Science)
 - Personalization
 - High-Quality Staffing
 - Safe, Healthy Schools
 - Financial Efficiencies

SEA and the LEA will monitor progress of the schools receiving School Improvement Grants in the *Continuous Improvement Plan*.

References

Boudett, K. City, E. & Murnane, R. (2013). *Data Wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Teitel, L. (2013). *School-based instructional rounds: Improving teaching and learning across classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Lewis, C. & Hurd, J. (2011). *Lesson study step-by-step: How teacher learning communities improve instruction*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Vermont Agency of Education (2016). *Coaching as Professional Learning: Guidance for Implementing Effective Coaching Systems*.

State of Vermont
 219 North Main Street, Suite 402
 Barre, VT 05641
education.vermont.gov

[phone] 802-479-1030
 [fax] 802-479-1835

Agency of Education

Vermont Agency of Education
Application Cover Sheet

School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003[g]

DO NOT TYPE IN THIS SPACE	
Log Number	Date Received

LEA				
Lead Contact (First Name, Last Name)				
Title	Telephone	Fax Number	E-mail Address	
	()	()		
Legal School Name for the Priority School Identified in this Application				
Grade Levels Served by the School Identified in this Application			School NCES #	
Total Number of Students Served by the School Identified in this Application			School Address (Street, City, Zip Code)	
School Model Proposed to be Implemented in the Priority School Identified in this Application				
VT State Model	Restart	Transformation	Evidence-based	Turnaround
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Fill out this cover sheet and the following application completely, making sure to attach the requested documents and supporting information. The boxes will expand as you type. Please submit the document to ([insert email link here](#)) by 5:00 pm on ([insert date here](#)) with all supporting documentation. Applications should be submitted in Word Doc format only. Incomplete applications will not be considered for funding. Questions should be directed to Lori Dolezal (lori.dolezal@vermont.gov) or Donna Stafford (donna.stafford@vermont.gov) at Vermont AOE.

If the LEA is applying to support more than one school in the SU/SD for improvement, a single application can serve that purpose but information for each must be included in the narrative and the attached documentation, including budgets and timelines. Fill out one cover sheet for each school to be served.

LEA application timeline (proposed)

August 26, 2016

October 14, 2016

October 17 – November 11, 2016

November 18, 2016

Application and instructions released to the field

Applications due to AOE

Review period

Notifications made

Narrative

Needs Assessment:

A needs assessment must be conducted for the identified school. Please describe the process used to administer the needs assessment and root cause analysis (please refer to the AOE guidance and resources for comprehensive needs assessments ([insert link here](#))). Needs to be analyzed must include instructional programs, school leadership, school systems, and school infrastructure and incorporate those identified by families and the community. Selected interventions shall be aligned to the needs identified. Please attach the needs assessment to the application and complete the narrative in the space below.

Needs Assessment Narrative:

Selection of Improvement Model:

Consultation with stakeholders (educators, families, community members, school board, etc.) is required in the selection of the improvement model for the identified school. Please fill out the following table to confirm the type of input and stakeholder(s) consulted. Family and community input is required. School leader and teacher/educator input is strongly suggested. Add additional lines as needed.

Date of session	Type of Session	Stakeholder Group	Number of Participants

Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP):

Development and implementation of a continuous improvement plan (CIP) are critical to the success of the identified school's improvement. The identified school(s) may already have a CIP, or may be planning to create one during the SIG planning year. Please describe in the narrative space below what the plan is for creating or revising the CIP and explain the connection to the selected school improvement model for the identified school. ([link to CIP Template](#))

Continuous Improvement Plan Narrative:

LEA Capacity for School Improvement:

The LEA has to show capacity to support the identified school(s) in the selected improvement model. Please describe how the LEA has shown capacity to allocate appropriate resources and provide support to the improvement model. In this narrative, the LEA must describe the actions taken, or planned, in order to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the selected school improvement model. Even if a planning year is built into the grant application, how will the LEA be fully ready to support implementation with fidelity of the selected model on the first day of school in the beginning year of full implementation?

LEA Capacity Narrative:**LEA Planning:**

Describe the actions the LEA will take, and/or has already taken, to design and implement a plan consistent with the requirements of the selected school improvement model. Include a timeline (attached to the application) for the years of funding requested. If activities have taken place prior to the application, refer to those in the narrative and include on the timeline as Prior Work.

