

SCORING RUBRIC FOR LEA APPLICATIONS
1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)
2014-15 School Year

District: _____

Reviewer # _____

Priority and Focus Schools: _____

Directions to Reviewers: *Each application will have at least two separate reviewers.* Read and score each section of the application using the Scoring Rubric to determine total amount of points.

LEAs must complete all sections of the application: 1) LEA Information 2) Assurances 3) Schools to be Served 4) Needs Assessment and Intervention Model Selection 5) Implementation of Intervention Model 6) Timeline 7) Annual Goals and Assessment 8) Consultation with Stakeholders 9) Optional Services 10) Budget

- LEAs that are proposing to use funds for a pre-implementation period must articulate them as such and do so according to the guidelines.
- Reviewers must determine when providing a score for each section of the rubric whether or not any proposed pre-implementation budget and activities are permissible.
- Districts must not be penalized for (i.e., not earn points during the review and scoring process) opting not to include pre-implementation activities.

Enter the total score in Points Awarded section below and summarize at least two strengths and one area that you feel could be strengthened in the application. Scoring rubrics will be shared with districts, if requested. In addition to rating each section, provide comments if you rated the section as “NOT ADEQUATE”.

Districts may be asked to revise their applications and resubmit them if additional information is needed.

Total Points Awarded: _____

Strengths (at least two):

Weakness (at least one):

SCORING GUIDE

Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded
1. LEA Information	5	
2. Assurances	5	
3. Schools to be Served	5	
4. Needs Analysis and Intervention Selection	15	
5. Implementation of Intervention Model	25	
6. Timeline	5	
7. Annual Goals and Assessment	10	
8. Consultation with Stakeholders	5	
9. Optional Services	NO POINTS	NO POINTS
10. Budget	15	
Total Points	90	

Having reviewed the district's proposal: (1) How ready to do you think the district is to make significant changes within the school(s)? (2) What support structures are described in the application that could be sustained after the money is gone? (3) How does the LEA intend to build leadership and teacher capacity? *Please refer to specifics within the application, as well as demographics of the applying school district (size, location, district and building level staffing, prior involvement in state sponsored support).*

What questions do you have for the district?

1) LEA INFORMATION	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
District information is filled out with signatures.	Missing two or more areas of information	Missing one area of information	All areas of information complete

2) ASSURANCES	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
	Missing two or more assurances	Missing one assurance	All areas of assurances complete

3) SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
District information is provided for priority and focus schools.	Missing multiple eligible schools, or missing multiple explanations/capacity to serve.	Missing eligible school, or missing explanation/capacity to serve.	All eligible schools are accounted for and models selected, or explanation given for why LEA does not have capacity to serve.

4) NEEDS ANALYSIS AND INTERVENTION SELECTION	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
<p>4a. Describe the process of determining the appropriate intervention model for each school.</p>	<p>Little or no completion of testing: data with goals; student leading indicators; key findings; analysis of instructional program, school leadership, and school infrastructure needs with selected interventions.</p> <p>Little to none of the required data sources have been provided and/or the analysis (findings) is lacking or minimal</p> <p>Little or no use of analysis and/or causes are illogical and not based on data</p>	<p>Some completion of testing: data with goals; student leading indicators; key findings; analysis of instructional program, school leadership, and school infrastructure needs with selected interventions.</p> <p>Some of the required data sources have been provided</p> <p>Some of the analysis (findings) from the data and goals and interventions seem accurate</p>	<p>Full completion of testing: data with goals; student leading indicators; key findings; analysis of instructional program, school leadership, and school infrastructure needs with selected interventions.</p> <p>All of the required data sources have been provided</p> <p>All of the analysis (findings) from the data and the goals and interventions are logical</p>

4b) Intervention model selected based on assessment of needs.	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
<p>District shows why the particular model was selected and how the selected model takes into account the achievement of specific subgroups (Native American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities).</p>	<p>The alignment of the schools needs with the improvement model chosen is lacking or minimal.</p> <p>Little or no account of specific subgroups (Native American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities) is taken into account.</p>	<p>A general alignment between the needs of the school with the model chosen has been demonstrated.</p> <p>Some account of the achievement of specific subgroups (Native American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities) is taken into account.</p>	<p>The alignment between the needs of the school with the model chosen is specifically and conclusively demonstrated as appropriate.</p> <p>The selected model takes into account the achievement of specific subgroups (Native American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities).</p>

