**LEA APPLICATION RUBRIC**

The LEA Application rubric is composed of three parts: the LEA Plan Overview, the School Proposal, and the Budget. Points for each item in the three parts are calculated by multiplying the item's weight by the rating of the school's response. Weights for the items on each rubric were determined as follows: 1 for basic information, 2 for state requirements, and 3 for federal requirements. The ratings are worth the following: 0 for "does not meet standard," 1 for "partially meets standard," 2 for “meets standard,” and 3 for "exceeds standards." Therefore, a response to an item with a weight of 3 and a rating of "meets standard" is given 6 points. LEAs must earn 75% of the points available *in LEA Plan Overview, Part II, and Budget; Sixty-five percent is required in Parts I and III* in order to advance to the interview round.

The following table shows each of the intervention types and the points required to enter the interview round.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model Type | LEA Plan Overview | | PART I | | PART II | | PART III | | Budget | | TOTAL | |
| Total Points | 75% Required | Total Points | 65% Required | Total Points | 75% Required | Total Points | 65% Required | Total Points | 75% Required | Total Points | Total Required |
| Turnaround | 48 | 36 | 49 | 32 | 72 | 54 | 126 | 82 | 36 | 27 | 331 | 231 |
| Transformation | 48 | 36 | 49 | 32 | 72 | 54 | 144 | 94 | 36 | 27 | 349 | 243 |
| Early Learning | 48 | 36 | 49 | 32 | 76 | 57 | 138 | 90 | 36 | 27 | 347 | 242 |
| Pathways to Success | 48 | 36 | 49 | 32 | 108 | 81 | 53 | 34 | 36 | 27 | 294 | 210 |
| Whole-School Reform | 48 | 36 | 49 | 32 | 18 | 14 | 48 | 31 | 36 | 27 | 199 | 140 |
| Closure | 48 | 36 | 49 | 32 | 24 | 18 | 27 | 18 | 36 | 27 | 184 | 131 |

**LEA Plan Overview**

1. Introduction

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School(s) | *Not applicable*. | Form is complete. | *Not applicable*. | *Form* ***is missing any of the following***:  Name,  Designation,  Accountability Label,  Selected Intervention,  NCES ID, or  MSIS Code. | 1 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 2 |
| 1. Consultation with Stakeholders | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following****:*  Agenda, minutes, and sign-in forms are completed and attached.  The description of the consultation with stakeholders is clear.  LEA provided a robust process for engaging families in the selection of the intervention model.  LEA provided multiple opportunities for meaningful stakeholder consultation. | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following****:*  Agenda, minutes, and sign-in forms are completed and attached.  The description of the consultation with stakeholders is clear.  The description of the consultation provides evidence that the district engaged families and the community in the selection of the intervention model. | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following****:*  Agenda, minutes, and sign-in forms are completed and attached  ***BUT***  the description of the consultation is vague  ***OR***  the evidence that the LEA engaged families and the community in the selection of the intervention model is unclear. | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following****:*  Agenda is not attached.  Minutes are not attached.  Sign-in form is not completed or not attached.  Description of the consultation is not provided.  No evidence that the LEA engaged families and the community in the selection of the intervention model. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Disclosure of External Party Application Assistance (IF APPLICABLE)   *Although LEAs cannot earn points for this item, any confusion on the part of reviewers must be addressed by LEAs in the interview round, if any of the LEA’s school proposals advance.* | *Not applicable.* | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following****:*  Form is clear and complete.  ***OR***  The LEA certified that no external parties assisted in the preparation of the application. | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following:***  External parties are listed, ***BUT*** the parties’ roles are not clearly described. | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following:***  LEA did not certify whether external parties assisted in the application ***AND*** no further information is provided. | 0 | *No points awarded during initial review.* |
| ***SECTION SUB-TOTAL*** | | | | | | ***11*** |