LEA Planning Narrative:**External Provider Review Process:**

Delineate below how the LEA will ensure the quality of external providers. Fill out each section with a plan to manage external providers at each level of engagement.

Recruit:	Screen:	Select:	Review:	Hold Accountable:

Resource Alignment:

How will the LEA align resources from a variety of sources in order to support the selected school improvement model? What actions have been, or will be, taken? Resources may include federal funds, local funds, etc. Reference to the attached budget is encouraged.

Resource Alignment Narrative:

LEA Support and Oversight of Improvement Model:

How will the LEA provide support and oversight to the school throughout the implementation of the selected school improvement model and beyond? What role will the LEA ask VTAOE to play in the implementation? Describe the steps that have been, and will be taken, to establish support and oversight to the school throughout the implementation and improvement process.

LEA Support Narrative:

LEA Policy/Practice Modification:

Describe what actions will need to be taken to modify general practices and/or policies (if necessary) in order to fully implement the selected school improvement model with fidelity. Include those at the LEA level as well as at the school level. (While specific examples are encouraged, deep detail is not required.)

Practice/Policy Modification Narrative:

Family & Community Engagement:

How will the LEA and school continue to engage families and the community after the selection of the school improvement model? What methods will be used to keep these stakeholders part of the improvement conversation and implementation in an ongoing basis? How will this be demonstrated throughout the implementation phase of the plan?

Family & Community Engagement Narrative:

Sustainability Plan:

Sustainability is critical to continuous improvement. How will the LEA and the school sustain the improvement and the reforms after the funding period ends? What resources and tools are available to continue the work? How will they be utilized?

Sustainability Narrative:

Evidence-Based Strategies:

Describe how at least one evidence-based strategy will be implemented in conjunction with the selected school improvement model. How will the strategy be chosen and how will it be applied in accordance with the selected improvement model? How will it be linked to the needs assessment and root cause analysis?

Evidence-Based Strategy Narrative:**School Monitoring:**

Describe how the LEA will monitor the selected school(s), including by establishing annual goals for student achievement on SBAC for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math as well as measuring progress on the other leading indicators as outlined in the SIG requirements ([Federal Register link](#)). (Double click on the Excel file below to add your data. Add more rows or columns to the table as necessary in order to include additional information.)

Baseline Data

Disaggregate	Group	Test Name	Number Tested	Average Scale Score	Total Percent Proficient and Above
All Students	All Students	i.e. SB Math Grade 03			
Disability	Special Ed				
English Language	ELL				
Family Income	FRL				
Gender	Female				
Gender	Male				
Migrant	Migrant				
Race/Ethnicity	American Indian or Alaskan Native				
Race/Ethnicity	Asian				
Race/Ethnicity	Black				
Race/Ethnicity	Hispanic				
Race/Ethnicity	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander				
Race/Ethnicity	White				

Achievement Goals – Complete for each grade level to be tested. Add more lines if necessary.

Grade Level	Subgroup	Year 1 Goal		Year 2 Goal		Year 3 Goal	
		Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA
	Female						

	Male						
	Migrant						
	Special Ed						
	ELL						
	FRL						
	American Indian or Alaskan Native						
	Asian						
	Black						
	Hispanic						
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander						
	White						

Leading Indicators	Baseline		Year 1 (2017 – 2018) Goal		Year 2 (2018 – 2019) Goal		Year 3 (2019 – 2020) Goal	
	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA
Number of minutes within the school year								
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup.								
American Indian or Alaskan Native								
Special Ed								
ELL								
FRL								
Male								
Female								
Asian								
Black								
Hispanic								
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander								
White								
Migrant								
Dropout rate								
Student attendance rate								
Number and percentage of students completed advanced coursework (e.g. AP/IB), early college or dual enrollment classes (HS only)								
Discipline incidents								
Chronic absenteeism rates								
Distribution of teachers by performance level on								

LEA's teacher evaluation system				
Teacher attendance rate				
4-year cohort graduation rate (HS only)				

Planning Year:
Describe the planning year activities. Include a detailed timeline (attach to application) and reference (identify the relationships/partnerships) how any partnerships with VTAOE or other agencies/organizations will be implemented and for what purpose. Include a description of how the activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected improvement model.

Planning Year Narrative:

Implementation Timeline:
Attach a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected improvement model in the selected school. If the applicant feels that a narrative is necessary to accompany the timeline, please include that below.