4c) LEADERSHIP SUPPORT	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
<p>Describe the district level support and leadership team that provides oversight and technical assistance to each school.</p>	<p>Limited description of the district level support and few or no district level participants have formed a leadership team.</p>	<p>Partial description of the district level support and a limited leadership team is described but does not include more than two district level participants, such as federal programs, special education, curriculum director, superintendent, local trustee, parent, school</p>	<p>Full description of the district level support and leadership team including participants, such as federal programs, special education, curriculum director, superintendent, local trustee, parent, school board member and others as appropriate.</p>

	<p>No commitment from school board.</p> <p>No district level liaison (i.e., an internal lead partner) for each school</p>	<p>board member and others as appropriate.</p> <p>Limited evidence of School Board commitment.</p> <p>District level liaison (i.e., an internal lead partner) for each school</p>	<p>Evidence of School Board commitment.</p> <p>District level liaison (i.e., an internal lead partner) for each school is accountable for the school progress in the intervention model</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5)Implementation of Intervention Model	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
5a. For each school, the District explains the actions they have taken (or will take) to design and implement the intervention model consistent with final School Improvement Grant requirements.	Limited evidence of school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. Any proposed pre-implementation activities are not clearly linked to interventions.	Sufficient description of school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. Any proposed pre-implementation activities are listed but not clearly linked to interventions.	Complete and detailed description of school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. Any proposed pre-implementation activities are linked to interventions.

REVIEWERS: The district must select a reform model prior to the beginning of the school year and begin implementation of the basic elements of the model at the beginning of the school year. However, certain elements such as job-embedded professional development, identifying and rewarding teachers and principals that have impacted student achievement may occur later in the school year.

- **Transformation Model:** Replace the principal (unless the school has replaced the principal within the past two years) ; grant principal sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; provide timeline for identifying and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as with the state content standards, develop schedules for extending learning time, and creating community-oriented schools; and provide plan for ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance from the district and external partners.
- **Turnaround Model:** Replace the principal, grant new principal sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; develop and adopt locally-determined “turnaround” competencies to screen all existing staff, rehiring up to 50% and select new staff; and identify processes for providing increased learning time to students and staff and for designing job-embedded professional development in collaboration with staff. The district will provide timelines indicating its commitments to address the remaining required actions.
- **Restart Model:** A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school into a charter school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. Restart models must be implemented in School Year 2014-2015 and must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school. In Idaho, such a charter school must be authorized under the LEA rather than the Charter School Commission, and the district will hold the EMO responsible for the meeting the final requirements associated with the intervention model. Additional information regarding the process of conversion may be obtained at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/.

(Note: A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) **While federal guidance does not require it, Idaho State policy requires that it is mandatory for any CMO or EMO that enters into an agreement**

to operate a Priority or Focus school to attend state sponsored professional development offered by the State Department of Education.

- **School Closure:** Establish a timeline for school closure and reassign students to other higher-achieving schools within the district.

A full description of the reform models and required elements can be found on the U.S. Department of Education's web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>

(Note to Reviewers: Districts were instructed to use the Center on Innovation and Improvement's publication Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners at <http://www.centerii.org/leamodel/>

Because each of the models is different, be sure to also identify the following features:

- *the model selected and then follow the appropriate rubric has been inserted in the district folder provided by the SDE*
- *if pre-implementation activities are indicated under this section, if they are permissible, and if they align with the selected intervention model*
- *if the LEA intends to select external partners beyond those already approved by the State, the application describes the rigorous review process that will be used to recruit, screen, and select such partners to ensure they are of high quality*

Transformation

Required:

- Has the principal been replaced? (If the principal is new to the school within the last 2 years, the principal may remain as principal if the district has implemented "in whole or part" the required elements of the selected model.
- Has the district implemented such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for hiring, placing and retaining effective teachers?
- Does the proposal indicate the implementation of rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals? In addition to employing the Danielson Framework, does the evaluation take into consideration student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collection of professional reflecting student achievement and increased graduation rates?
- Does the plan Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice,

Transformation

have not done so?

- Does the proposal use data to identify and adopt an instructional program that is research-based and aligned to state standards both vertically and across classrooms?
- Does the proposal identify professional development that is ongoing, job-embedded and aligned to identified needs?
- Has the district ensured the continuous use of student data (formative, summative, diagnostic) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet academic needs?
- Has the district established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all subjects?
- Does the plan include providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community involvement?