1. District Leadership

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. District Governance    * + 1. Policy Analysis and Timeline | *Not applicable.* | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  Evidence provided that the LEA conducted a thorough policy analysis.  For each policy addressed, the LEA clearly describes how the policy presents a barrier to reform and how the policy will be changed to eliminate the barrier.  For each policy addressed, the LEA provides a reasonable timeline for when the work of changing the policy will be completed. | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following***:  Most of the information in the chart is clear ***BUT*** some of the LEA’s explanations of how policies present a barrier are unclear.  Most of the information in the chart is clear ***BUT*** some of the LEA’s explanations of how policies will be changed are unclear.  Some policies have target completion dates that are not reasonable. | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following***:  No evidence provided that the LEA conducted a policy analysis.  Most of the information provided on policy barriers or changes is vague or confusing.  The LEA fails to provide completion dates for changing one or more policies. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4 |
| * + - 1. School Board Approval | *Not applicable.* | Clear evidence of Board approval is provided. | *Not applicable.* | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following***:  No evidence of Board approval provided. ***OR***  Evidence of Board approval is ambiguous. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| * + - 1. External Provider Contracting Process | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  The LEA’s plan satisfies all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The LEA provides clear, high-quality interview protocols or evaluation rubrics for screening, evaluating, and selecting External Providers. | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  The LEA describes a clear process for recruiting External Providers.  The LEA will use MDE’s model Request for Proposals (RFP).  ***OR***  The LEA’s RFP is clear, high-quality, and encourages competition.  The LEA’s process for screening, evaluating, and selecting External Providers is clear and includes responsible parties and timelines.  The LEA will use MDE’s model Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).  ***OR***  The LEA’s model (MOU) is clear and high-quality; it includes all required information. | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following***:  The LEA has a process for recruiting External Providers ***BUT*** this process is unclear.  The LEA’s RFP is clear but lacks important sections, such as a scope and timeline of work; budget information; standard terms and conditions; proposal due date and format; required information; assurances; reporting requirements; and evaluation factors.  The LEA’s process for screening, evaluating, and selecting External Providers is clear ***BUT*** lacks persons responsible or timelines.  The LEA’s MOU is clear but lacks important sections including, but not limited to, scope of work, responsibilities of parties, evaluation metrics and process, the requirement to hold at least quarterly meetings with providers for review purposes, the criteria which the LEA will use in determining re-hiring decisions, or funding information. | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following***:  The LEA does not have a process for recruiting External Providers.  The LEA does not intend to use MDE’s RFP but does not provide its own. ***OR***  The LEA’s RFP is vague or confusing.  The LEA’s process for screening, evaluating, and selecting External Providers is vague, confusing, or absent.  The LEA does not intend to use MDE’s MOU but does not provide its own.  ***OR***  The LEA’s MOU is vague or confusing. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. District Capacity for Selected Interventions | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  The LEA provides compelling evidence that it has improved student outcomes with numerous, substantial grants.  Executive district leadership will be deeply engaged in the improvement process as evidenced by delegated responsibilities for various aspects of the SIG process.  The LEA has a clear plan for internally monitoring implementation at the school-level, which includes oversight from a designated, district-level Turnaround Officer.  The LEA presents evidence of an unqualified audit. | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  The LEA provides evidence that it has improved student outcomes with previous grants.  Executive district leadership will be engaged in the improvement process.  The LEA has a clear plan for internally monitoring implementation at the school-level, which includes oversight from a designated, district-level Turnaround Officer.  The LEA presents quantitative evidence that personnel involved with the grant, including the designated Turnaround Officer, have a track record of success in raising achievement.  Neither the LEA nor one or more of its served schools has been rated as failing for two consecutive years.  ***OR***  The LEA is under conservatorship.  The LEA presents evidence of an unqualified audit.  The attached, relevant Schoolwide Plan and Priority or Focus Action Plan, as applicable, is aligned to the school proposal. | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following***:  The LEA provides weak evidence that it has improved student outcomes with previous grants.  Executive district leadership will be engaged in the improvement process but the engagement will be limited or unclear.  The LEA’s plan for internally monitoring implementation at the school-level is unclear.  The LEA presents evidence that personnel involved with the grant have a track record of success in raising achievement.  The LEA or one or more of its served schools has been rated as failing for two consecutive years.  ***AND***  The LEA is not under conservatorship.  The LEA has some financial accountability issues that must be addressed by the LEA in the interview round, if the proposal advances.  The attached, relevant Schoolwide Plan and Priority or Focus Action Plan, as applicable, is not aligned to the school proposal.  Any school in the LEA previously received a School Improvement Grant. | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following***:  The LEA provides no evidence that it has improved student outcomes with previous grants.  Executive district leadership will not be engaged in the improvement process.  The LEA presents no plan for internally monitoring implementation at the school-level ***OR*** does not include plans for a designated Turnaround Officer.  The LEA presents no evidence that personnel involved with the grant have a track record of success in raising achievement.  The LEA failed to provide its most recent Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs.  The LEA has serious financial accountability issues, according to documentation provided.  The LEA failed to attach the relevant Schoolwide Plan or Priority or Focus Action Plan, as applicable.  The school previously received a School Improvement Grant. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Sustainability | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  The LEA makes a particularly compelling case for how it will sustain reforms from the district-level through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. | *Proposal meets* ***all of the following***:  The LEA makes a clear case for how it will sustain reforms from the district-level through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. | *Proposal meets* ***at least one of the following***:  The LEA’s case for sustaining the reforms is mostly clear, ***BUT*** it lacks a description of how the LEA, from the district-level, will support one of the following: quality implementation, human capital development, or on-going community engagement. | *Proposal meets* ***any of the following***:  The LEA’s response is vague or confusing.  The LEA does not describe how it will sustain reforms from the district-level. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| ***SECTION SUBTOTAL*** | | | | | | ***37*** |
| **LEA PLAN TOTAL** | | | | | | **48** |