Implementation Timeline Narrative:

Evidence-Based, Whole School Reform Model:
If the LEA is choosing to implement an evidence-based, whole school reform model, describe how the model will be implemented with evidence of effectiveness. This evidence should include a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the selected school. In addition, the LEA must describe how it will partner with a whole school reform model developer as outlined in the SIG requirements (include link). For LEAs not utilizing this model, this section is not necessary.

Evidence-Based, Whole School Reform Model Narrative:

REAP Turnaround or Transformation Model Schools:
If an LEA is choosing the Turnaround or Transformation model, and is a REAP district, and is choosing to modify one of the elements of those models, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element. If an LEA is not choosing either of those models and is not a REAP district, this section is not necessary.

REAP Turnaround or Transformation Narrative:

LEA Assurances:

As a condition of the receipt of funds under the Vermont Agency of Education School Improvement Grant (SIG), the Local Education Agency (LEA) agrees to comply with the following Assurances.

Please check the box next to each assurance to demonstrate agreement. The LEA assures that it will:

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
- 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 and focus 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.
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- Ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus 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.

LEA Budget:

The LEA must submit a budget for the school improvement work. A Sample budget (including a planning year) is below. If the LEA is submitting for more than one school, they can be included in the same budget. Use the Grantium investments to complete the Budget Narrative and utilize the Investment template to guide how to fill out the investment strategies. [\(insert link to investment template\)](#)

LEA XXXX BUDGET						
	Year 1 Budget (Planning)	Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five- Year Total
School #1	\$25,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$425,000
School #2	\$25,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$375,000
LEA-level Activities	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$50,000
Total Budget	\$60,000	\$260,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$110,000	\$850,000

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

LEA responsibilities	Criteria/Indicator	Scale		
		Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	Requirement	Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	LEA has analyzed the needs of the school and selected an intervention based upon that assessment	Needs assessment is not referenced; selected intervention does not meet the identified needs of the school in a clear and connected way.	Needs assessment is referenced; selected intervention meets most of the identified needs. Connection between identified needs and intervention is not clear. Needs assessment is not clearly referenced.	Needs assessment is referenced in a clear and connected way; selected intervention meets the identified needs of the school in a clear and connected way.
	LEA has demonstrated how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of intervention for the school	LEA has a plan with very limited detail for how oversight and support will be provided to the school during implementation of the intervention. No individual has been designated to support the school at the LEA level.	LEA has provided a plan for oversight and support for the school but hasn't designated an individual at the LEA level to manage the work. The plan is adequate but needs more detail to be effective.	LEA has designated an individual who will support school in the implementation of the intervention. A clear and reasonable plan for oversight is included in the application.
	Overall, the LEA has demonstrated that it will implement one or more evidence-based strategy in accordance with the selected intervention	An evidence-based strategy is either not referenced or is not aligned with the selected intervention. The plan for implementation is unclear.	At least one evidence-based strategy is referenced and is aligned with the selected intervention. The plan for implementation is not completely clear.	Evidence-based strategies are referenced throughout the application and align clearly with the selected intervention. At least one strategy is clearly articulated and includes an implementation plan.
	If one of the schools is in a REAP district, and using the turnaround or transformation model with modifications, an explanation of how intent will be met is included.	Modification to model is identified but intent is not maintained through modification or intent is not explained to the extent that maintenance is clear.	Modification to model is identified and intent is present. Explanation needs more detail to be clear and connected to the model and to the improvement plan.	Even though modification is made, intent is clearly met through actions of LEA and school leaders. Alignment with improvement plan is clear and defined.
Professional Learning	Criteria/Indicator	Scale		
		Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	Requirement	Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