Permissible:

- Provide additional incentives to attract and retain staff
- Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal
- Partnerships with parent organizations and faith based organizations, health clinics, other state/local agencies
- For secondary schools, credit recovery programs
- Use and integrate technology-based interventions
- Provide additional professional development to teachers to support students with disabilities and English language learners
- Establishment of early warning systems (attendance, discipline referrals, grades, homework, participation)
- Implement a school-wide response to intervention model
- Adopt a new governance structure
- Implement a new school model (themed, dual language academy)
- Implement a per-pupil based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA's capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?

Transformation

- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

Turnaround

Required:

- Has the district replaced the principal? (If the principal is new to the school within the last 2 years, the principal may remain as principal if the district has implemented “in whole or part” the required elements of the selected model.
- Has the district used a locally adopted measure to assess the competencies of staff who can work in the turnaround school? The assessment must be to screen all existing staff and select new staff, rehiring no more than 50%.
- Does the district’s application demonstrate that they will implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for hiring, placing and retaining effective teachers?
- Does the proposal use data to identify and adopt an instructional program that is research-based and aligned to state standards both vertically and across classrooms?
- Does the proposal identify professional development that is ongoing, job-embedded and aligned to identified needs?
- Has the district ensured the continuous use of student data (formative, summative, diagnostic) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet academic needs?
- Has the district established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all subjects?
- Has the district included appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and support for students?
- Has the district adopted a new governance structure to address turnaround schools? (The district may hire a chief turnaround office to report directly to the superintendent.)
- Does the district’s plan provide the principal with sufficient operating flexibility in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting to fully implement comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?

Permissible:

- Implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. For example, in

Turnaround

addition to employing the Danielson Framework, evaluation takes into consideration student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collection of professional reflecting student achievement and increased graduation rates.

- Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice have not done so.
- Provide additional compensation to attract and retain staff, such as bonus to recruit and place a cohort of high performing teachers together in a low achieving school.
- Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- Partner with parent, faith based, and other community based organizations such as health clinics, or other state/local programs.
- Extend the school day to provide such strategies as advisories built into the school day.
- Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline.
- Expand program to offer pre-kindergarten or full day kindergarten.
- For secondary schools:
 - Increase graduation rate through strategies such as credit recovery.
 - Improve student transition from middle to high school
 - Increase rigor in coursework
 - Offer opportunities for advanced courses
 - Provide supports to ensure that low-income students can take advantage of these programs
 - Establish early warning systems (attendance, discipline referrals, grades, homework completion)
- Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.
- Conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity, having intended impact on student achievement and modified if ineffective.
- Implement a school-wide response to intervention model
- Provide additional professional development to teachers to support student with disabilities and English language learners.
- Use and integrate technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- Ensure school receives intensive ongoing technical support from district, state, or external providers (CBs)
- Implement a new school model (themed, dual language academy)

Turnaround

- Implement a per pupil school based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA's capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?
- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure

Required:

- Has the district established a plan and timeline for school closure with closure to occur before the beginning of the coming school year?
- Has the district identified other higher performing schools within reasonable proximity to schools being closed?
- Does the district have a plan for supporting the students in the new schools?

Restart

Requirements:

LEAs have the option of either restarting the school as a charter school or selecting an external educational management organization (EMO). The EMO may be either a non-profit or for profit entity.

- If the district intends to close the school and restart it as a Charter School, have they provided evidence of having accessed information from Michelle Clement Taylor, School Choice Coordinator?
- Has the district accessed information provided on the State Department of Education's website for charter school developers and/or authorizers? (http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/authorizers.htm)
- If the district intends to enter into an agreement with EMO do they have a clear and delineated process for selecting an EMO?
- Has the district compiled a pool of potential EMOs?
- Does the district describe the process they will use to vet each of the EMOs?
- Has the district assured that all former students who wish to attend the restarted school will be granted permission to attend the restarted school?
- How will the district monitor the performance of the EMO?

5b. EXTERNAL PROVIDERS	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
The District must provide any proposed pre-implementation activities and detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. If the LEA intends to select external partners beyond those already approved by the State.	Missing two or more areas of information and descriptions are limited and incomplete.	Missing at least one area of information and descriptions are sufficient but not complete.	If the LEA intends to select external partners beyond those already approved by the State, the LEA must Describe the rigorous review process that will be used to recruit, screen, and select such partners to ensure they are of high quality. Describe how the proposed

			<p>plan will positively impact student outcomes.</p> <p>List the multiple measures that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of external partners.</p> <p>Stakeholders will be involved in the selection process of external providers.</p> <p>*TA from SSOS at State Dept. is approved and evaluated at the State Level.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5c. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
District describes activities and it has taken (or will take) to align other new and existing resources to fully implement the reform model.	Missing two or more areas of information listed in <i>excellent</i> .	Missing one area of information listed in <i>excellent</i> .	<p>Lea included other local, state, or federal financial resources that will be used to implement the reform model.</p> <p>Clear plan for continuously reviewing the allocation of resources to ensure implementation and sustainability of the program. Clear description of how the LEA will coordinate both new and existing resources.</p>