**School Proposal**

1. Introduction

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School | *Not applicable*. | Form is complete. | *Not applicable*. | Form ***is missing any of the following***:  Name,  Designation,  Accountability Label,  Selected Intervention,  NCES ID, or  MSIS Code. | 1 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 2 |
| 1. Alignment with the Needs Assessment 2. Comprehensive Needs Assessment | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Provides a clear, in-depth discussion of the school’s needs in each area.  Provides both quantitative and qualitative evidence in each area; evidence is disaggregated.  MCAPS data is attached. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Clearly describes the school’s needs in each area.  Provides qualitative or quantitative evidence of need in each area.  MCAPS data is attached. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following:***  Description of needs in any area is unclear.  Qualitative or quantitative evidence provided is inadequate to support identified needs.  MCAPS data is attached but confusing. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Description of needs is missing for one or more areas.  Neither qualitative nor quantitative evidence is provided for one or more areas.  MCAPS data is not attached. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Intervention Model Selection | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The narrative explains in detail how the choice of the intervention model is aligned with school needs. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The needs assessment data supports the school’s model selection.  PATHWAYS/WHOLE-SCHOOL MODEL:  The model will be implemented for all students.  PATHWAYS MODEL:  Evidence shows that the model improves student academic achievement or attainment.  WHOLE-SCHOOL MODEL:  Evidence shows that the model improves student academic achievement or attainment for the population served by the school.  WHOLE-SCHOOL:  Evidence shows that the developer has served a population similar to the applicant school. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The needs assessment data weakly supports the school’s model selection. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The needs assessment data does not justify the school’s model selection.  PATHWAYS/WHOLE-SCHOOL MODEL:  The model will not be implemented for all students.  PATHWAYS MODEL:  Evidence does not show that the model improves student academic achievement or attainment.  WHOLE-SCHOOL MODEL:  Evidence does not show that the model improves student academic achievement or attainment for the population served by the school.  WHOLE-SCHOOL:  Evidence does not show that the developer has served a population similar to the applicant school. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Baseline Data and Performance Goals | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Completed Performance Framework sets reasonable but ambitious goals for the school. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Performance Framework is complete; adequate goals set. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Performance Framework is partially incomplete and/or goals are inadequate. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Performance Framework is not attached. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Alignment with Intervention Requirements | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The summary chart provides a succinct but detailed discussion of how each intervention requirement for the chosen model will be met.  Page references provide clear evidence that the proposal will exceed the intervention requirements of the chosen model. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The summary chart adequately addresses how each intervention requirement will be met.  Page references provide evidence that the proposal will meet all of the intervention requirements. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The summary chart references fulfillment of each intervention requirement, but the chart does not address how all of the requirements will be met.  Page references provide some evidence of the proposal’s alignment with all intervention requirements, but evidence is unclear or weak for one or more requirement. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The summary chart neither references nor addresses one or more of the intervention requirements for the chosen model.  Page references do not provide evidence of proposal’s alignment with the intervention requirements.  Page references directly contradict any requirement. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Foundation Laid through Priority/ Focus Schools Process or Previous SIG Process | *Not applicable*. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school improvement actions taken since being designated a Priority or Focus school are clear and significant.  The chart describing teams supporting improvement is complete, the meetings have been frequent, and significant outcomes or actions have resulted from the meetings.  The school had no previous SIG award ***OR*** the previous SIG award produced strong, sustained student achievement gains. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school improvement actions taken since being designated a Priority or Focus school are clear ***BUT*** insignificant.  The chart describing teams supporting improvement is complete but the meetings have not been frequent ***OR*** no significant outcomes or actions have resulted from the meetings.  If the school had a previous SIG award, it only produced weak or un-sustained student achievement gains. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The description of the school improvement actions taken since being designated a Priority or Focus school is vague or confusing.  The chart describing teams supporting improvement is incomplete, vague, or confusing.  If the school had a previous SIG award, it was terminated or did not produce student achievement gains. | 1 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 1  *Meets standard* = 2 |
| 1. Implementation Milestones    1. Pre-Implementation or Planning Year | Proposal ***meets all of the following***:  Activities are clear, allowable, and comprehensive.  Activities are assigned to specific individuals (by name and/or position).  Activities have a clear timeline, evaluation metrics that allow for continuous monitoring, and are necessary. | Proposal ***meets all of the following***:  Activities are clear and allowable.  Activities are assigned to specific individuals (by name and/or position).  Activities have a clear timeline and identified evaluation metric.  Activities are necessary to the successful implementation of the school proposal. | Proposal ***meets at least one of the following***:  Some activities are unclear.  Some activities are not assigned to specific individuals.  Some activities lack a clear timeline, identified evaluation metric, ***OR*** connection to successful implementation. | Proposal ***meets any of the following***:  Too few activities are listed to evaluate pre-implementation/ planning.  Some activities are not allowable.  No responsible individuals are given.  No timeline is given.  No identified evaluation metrics are given.  No connections to successful implementation are given. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| * 1. Implementation and Sustainability Years | Proposal ***meets all of the following***:  Milestones are clear, actionable, and comprehensive.  Milestones are assigned to specific individuals (by name and/or position).  Milestones have a clear timeline and evaluation metrics that allow for continuous monitoring. | Proposal ***meets all of the following***:  Milestones are clear and actionable.  Milestones are assigned to specific individuals (by name and/or position).  Milestones have a clear timeline and identified evaluation metric. | Proposal ***meets at least one of the following***:  Some milestones are unclear.  Some milestones are not assigned to specific individuals.  Some milestones lack a clear timeline or evaluation metric. | Proposal ***meets any of the following***:  Too few milestones are listed to evaluate. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| **PART I TOTAL** | | | | | | **49** |

Preferential Points:

* Any school proposal for a school that has never received SIG may be awarded **10 preferential points** in this section. Evidence must be found in item D.3 found in Part I of the School Proposal section of the RFP.