<p>Provision for internal and external structures for ongoing, embedded professional learning</p>	<p>Professional learning structures are in place yet are not embedded, ongoing or do not have a clear plan for sustainability. Reliance on a single provider system is clear and inadequate.</p>	<p>Structures are in place, either internally or externally, to support embedded professional learning. A clear plan is present to support this professional learning in a sustainable and ongoing way. Application is missing detail and/or professional learning is not embedded within the school and LEA.</p>	<p>Structures have been established, both internally and externally, to support and maintain embedded professional learning for teachers and school leaders. Clear plans are in place for sustaining these structures and maintaining ongoing professional learning.</p>
<p>Promotion of culture in which educators openly share resources, ideas and problems of practice</p>	<p>A culture of learning and sharing is not included in the narrative or investments of the application in relation to professional learning. Little to no reference is made to sharing of resources, ideas and/or problems of practice.</p>	<p>Sharing between educators of resources, ideas and/or problems of practice is referenced but not explicitly promoted as a component of day to day culture.</p>	<p>A structure is in place that encourages sharing and collaboration between educators. Ways for resources, ideas and problems of practice to be shared within the school are clearly stated in the application.</p>
<p>Intentional structures for regular professional learning community meetings to engage in collaborative inquiry around relevant student and educator data</p>	<p>A regular meeting schedule is not planned for or the intent of the learning community is not engaging in exploration of student and educator data. Connection to the local comprehensive assessment system is not present.</p>	<p>Regular meetings are scheduled around student and educator data. These meetings are either currently running or are planned for. Little explanation is given on the meeting plan and the role of the facilitator is unclear. Connection to the local comprehensive assessment system is unclear.</p>	<p>A regular meeting schedule is in place or has been arranged for. It is the role of someone on the school leadership team or other trained designated school leader to guide these meetings with intent to explore student and educator data. Reference is made to the local comprehensive assessment system.</p>

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

	Creation of structures that promote collaborative learning	Application does not reflect presence of embedded structures in the school and/or supported by the LEA that promote collaborative learning among the educators. A plan is not present or clearly defined that creates such structures.	Application contains reference to presence of embedded structures to promote collaborative learning among school educators. A plan is defined to utilize these structures going forward in alignment with the selected improvement model. More definition is required to fully understand implementation and usage of the structures.	Application contains clear references to presence of embedded structures to promote collaborative learning among school educators and support by the LEA. A plan is defined to utilize these structures going forward in alignment with the selected improvement model. The plan is well developed and clear.
Personalized Learning Environment	Criteria/Indicator	Scale		
	Requirement	Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	Students have personalized learning plans	Students do not have individual personalized learning plans, or do not have a clear voice in the development of their learning plans.	Students have a voice in the development of their personalized learning plans and the plans are connected to the selected school improvement model.	Students have a clear voice in the development of their individual personalized learning plans. The intent to connect student plans to the school improvement model is clear and personalization is in the forefront of student success.

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

			It is clear from the application narrative that the identified school(s) are dedicated to supporting a personalized learning environment. Multiple specific examples are present in the application and personalized learning is threaded through the suggested activities. The selected school improvement model demonstrates commitment to personalized learning.	
	Personalized learning environment	The application narrative does not clearly demonstrate that the identified school(s) has an environment conducive to, or consciously dedicated to, personalized learning.	It is clear from the application narrative that the identified school(s) is in process of developing and supporting a personalized learning environment. At least one specific example can be drawn out of the narrative to prove this point. The selected school improvement model demonstrates commitment to personalized learning.	
Practice and Performance	Criteria/Indicator	Scale		
	Requirement	Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	School leaders and educators have skills and knowledge necessary for large scale improvement	The narrative and described activities are not clearly demonstrating that the school and LEA leaders have the skills and knowledge necessary to conduct a large scale improvement. Partner organizations, including VTAOE, are not included to fill the gaps in knowledge.	The narrative is clear and the described activities demonstrate that either the LEA or the school leaders have most of the knowledge necessary to initiate and sustain the selected improvement model. The clarity of product, timeline and proposed activities is lacking specificity, thereby not supporting a clear depth of knowledge. Inclusion of partner organizations to fill some of the gaps is not clear.	It is clear from the application narrative and described activities that the school and LEA leaders have the knowledge and skills necessary to initiate and sustain the selected improvement model. The clarity of product, timeline and proposed activities, as well as the thoroughness of the application and the willingness to work with partners, families and the community support this depth of knowledge.