5d. PLAN TO MODIFY LEA PRACTICES AND POLICIES	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
<p>Explain any proposed activities and the actions the District has taken (or will take) to modify its practices or policies if necessary and enable its schools to fully and effectively implement the reform model.</p>	<p>The proposed activities and/or connections made are vague or INCOMPLETE.</p>	<p>A detailed description is provided that addresses SOME of the proposed activities but lacks a complete plan.</p>	<p>Clear process for annual review and revision of board policies and procedures.</p> <p>Description of LEA processes and policies related to recruiting and retaining highly effective leaders and teachers</p> <p>Explains how communication will be intentional and frequent between the superintendent, district leaders and staff in participating schools.</p> <p>Description of how activities indicated under this section align with the selected intervention model.</p>

5e. SUSTAINABILITY	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
<p>Explain the actions the District will take to sustain reforms</p>	<p>No or limited description of plan for sustainability.</p>	<p>Requires additional development in order to be</p>	<p>Clear description of the system-wide infrastructures</p>

once the funding period ends.		effective.	the district has developed or will develop to sustain reforms in each school.
-------------------------------	--	------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5f. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN PRACTICES AND POLICIES	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
District and school(s) improvement plan. Process used in the district and in each school to effectively use the WISE Tool (online Strategic Planning Tool) schools to fully and effectively implement the reform model.	Missing two or more areas listed in <i>excellent</i> .	Missing one area listed in <i>excellent</i> .	Regular, on-going use of the WISE Tool for school improvement is evident. Leadership team is involved in planning and monitoring plan. Plan is current and communicated on a regular basis to school board.

6.TIMELINE	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
Timeline delineates any proposed pre-implementation activities and the steps the District will take to implement the basic elements of the selected reform model in each school.	NO timeline is provided OR the provided timeline is incomplete in 2 or more components.	Timeline lacks a few key elements of the selected reform model.	Indicates that the District has the ability to implement the basic elements of the model during the current school year. Includes all key elements that are required to be in place at the beginning of the school

			<p>year (e.g., increasing learning time, selecting a CMO or EMO, etc.).</p> <p>Includes a three-year timeline for implementing the selected reform model</p> <p>Allows for certain basic elements to be revisited (job-embedded professional development, identifying and rewarding principals and teachers who have increased student achievement) to occur later in the process of implementing the model</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7.ANNUAL GOALS AND ASSESSMENT	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
7a)The LEA will monitor each Priority and or Focus school that receives school improvement funds by establishing the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading and mathematics.	NO or inaccurate goals are listed with only a few or no multiple measures.	Annual goals are not consistent with minimum goal of proficient or advanced and multiple measures are MINIMAL.	<p>Description of how at a minimum, the goal for maintaining the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year’s ISAT (or SBAC when it is in place) should be 95%.</p> <p>Multiple measures are included as consistent with district expectations and</p>

			<p>student achievement goals.</p> <p>Realistic goals for increasing the percentage of below basic students to basic, and basic to proficient in all and subgroups.</p> <p>If the targeted school is a secondary school, the district included annual goals related to increasing graduation rate.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7b. INTERIM AND/OR FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
Interim and/or formative assessment as well as other indicators (attendance, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, Title I, classroom grades, etc.) to determine if students are making progress toward the annual goals established by the District.	NO or very few assessments will be used to monitor progress.	The assessment system to monitor progress is MINIMAL.	<p>Description of the district plan for creating common assessments for every content area measured on ISAT (soon to be SBAC).</p> <p>Description of the District comprehensive assessment plan (screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic, interim and summative assessments).</p> <p>District timeline for collecting</p>

			<p>and analyzing the assessment data and how it will be communicated with school board, school leadership, parents and teachers is included.</p> <p>Description of how formative assessment is used to improve instruction.</p> <p>Explanation of how students are identified as “at-risk”.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
<p>The District has consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the District’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its schools.</p>	<p>Vague of no description of how consultation with stakeholders was sought during implementation process. Clearly not a priority of LEA.</p>	<p>Limited consultation with stakeholders and lack of input sought and used during application process.</p>	<p>The District has consulted with relevant stakeholders (School Board Members, Personnel Associations, Building Leadership Teams, Parents, etc.) regarding the District’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its schools.</p> <p>Description of how stakeholder input will be sought and used</p>