1. Teaching and Learning—Turnaround, Transformation, Early Learning, and Pathways to Success

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Curriculum 2. Use of State Standards | *Not applicable*. | Proposal ***meets all of the following***:  The school uses the state standards as the basis of the school’s curriculum. | | *Not applicable*. | Proposal ***meets any of the following***:  The school does not use the state standards as the basis of the school’s curriculum. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| 1. Research-Based Materials | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposed materials are research-based and sufficient to support full implementation of the standards in all subject areas/grades.  The school has a clearly defined, regular process for determining the effectiveness of curricular materials.  The school has a regular, clear, and high-quality process for determining whether materials are aligned with the standards. | Proposal ***meets all of the following***:  Proposed materials are research-based and sufficient to support full implementation of the standards in all subject areas/grades.  The school has a defined process for determining the effectiveness of curricular materials.  The school has a clear process for determining whether materials are aligned with the standards. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Proposed materials are research-based ***BUT*** not sufficient to support full implementation of the standards in some subject areas/grades.  The school has a defined process for reviewing curricular materials regularly, ***BUT*** the process will not provide information about the effectiveness of the materials.  The school’s process for determining whether materials are aligned is not adequate. | Proposal ***meets any of the following***:  Proposed materials are not research-based ***OR*** are not sufficient to support full implementation of the standards in most subject areas/grades.  The school’s process for reviewing curricular materials is vague or confusing.  The school’s process for determining whether materials are aligned with the standards is vague or confusing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Vertical Alignment | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school has provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in each subject area/grade.  ***OR***  The school has a clear, high-quality plan (including a timeline and persons responsible) for developing pacing guides.  The school has a regular, clear process for reviewing and revising pacing guides in all subject areas/grades.  The school has a clear, high-quality plan for cross-grade planning. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school has provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in each subject area/grade.  ***OR***  The school has a clear plan (including a timeline and persons responsible) for developing pacing guides.  The school has a clear process for reviewing and revising pacing guides in all subject areas/grades.  The school has a clear plan for cross-grade planning. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school has provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in some subjects/ grades.  ***BUT***  The school lacks clear plans, including a timeline and persons responsible, for developing pacing guides for the remaining subject areas/grades.  The school’s process for reviewing and revising pacing guides in all subject areas/grades is unclear.  The school’s plan for cross-grade planning is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school has not provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in any subject area/grade. ***AND***  The school lacks a clear plan, including a timeline and persons responsible, for developing pacing guides in each subject area/grade.  The school has neither a regular nor clear process for reviewing and revising pacing guides in all subject areas/grades.  The school has no plan for cross-grade planning. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. PATHWAYS ONLY: College and Career Ready Competencies | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school’s list of college and career ready competencies are evidence-based ***OR*** the school’s process for developing the competencies will result in evidence-based strategies. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school attached a comprehensive list of college and career ready competencies ***OR*** has a clear process for how to develop this list.  The school provides a clear description for how the competencies will be effectively integrated in each course.  The school provides a clear plan for using the Senior Capstone Project to demonstrate a student’s mastery of the competencies. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school provides a list of competencies ***BUT*** the list is vague, incomplete, or inadequate.  The school’s plan for integrating the competencies will not be effective or will include some but not all courses. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school did not attach a defined list of college and career ready competencies ***OR*** the description of how the school will develop the competencies is vague or confusing.  The school’s plan for integrating the competencies in each course is vague or confusing.  The school’s plan for a Senior Capstone Project is vague or confusing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. PATHWAYS ONLY: Career Pathways | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school a clear description of provides multiple, varied pathways with comprehensive supporting coursework. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school provides a clear description of pathways with comprehensive supporting coursework. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school provides a clear description of pathways but either the pathways or supporting coursework are limited in scope. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s description of career pathways is vague or confusing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. PATHWAYS ONLY: College Credit | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school names the appropriate partners to provide college credit to all students and attaches signed memoranda of understanding with its key institution of higher education (IHE) partner.  The school’s plans to provide college credit to all students at no cost, including tuition fees, and textbook costs, are clear and effective. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school names the appropriate partners to provide college credit to all students and attaches signed memoranda of understanding with its key institution of higher education (IHE) partner.  The school’s plans to provide college credit to all students at no cost, including tuition fees, and textbook costs, are clear ***BUT*** the plans are not likely to be effective. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school does not name the appropriate partners to provide college credit to all students OR does not attach signed memoranda of understanding with its key institution of higher education (IHE) partner.  The school’s plan to offer college credit to all students at no cost, including tuition, fees, and textbook costs, is vague or confusing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. PATHWAYS ONLY: Work-Based Learning Opportunities | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school names the appropriate partners to provide work-based learning opportunities.  The school’s plans to provide work-based learning opportunities are clear and effective.  The school provides signed memoranda of understanding with partners. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school names the appropriate partners to provide work-based learning opportunities.  The school’s plans to provide work-based learning opportunities are clear and effective. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school names the appropriate partners to provide work-based learning opportunities.  The school’s plans to provide work-based learning opportunities are clear ***BUT*** the plans are not likely to be effective. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school does not name the appropriate partners to provide work-based learning opportunities.  The school’s plan to offer work-based learning opportunities is vague or confusing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Instruction 2. Instructional Improvements | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposed instructional improvement strategies are clear, evidence-based, effective, and aligned to the professional development plan.  Proposed instructional improvements are aligned to school needs as identified by the needs assessment.  Proposed instructional improvements will cover all grades/subject areas. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposed instructional improvement strategies are clear, effective and aligned to the professional development plan.  Proposed instructional improvements are aligned to school needs as identified by the needs assessment.  Proposed instructional improvements will cover tested grades/subject areas. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Proposed instructional improvement strategies are clear but ineffective.  Some misalignment between proposed instructional improvements and needs assessment.  Proposed instructional improvements will address some grades or subject areas. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Current or proposed plans for instruction are vague or confusing.  No alignment between proposed instructional improvements and needs assessment.  Instructional are not addressed or do not indicate a change from current practice. | 2 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. EARLY LEARNING ONLY: Full-Day Kindergarten and High-Quality Pre-School    1. Full-Day Kindergarten    2. Compulsory Attendance for Enrolled Kindergarteners | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school offers full-day Kindergarten to all students.  Full-day Kindergarten is compulsory for every child who enrolls. | | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school does not offer full-day Kindergarten to all students.  Full-day Kindergarten is not compulsory for every child who enrolls. | 2 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 4 |