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

<p>Educators in the school have demonstrated a deep understanding of the process of student learning</p>	<p>Application narrative does not address student learning through the lens of personalization. Sufficient attention is not given to the activities around student learning in the selection or proposed implementation of the selected improvement model.</p>	<p>Application narrative makes connections between personalization of student learning and the selected improvement model. Student learning activities are referenced throughout the narrative. It is clear that educators are considering student learning in the development of the improvement process and timeline.</p>	<p>Application narrative makes clear and regular connections between personalized student learning and the selected improvement model. Student learning activities are referenced and supported throughout the narrative. It is clear that student learning is in the forefront of the improvement process and implementation timeline.</p>
<p>Educators in the school have demonstrated a deep understanding of the process of improving teaching</p>	<p>Application narrative does not address teacher improvement through the lens of personalization or learning communities. Sufficient attention is not given to the activities around teacher learning and improvement in the selection or proposed implementation of the selected improvement model.</p>	<p>Application narrative makes connections between personalization of teacher learning and the selected improvement model. Teacher learning activities are referenced throughout the narrative. It is clear that educators are considering teacher professional development in the development of the improvement process and timeline.</p>	<p>Application narrative makes clear and regular connections between personalized teacher learning and the selected improvement model. Teacher professional development activities are referenced and supported throughout the narrative. It is clear that teacher learning is in the forefront of the improvement process and implementation timeline.</p>
<p>Reference to VT based guidance documents</p>	<p>VT based guidance documents are not clearly referenced in the narrative or supporting application documentation.</p>	<p>VT based guidance documents are utilized in the creation of the narrative. One or two are referenced specifically in regard to implementing the selected improvement model.</p>	<p>VT based guidance documents are clearly utilized and referenced throughout the narrative. Multiple documents and templates are referenced and utilized in regard to implementing the selected improvement model.</p>
<p>Continuous Improvement</p>	<p align="center">Scale</p>		
<p>Requirement</p>	<p>Needs Major Revisions</p>	<p>Needs Minor Revisions</p>	<p>Allowable as Written</p>

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

<p>Current continuous improvement plan is attached</p>	<p>Current continuous improvement plan is not attached.</p>	<p>Current continuous improvement plan is attached but has no connection to the needs assessment presented.</p>	<p>Current continuous improvement plan is attached. Any incongruities between the current plan and the needs assessment are addressed through the proposed school improvement model.</p>
<p>Allocation of sufficient resources to improvement initiatives</p>	<p>Allocation of human and financial resources to the improvement initiatives is not clearly defined in a way that it is clear they are sufficient to accomplish the proposed activities. OR, the allocated human and/or financial resources are insufficient to accomplish the proposed initiatives.</p>	<p>Allocation of human and/or financial resources to the improvement initiatives are defined in the application. The resources are sufficient with conditions or the explanation is not thorough enough for true understanding of their sufficiency in accomplishing the proposed initiatives.</p>	<p>Allocation of human and financial resources are clearly defined and clearly sufficient to accomplish the proposed initiatives.</p>
<p>Plan for regular analysis and use of data to drive instructional and programmatic decisions</p>	<p>A data and analysis plan is loosely outlined or is not present. If present, the connection to instructional and programmatic decisions is not clearly outlined.</p>	<p>A data and analysis plan is present and outlined so that the connection to instructional and programmatic decision making is clear.</p>	<p>A data and analysis plan is present, structured and fully outlined. The connection to instructional and programmatic decision making is very clear and integral to the improvement model to be implemented.</p>
<p>Presence of a teacher and leader evaluation system</p>	<p>A teacher and leader evaluation system is either not present or one element (teacher or school leader) is not present; OR, the system is not explained such that the connection to the selected improvement model is clear.</p>	<p>A teacher and leader evaluation system is either present or planned with connection to the selected improvement model.</p>	<p>A teacher and leader evaluation system is present with planned expansion/revision in connection to the selected improvement model. OR, the current system is fully aligned with the selected improvement model.</p>

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

	Plans for self-assessment and monitoring	LEA and school have no outlined or very limited plans for self-assessment and monitoring built into the application.	LEA and school have outlined plans for self-assessment and monitoring in the application. The plans need more work to be functional and sustaining. The plans fit with the selected school improvement model.	LEA and school have outlined plans for self-assessment and monitoring in the application. The plans are well-thought out and fit with the selected school improvement model.
	Plans for building capacity around technical, human and social capital	The LEA and school have no outlined or very limited plans for building capacity around technical, human and/or social capital. If one or more of these elements has been addressed, the plans are limited in scope and may not fit with the selected improvement model.	The LEA and school have outlined plans for building capacity in each of the three areas and the plans fit with the selected school improvement model. More work is necessary to make the plans functional and sustaining.	The LEA and school have outlined plans for building capacity in each of the three areas and the plans fit with the selected school improvement model. The plans are well thought out but it's likely that more work is necessary to make the plans functional and sustaining.
Family Engagement	Criteria/Indicator	Scale		
	Requirement	Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	Plans for engaging parents and families in student learning and school culture	The LEA and school have no outlined or very limited plans for engaging parents and families in student learning and school culture. If plans are present, they are only for parents and not other family members. Plans are not connected to the selected school improvement model.	The LEA and school have outlined plans for engaging parents and families in student learning and school culture and the plans fit with the selected school improvement model. More work is necessary to make the plans functional and sustaining.	The LEA and school have outlined plans for engaging parents and families in student learning and school culture and the plans fit with the selected school improvement model. The plans are well thought out but it is likely that more work is necessary to make the plans functional and sustaining.