			<p>during the implementation process.</p> <p>Included a timeline for regular communication with stakeholders.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

9.OPTIONAL SERVICES (NO POINTS AWARDED)	Idaho Superintendents Network	Network of Innovative School Leaders	Idaho Building Capacity Project
Districts have the option to apply for any of the following services, but are not required to do so, and may apply for SIG funds without selecting participation in the following SDE SSOS services.	List school(s) requesting IBC:	List school(s) requesting NISL:	List school(s) requesting ISN:

10 BUDGET AND CAPACITY TO USE SIG FUNDS	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
10a.Describe how the LEA will use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each school	<p>Little or no expenditures are reasonable, allowable, or necessary.</p> <p>Few, if any, expenditures are aligned with the</p>	<p>Some expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.</p> <p>Some expenditures are aligned with the activities</p>	<p>Expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.</p> <p>Expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.</p>

in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.	activities and goals of the grant. Budget demonstrates no reduction in funding, internal capacity building or sustainability over time.	and goals of the grant. Budget demonstrates some reduction in funding as internal capacity is built and sustained over time.	Budget demonstrates gradual reduction as internal capacity is built and sustained over time.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

10b. BUDGET AND CAPACITY TO USE SIG FUNDS	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
10b. Describe how the LEA will ensure that each school receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and how those resources will be aligned with the selected intervention for each school.	Few, if any, expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant. Budget demonstrates no reduction in funding, internal capacity building or sustainability over time. Expenditures could be considered supplanting (expenditures are also included in Basic Title I Budget, or are responsibility of district).	Some expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant. Budget demonstrates some reduction in funding as internal capacity is built and sustained over time. Some expenditures may be considered supplanting (some expenditures are also included in Basic Title I Budget, or are responsibility of district).	Expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant. Budget demonstrates gradual reduction as internal capacity is built and sustained over time. Expenditures are not considered supplanting (expenditures are not included in Basic Title I Budget, or are not responsibility of district).

10c. PROPOSED BUDGET	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 3 points	Excellent – 5 points
Proposed budget indicates the amount of school improvement funds the district will expend for 3 years for each school.	Budget is vague or no description of how the LEA will allocate SIG funds over a 3 year period. Clearly not a priority of LEA.	Budget is limited and the description of how the LEA will allocate SIG funds over a 3 year period is incomplete.	The budget should include a summary of proposed funding amounts and a narrative explaining how the district will allocate SIG funds over a 3-year period (until the end of the period of availability). A separate budget table should be created for each school the district intends to serve and the funding should be consistent with both the timeline provided by the LEA for implementation and support required activities.

REVIEWERS: The Budget must reflect the following:

1. Falls within the parameters of the SIG final requirements, which may be no less than \$50,000 and no more than \$2 million per year over no more than three years. Pre-implementation expenses that are requested must be delineated as such in the budget narrative and included as part of the Year 1 budget request. Pre-implementation expenses must also be permissible and aligned with the selected intervention model.
2. Budget summary table completed and must include the following:
 - Subtotal of expenditures by grant categories and budget categories, with subtotals of proposed budget amounts for the district and each Priority and Focus school for a maximum of three years (through September 30, 2017).
 - Total budget amount for each school and for the district (through September 30, 2017).
 - Descriptions should include name of each school, delineate Priority or Focus, and the total proposed budget for that school each year.

- Ensure that all proposed expenditures are permissible. Ensure that no prohibited expenses are included. For example, construction, such as structural alterations to buildings, building maintenance, or repairs, is specifically prohibited according to 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c).

In addition to cumulative information, provide individual proposed budget amounts and a narrative indicating how the district will allocate SIG funds through the period of availability, with separate detailed budget narratives for the district and each of the Priority and Focus schools the district is committing to serve.

3. Budget Narrative completed.

The budget must provide sufficient funding for the following activities:

- Implement the selected intervention model and its requirements (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) in each Priority and Focus school.
- Conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the district's Priority and Focus schools. Such district-level activities must be described in a budget narrative that is specific to the district office and separate from the school-level budget narrative.

As appropriate, include state-level expenses associated with technical assistance and other support services required or requested and agreed upon by the Idaho SDE and district. Requested activities may be for implementing intervention models in Priority and Focus schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also contact the SDE about contracting for either external providers or services. Selection of external providers that are not pre-approved by the SDE will be evaluated based on the criteria set in Section B, Part 2 (2), of the SEA Application.