| * 1. High-Quality Pre-School | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plans for ***ALL*** of the following are likely to be effective and one or more is innovative:  Staff qualifications; professional development; child-to-staff ratio; class size (including the total number of classes and students to be served); full-day program, inclusion of children with disabilities; developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula aligned to state standards; individualized accommodations and supports; comparable staff salaries; program evaluation; on-site or accessible comprehensive services; or evidence-based health and safety standards. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plans for ***ALL*** of the following are likely to be effective:  Staff qualifications; professional development; child-to-staff ratio; class size (including the total number of classes and students to be served); full-day program, inclusion of children with disabilities; developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula aligned to state standards; individualized accommodations and supports; comparable staff salaries; program evaluation; on-site or accessible comprehensive services; or evidence-based health and safety standards. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plans for ***ANY*** of the following are likely to be ineffective:  Staff qualifications; professional development; child-to-staff ratio; class size (including the total number of classes and students to be served); full-day program, inclusion of children with disabilities; developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula aligned to state standards; individualized accommodations and supports; comparable staff salaries; program evaluation; on-site or accessible comprehensive services; or evidence-based health and safety standards. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Descriptions of ***ANY*** of the following are vague or confusing:  Staff qualifications; professional development; child-to-staff ratio; class size (including the total number of classes and students to be served); full-day program, inclusion of children with disabilities; developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula aligned to state standards; individualized accommodations and supports; comparable staff salaries; program evaluation; on-site or accessible comprehensive services; or evidence-based health and safety standards. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Multi-Tiered System of Supports Instructional Model/ Intervention Process (IP) | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school describes a multi-tiered system of support that exceeds State Board requirements.  Current and proposed academic and non-academic services create a school-wide system of support for all students. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school describes a clear multi-tiered system of supports that meets State Board requirements.  Proposed academic and non-academic services enhance current services to create a system of support for struggling students.  FOR PATHWAYS:  Plans for academic and socio-emotional counseling are clear and show a significant commitment to counseling services, including college academic advising.  Plans for teacher advisors are clear and well-designed.  FOR TURNAROUND:  Socio-emotional counseling and community-oriented services will be enhanced through SIG to meet the needs of students. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school’s multi-tiered system of supports is unclear or does not meet State Board requirements.  Proposed academic or non-academic services are inadequate or only marginally improve current services.  Current and proposed academic or non-academic services are limited to those provided by special education teachers or for selected grades. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school provides no evidence of a multi-tiered system of supports.  The school’s current and/or proposed academic or non-academic services are vague or confusing.  FOR PATHWAYS:  The school does not propose plans for academic counseling, teacher advisors, or socio-emotional counseling or services.  FOR TURNAROUND:  The school does not propose plans for socio-emotional counseling and other services or community-oriented services. | 2 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Special Populations | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school has clear, evidence-based plans for enhancing instruction for all special populations. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school has clear plans for enhancing instruction for all special populations. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school has clear plans for enhancing instruction for some special populations. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s plans for enhancing instruction for special populations are vague or confusing. | 2 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. TURNAROUND/ TRANSFORMATION ONLY: Increased Time | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposal will increase annual instructional minutes by at least 300 hours.  Increased time will be mandatory for all students.  School schedules and school calendars clearly demonstrate instructional time is equal to the proposed increased time. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposal will increase annual instructional minutes by at least 150 hours.  Increased time will be mandatory for all students.  School schedules and school calendars clearly demonstrate instructional time is equal to the proposed increased time. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Proposal will increase annual instructional minutes by less than 150 hours.  Increased time will be open to all students.  School schedules and calendars do not align with proposed increased time. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Proposal will not increase annual instructional minutes.  Increased time will not be open to all students.  School schedules and school calendars do not demonstrate increased instructional time. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Data for Instructional Decision-Making 2. Current and Proposed Assessments | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Current and proposed assessments cover all grades and subject areas.  The school’s assessment plan includes formative, interim, ***AND*** summative assessments for each subject area/ grade level.  Proposed assessments will upgrade and/or streamline the assessment plan.  New internal assessments will be high-quality and standardized within all grade-levels/ subject areas. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Current and proposed assessments cover all tested grades and subject areas.  The school’s assessment plan includes formative, interim, ***AND*** summative assessments for tested subject areas/ grade levels.  Proposed assessments will eliminate gaps in the current assessment plan.  New internal assessments will be high-quality and standardized in tested grades/ subject areas. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Current and proposed assessments cover some tested grades and subject areas.  The school’s assessment plan includes formative, interim, ***AND*** summative assessments for some tested subject areas/grade levels.  Some proposed assessments are duplicative.  New internal assessments will vary within grade-levels/ subject areas. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s current and proposed assessments are vague or confusing.  The school’s assessment plan is missing formative, interim, ***OR*** summative assessments for tested subject areas/ grade levels.  All proposed assessments are duplicative.  Plans for new internal assessments are vague or confusing. | 2 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Data-Driven Decision-Making | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Clear evidence is provided that instructional decisions are informed by data.  Assessment plan will provide timely data (within 1-3 days) that can be analyzed by sub-groups, items, and classrooms.  The school’s systems/policies/ procedures/ structures to support data analysis and use on a consistent basis are clear and align with school schedules. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Clear evidence is provided that instructional decisions are informed by data.  Assessment plan will provide timely data (within 4-5 days) that can be analyzed by sub-groups, items, and classrooms.  The school’s systems/policies/ procedures/ structures to support data analysis and use on a consistent basis are clear. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Limited evidence is provided that instructional decisions are informed by data.  Assessment plan will provide timely data that can be analyzed by sub-groups, items, ***OR*** classrooms.  The school’s systems/policies/ procedures/ structures to support data analysis do not provide adequate time for analysis. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  No or vague evidence of data-driven decision-making is provided.  Data provided will not be timely (greater than a week) nor will it permit disaggregated analysis.  The school’s systems/policies/ procedures/ structures to support data analysis and use on a consistent basis are vague, confusing, or missing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. PATHWAYS ONLY: Early Warning System | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school has experience using an Early Warning System to identify students at-risk of dropping out of school, students least likely to attend college, and/or students historically under-represented in college courses. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school has an operational Early Warning System OR the school has clear, effective plans for developing or acquiring an Early Warning System for use from the start of the first full year of implementation.  The school has access to appropriate data to identify the population at-risk of dropping out of school or the students least likely to attend college and/or those historically under-represented in college courses. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s plans for developing or acquiring an Early Warning System will not allow use of the system from the start of the first full year of implementation.  The school has limited access to appropriate data to identify the population at-risk of dropping out of school or the students least likely to attend college and/or those historically under-represented in college courses. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school does not have an operational Early Warning System ***AND*** plans for developing or acquiring an Early Warning System for use from the start of the first full year of implementation are vague or confusing.  The school does not have access to appropriate data to identify the population at-risk of dropping out of school or the students least likely to attend college and/or those historically under-represented in college courses.  The school’s plans for data for the Early Warning System are vague or confusing. | 3 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Instructional Leadership and Staff 2. Current Instructional Staff 3. Proposed Instructional Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The staff plan meets all items under the “meets standard” column.  The proposed staff plan reflects evidence-based school improvement strategies. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposed staff plan will support full implementation of the school proposal.  All staff positions are clearly described.  The proposed staff plan is aligned with the needs assessment.  All SIG-funded positions will meet EDGAR cost principles. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some positions or personnel are unnecessary to fully implement the proposal.  Some staff positions are not clearly described.  Staff plan alignment with the needs assessment is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The staff plan will not support full implementation of the school proposal.  The staff plan is vague or confusing.  Staff plan is not aligned to the needs assessment.  Any SIG-funded position does not meet EDGAR cost principles. | 2 | | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| **PART II TOTAL** | **Turnaround = 72** | | **Transformation = 72** | | **Early Learning = 76** | | **Pathways = 108** | |