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

<p>LEA has demonstrated how it will meaningfully engage families and communities in the implementation of the intervention in an ongoing basis</p>	<p>LEA has not demonstrated how it will engage families and community members in the implementation of the selected school improvement model. Connections between the model, activities and community engagement is weak or only present during the planning year.</p>	<p>LEA has made connections between the selected improvement model and activities to engage families and community members in ongoing implementation. The connections are present through all years of implementation. Activities are aligned with the selected model and realistic in implementation.</p>	<p>LEA has clearly articulated engagement activities for families and community members to support ongoing implementation of the selected improvement model. Activities are aligned with the model and present in all years of implementation.</p>
<p>Needs assessment includes input from family and community members</p>	<p>Needs assessment is either not attached to the application or does not include input from either families, community members or both.</p>	<p>Needs assessment is attached to the application and includes input from family and community members.</p>	<p>Needs assessment is attached to the application and includes meaningful input from family and community members. It's clear from the input that questions were thoughtful and purposeful for information gathering.</p>
<p>Budget/ Financial</p>	<p align="center">Scale</p>		
<p>Criteria/Indicator</p>	<p>Needs Major Revisions</p>	<p>Needs Minor Revisions</p>	<p>Allowable as Written</p>
<p>Clear investments referenced to plans for continuous improvement, needs assessment, professional learning, personalized learning and family engagement</p>	<p>Investments are partially aligned, or somewhat misaligned to the suggested work. They need considerable revision in order to be reasonable, necessary and allocable.</p>	<p>Investments align to the work planned but need some revision in order to be reasonable, necessary and allocable.</p>	<p>Investments are clearly written, follow the VT template, align to the work planned and are allowable, reasonable, necessary and allocable.</p>

Vermont LEA School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Rubric

Sustainability of reforms	A plan for sustainability after the end of the initial grant cycle is present but needs infusion of funds that are not guaranteed. Staffing levels are not clearly or adequately resourced going forward. Workloads are not sustainable and cannot be managed going forward.	A sustainability plan is included in the narrative and is clearly articulated. The funds being relied upon are not fully guaranteed but are likely to be available. Staffing levels seem to be adequately resourced going forward but the plan is not fully articulated.	A clearly articulated sustainability plan is included in the narrative. Funds for sustaining the improvement work are clearly outlined and sourced in a reliable way. Staffing levels are adequately resourced and take into account changes in local and federal funding formulas. Workloads are also sustainable and can be managed going forward.	
Practical timelines	A timeline is included but is not fully annotated. Most goals seem reasonable but some elements of the timeframe are not articulated or do not seem reasonable to occur in the time allotted.	An annotated timeline is attached to the application. Goals and elements of the timeline are reasonable to occur in the time allotted.	An annotated timeline is attached to the application. Goals and elements of the timeline are realistic, build upon each other and reference other elements of the application.	
Selection of external providers	Criteria are either not fully present or is lacking in detail.	Criteria are filled out, with enough detail to for the LEA to make decisions. Criteria needs more specificity for someone outside the LEA to clearly understand the rationale behind choosing and evaluating a provider.	Criteria are fully filled out, clear and comprehensive. The table could easily be used by anyone in the LEA.	
Comprehensive approach to funding curriculum, instruction, assessment and student support strategies; utilization of local and federal funds	Approach to the proposed intervention and improvement model is disjointed, with funds disbursed unevenly between the different strategies. Federal and local funds are also unevenly distributed or inappropriately utilized.	Approach to the proposed intervention and improvement model is aligned, funds are disbursed evenly between the different strategies. Federal and local funds are aligned with the correct strategies. No visible supplement/supplant issues are present.	Approach to the proposed intervention and improvement model is clear, consistent and comprehensive. Strategies are aligned with each other and funding sources are clearly connected to the appropriate strategies. There are no supplement/supplant issues.	
Assurances	Criteria/Indicator	Scale		
	Requirement	Needs Major Revisions	Needs Minor Revisions	Allowable as Written
	Required LEA assurances	Assurances are not all checked	Some assurances are checked	All assurances are checked