Preferential Points:

* Proposals for the Turnaround or Transformation Model which make dual enrollment and AP/IB courses available to ALL students are eligible for **10 preferential points**. Evidence must be provided in item B.1.b. found in Part II of the School Proposal section of the RFP.
* Proposals for the Turnaround or Transformation Model which incorporate high-quality pre-school using the Early Learning Collaborative model are eligible for **10 preferential points**. Evidence must be provided in item B.2.c. found in Part II of the School Proposal section of the RFP.
* Proposals for the Turnaround, Transformation, or Early Learning Models which incorporate a strong, detailed literacy plan inclusive of all grades but especially K-3 are eligible for **10 preferential points**. Evidence must be provided in item B.1.b. found in Part II of the School Proposal section of the RFP.

1. Teaching and Learning—Closure

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Newly Consolidated School(s)    1. School Information | *Not applicable.* | Form is complete. | *Not applicable.* | Form ***is missing any of the following***:  Name,  Accountability Label,  Grades Served,  Enrollment,  NCES Code, or  MSIS Code. | 1 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Meets standard = 2* |
| * 1. Higher Achieving School(s) | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school(s) to which students will transfer is/are higher achieving. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some but not all of the schools to which students will transfer are higher achieving. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school(s) to which students will transfer are not higher achieving. | 3 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Partially meets standards = 3*  *Meets standard = 6* |
| * 1. Proximity to Closed School | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  All of the school(s) to which the students will transfer are within a reasonable proximity to the closed school. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some but not all of the schools to which students will transfer are within a reasonable proximity to the closed school. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school(s) to which students will transfer are not within a reasonable proximity to the closed school. | 2 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Partially meets standard = 2*  *Meets standard = 4* |
| 1. Closure Plan 2. Transfer Plan | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The transfer plan is clear and will result in minimal disruptions for students. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The transfer plan is clear but may cause disruption in the educational experience for transferred students. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The transfer plan is vague or confusing. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Consolidated Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Staff consolidation plan is clear.  Consolidation plan eliminates all duplicative or unnecessary positions or personnel.  Plan describes how the district will handle excess staff (release v. transfer).  Plan describes how the district will use teacher effectiveness (as measured by student data) to determine which personnel to release or transfer. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Staff consolidation plan is clear.  Consolidation plan eliminates all duplicative or unnecessary positions or personnel.  Plan describes how the district will handle excess staff (release v. transfer). | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Staff consolidation plan may need some clarification.  Consolidation plan eliminates some but not all duplicative or unnecessary positions or personnel.  Plan’s description of how the district will handle excess staff is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s staff consolidation plan is vague or confusing.  The staff plan adds or does not eliminate any unnecessary positions or personnel.  Plan does not describe how the district will handle excess staff. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| **PART II TOTAL** | | | | | | **24** |

1. Teaching and Learning—Whole-School Reform Model

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Approved Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The whole-school reform model has been approved by the US Department of Education. | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The whole-school reform model has not been approved by the US Department of Education. | 3 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Meets standard = 6* |
| 1. Fit with Student Instructional Needs | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal provides a compelling description of how the model will address the teaching and learning needs of the school ***AND*** how the model will address the student non-academic support needs of the school. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal clearly describes how the model will address the teaching and learning needs of the school.  The proposal clearly describes how the model will address the student non-academic support needs of the school. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the teaching and learning needs of the school is weak.  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the student non-academic support needs of the school is weak. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the teaching and learning needs of the school is vague or confusing.  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the student non-academic support needs of the school is vague or confusing. | 3 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Partially meets standards = 3*  *Meets standard = 6* |
| 1. Instructional Leadership and Staff 2. Current Instructional Staff 3. Proposed Instructional Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The staff plan meets all items under the “meets standard” column.  The proposed staff plan reflects evidence-based school improvement strategies. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposed staff plan will support full implementation of the school proposal.  All staff positions are clearly described.  The proposed staff plan is aligned with the needs assessment.  All SIG-funded positions will meet EDGAR cost principles. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some positions or personnel are unnecessary to fully implement the proposal.  Some staff positions are not clearly described.  Staff plan alignment with the needs assessment is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The staff plan will not support full implementation of the school proposal.  The staff plan is vague or confusing.  Staff plan is not aligned to the needs assessment.  Any SIG-funded position does not meet EDGAR cost principles. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| **PART II TOTAL** | | | | | | **18** |

1. Operations and Support Systems—Turnaround, Transformation, and Early Learning

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | | **Meets** | | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | | **Weight** | **Total Points** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Allocation of Financial Resources | *Not applicable.* | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  All additional sources of revenue will support/align with the SIG propos al and the school’s needs. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some sources of additional revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Use of additional revenue does not align with the school proposal or the school’s needs.  Explanations of how resources will support/align with the SIG proposal are vague or confusing. | | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* =2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 | |
| 1. Human Resource Systems 2. Recruitment and Hiring    1. School Leader   *For Early Learning models and Turnaround/ Transformation schools that do not qualify for an exemption* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan includes clear timelines and multiple, effective recruitment strategies.  The job description for the School Leader is clear and comprehensive.  The school’s process for evaluating applicants uses high-quality interview protocols. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan includes clear timelines and at least one effective recruitment strategy.  The job description for the School Leader is clear.  The school’s process for evaluating applicants is clear and thorough. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan is clear ***BUT*** is unlikely to garner qualified candidates.  The job description for the School Leader is vague or confusing. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan is vague or confusing.  The school does not have a job description for the School Leader.  The school’s process for evaluating/ selecting applicants is vague or confusing. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| *For schools qualifying for an exception* | *Not applicable*. | | Evidence retained principal has a “track record of success in raising student achievement” is clear, quantitative, and compelling. ***OR***  A rural flexibility school’s description of how it will meet the intent and purpose of the requirement is compelling. | | Evidence retained principal has a “track record of success in raising student achievement” is clear and quantitative but not compelling. ***OR***  A rural flexibility school’s description of how it will meet the intent and purpose of the requirement is weak. | Evidence retained principal has a “track record of success in raising student achievement” is not clear or not quantitative.  Principal being retained is not “newly hired.”  School claimed a rural exemption but does not qualify. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| * 1. Instructional Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan includes clear timelines and multiple, effective recruitment strategies.  The school’s process for evaluating applicants reflects high expectations. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan includes clear timelines and at least one effective recruitment strategy.  The school’s process for evaluating applicants is clear and reflects high expectations. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s recruitment plan is clear ***BUT*** is unlikely to garner qualified candidates. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s instructional staff recruitment plan is vague or confusing.  The school’s process for evaluating applicants is vague or confusing. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| * 1. Financial Incentives | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school proposes SIG-funded financial incentives that are based on student performance outcomes. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school proposes SIG-funded financial incentives and identifies any available state or federal financial incentive programs. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school only proposes financial incentives currently available through state or other federal programs. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school proposes no financial incentives, SIG-funded or otherwise. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. TURNAROUND ONLY: Screening And Re-Hiring | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan describes in-depth how the district will use teacher effectiveness (as measured by student data) to determine which personnel to release or retain (no more than 50% of current staff).  Plan includes interview protocols. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan describes how the district will screen and re-hire no more than 50% of staff. ***OR***  A rural flexibility school provides a compelling description of how it will meet the intent and purpose of this requirement. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Plan is does not clearly describe how the district will screen and re-hire no more than 50% of current staff. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Plan does not describe how the district will determine which personnel to release or transfer.  A school claims a rural flexibility exemption but does not qualify. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. Employment Policies 2. Placement | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher effectiveness.  Teacher preference is not a factor in making assignments. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher effectiveness.  Teacher preference is taken into consideration but not as the most important factor. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Placement process is clear but driven by seniority or teacher preference. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Placement process is vague or confusing. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. TRANSFORM-ATION/ EARLY LEARNING ONLY: Evaluation policies | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school will use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***OR***  Plan meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  Plan also provides qualitative and quantitative indicators of effectiveness.  Plan includes board policies for teacher and administrator evaluation. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school will use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***OR***  Plan clearly describes teacher and administrator evaluation processes that include both informal and formal observations and artifacts as indicators of effectiveness.  The plan includes a timeline and specific improvements that will be made to the school’s evaluation system.  The school’s evaluation system is rigorous, transparent, and equitable; uses student data as a significant factor; and was developed with teacher and principal input. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school will not use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***AND***  Plan describes teacher ***OR*** administrator evaluation processes that include both informal and formal observations and some artifacts as indicators of effectiveness.  The plan for improvements to the current evaluation system is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school will not use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***AND***  Plan does not describe how the district will evaluate teachers and administrators.  Plan does not include current evaluation tools.  Plan does not provide improvements or changes to current evaluation system.  The school’s evaluation system lacks rigor, transparency, and equity; student data as a significant factor; ***OR*** teacher and principal input. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. TRANSFORM-ATION/ EARLY LEARNING ONLY: Financial Rewards | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school proposes SIG-funded financial rewards with timelines and policies.  The school proposes SIG-funded financial rewards that are based on student performance outcomes. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school proposes SIG-funded financial rewards. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s plan for financial rewards is vague or confusing. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school proposes no financial rewards. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. Opportunities for Promotion and Career Growth | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Opportunities for promotion are clear, numerous, and substantive.  Opportunities for involvement in the decision-making process are clear and substantive. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Opportunities for promotion are clear.  Opportunities for involvement in the decision-making process are clear. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Opportunities for promotion are limited.  Opportunities for involvement in the decision-making process are limited. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Opportunities for promotion or involvement in reform are vague or confusing.  Opportunities for promotion or involvement in the decision-making process are not included. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. TRANSFORM-ATION/ EARLY LEARNING ONLY: Termination | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan provides a clear, in-depth description of teacher and administrator effectiveness and ineffectiveness.  Plan includes board policies for teacher and administrator termination and non-renewal.  Plan includes a clearly defined process for developing, implementing, and evaluating outcomes of improvement plans for ineffective teachers and administrators. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan provides a clear description of teacher and administrator effectiveness and ineffectiveness.  Plan describes a process for non-renewal of teachers ***AND*** administrators.  Plan includes a clearly defined process for developing improvement plans. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Plan’s description of teacher and administrator effectiveness and ineffectiveness is vague or confusing.  Plan describes a process for non-renewal of teachers ***OR*** administrators.  Plan for developing staff improvement plans is vague or confusing. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Plan does not describe teacher and administrator effectiveness and ineffectiveness.  Plan does not describe how the district will non-renew or terminate teachers and administrators.  No reference to staff improvement plans. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. Organizational Structures and Management 2. Governance    1. Proposed Governance Structure    2. District-Level Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan meets all items in the “meets standards” column.  School improvement is clearly a district-wide priority as demonstrated by an internal school improvement monitoring process. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for ***both*** the school and the district.  TURNAROUND ONLY:  The proposal includes a detailed description of the proposed changes to the governance structure.  ALL:  District-level staff support is clear and adequate to ensure fidelity of implementation at the school-level. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for the school ***OR*** the district.  TURNAROUND ONLY:  The proposal’s description of the changes to the governance structure is vague or confusing.  ALL:  District-level staff support is limited. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are vague or omitted.  TURNAROUND ONLY:  The proposal lacks a description of changes to the governance structure.  ALL:  No district-level staff support is provided. | | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 | |
| * 1. TURN-AROUND/ TRANSFORM-ATION ONLY: School Autonomy | *Not applicable.* | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Evidence is provided that the school’s leadership will have autonomy in making school improvement decisions and will be held accountable for those decisions. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Autonomy relevant to school improvement at the school-level is limited. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Decisions relevant to school improvement are the responsibility of district-level leadership only. | | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 | |
| 1. External Providers   *Schools are not required to contract with External Providers. If the school chooses to contract with External Providers, the school must have a clear plan for services. If not, the school must address this in the interview round if the application advances.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The plan meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The district describes an internal process for monitoring the effectiveness of services provided by External Providers. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The plan includes a comprehensive, proposed scope of work for the External Provider(s).  The scope of work includes quantitative performance measures. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The plan includes a vague proposed scope of work for the External Provider(s).  The scope of work includes limited quantitative performance measures. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The scope of work does not adequately define expectations for the performance of External Providers. | | 0 | *No points awarded during the initial review.* | |
| 1. School Climate | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The plan meets all items in the “meets standards” column.  Proposed solutions develop the capacity to create a sustained change in school culture. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposal clearly describes the school’s climate as defined through the comprehensive needs assessment process.  Proposed actions will directly address the problems identified by the needs assessment. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Proposal clearly describes the school’s climate as defined through the comprehensive needs assessment process, ***BUT*** proposed actions do not address the root cause of the problems identified by the needs assessment. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Proposal is vague or confusing.  Proposal does not address climate issues identified by the needs assessment. | | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 | |
| 1. Support for Teaching and Learning 2. Professional Development | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal includes all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The proposal includes a calendar with clear lines of responsibility for implementation.  Proposed activities are designed to develop the capacity and professional skills of teachers and principals. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal includes a comprehensive plan that provides targeted, job-embedded professional development which is tied to staff evaluations.  The proposal includes a system for monitoring the implementation of professional development initiatives that support the school’s instructional program. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The proposal includes a comprehensive plan that provides targeted, job-embedded professional development ***BUT*** is not tied to staff evaluations.  The proposed system for monitoring the implementation of professional development initiatives is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The proposal lacks a structured professional development process (not continuous, job-embedded, comprehensive, or targeted).  The proposal lacks a system for monitoring the professional development outcomes. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. Time for Faculty Collaboration | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  School allots at least 60 minutes a week for faculty collaboration in grade-level, department-level, or special services groups and at least 90 minutes a month for full faculty meetings.  Meetings are for data analysis, student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches, joint lesson planning, professional development/ coaching, and/or school-wide efforts to support the school proposal.  A process for monitoring meeting outcomes is described.  School schedules reflect reserved time. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  School allots at least 30 minutes a week for faculty collaboration in grade-level, department-level, or special services groups and at least 60 minutes a month for full faculty meetings.  EARLY LEARNING ONLY:  School allots regular time for cross-grade planning.  Meetings are for data analysis, student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches, joint lesson planning, and professional development/ coaching.  School schedules reflect reserved time. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  School allots at least 30 minutes a week for faculty collaboration in grade-level, department-level, or special services groups and at least 60 minutes a month for full faculty meetings.  EARLY LEARNING ONLY:  School allots time for cross-grade planning ***BUT*** it is infrequent.  Meeting topics are limited and do not reflect the scope of the school improvement process.  School schedules reflect some reserved time. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  School schedules do not reflect adequate time for faculty collaboration.  EARLY LEARNING ONLY:  School does not allot time for cross-grade planning.  Meetings’ purposes are vague or omitted. | | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 | |
| 1. Parent and Community Engagement 2. Community-School Relations | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The school uses numerous, substantive methods to discover parental and community satisfaction.  The proposal describes innovative improvements to enhance community-school relations. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Current and proposed methods of determining parental and community satisfaction with the school are clear and adequate.  Current and proposed complaint procedures are included. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Current and proposed methods of determining parental and community satisfaction with the school are unclear or insufficient.  Current and proposed complaint procedures are vague. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school has no method for determining parental and community satisfaction with the school.  The school lacks complaint procedures for parents or community members. | | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 | |
| 1. Services for Families and Community Members |  | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Services will enhance student achievement at the targeted school.  Services address the needs of children and their families in the targeted school.  Services are provided at a variety of times and locations. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Services will not enhance student achievement at the targeted school. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Services are vague or confusing.  Services will not address the needs of children and their families in the targeted school.  Services are limited to the traditional school setting and schedule. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. Engagement In School Improvement | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The proposal includes a highly structured, Board-approved, school-wide plan to engage parents and community members.  The proposal includes a plan or process to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the engagement efforts. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Opportunities for meaningful engagement are clear and numerous.  Engagement plans include multiple opportunities for parents to review school performance and participate in decision-making about school improvement plans.  The proposal is designed to strengthen or expand current involvement activities using SIG funds. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are limited.  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are shallow: no parents will have a formal role in decision-making about school improvement plans. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are too vague or too confusing to evaluate.  No opportunities for engagement are given. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| 1. Sustainability | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school makes a particularly compelling case for how it will sustain reforms through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. This case synthesizes information from the entire proposal (plan and budget) which attests to the sustainability of the reforms. | | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school makes a clear case for how it will sustain reforms through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. This case synthesizes information from the entire proposal (plan and budget) which attests to the sustainability of the reforms. | | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s case for sustaining the reforms is mostly clear, ***BUT*** it lacks a description of how the school will support one of the following: quality implementation, human capital development, or on-going community engagement. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s response is vague or confusing.  The school does not describe how it will sustain reforms. | | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 | |
| **PART III TOTAL** | | **Turnaround = 126** | | **Transformation = 144** | | | **Early Learning = 138** | | |

1. Operations and Support Systems—Pathways to Success

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Allocation of Financial Resources | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  All additional sources of revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some sources of additional revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Use of additional revenue does not align with the school proposal or the school’s needs.  Explanations of how resources will support/align with the SIG proposal are vague or confusing. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* =2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Evaluation Policies | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school will use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***OR***  Plan meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  Plan also provides qualitative and quantitative indicators of effectiveness.  Plan includes board policies for teacher and administrator evaluation. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school will use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***OR***  Plan clearly describes teacher and administrator evaluation processes that include both informal and formal observations and artifacts as indicators of effectiveness.  The plan includes a timeline and specific improvements that will be made to the school’s evaluation system.  The school’s evaluation system is rigorous, transparent, and equitable; uses student data as a significant factor; and was developed with teacher and principal input. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school will not use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***AND***  Plan describes teacher ***OR*** administrator evaluation processes that include both informal and formal observations and some artifacts as indicators of effectiveness.  The plan for improvements to the current evaluation system is unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school will not use the MDE’s teacher evaluation plan ***AND***  Plan does not describe how the district will evaluate teachers and administrators.  Plan does not include current evaluation tools.  Plan does not provide improvements or changes to current evaluation system.  The school’s evaluation system lacks rigor, transparency, and equity; student data as a significant factor; ***OR*** teacher and principal input. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Organizational Structures and Management 2. Governance    1. Proposed Governance Structure    2. District-Level Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan meets all items in the “meets standards” column.  School improvement is clearly a district-wide priority as demonstrated by an internal school improvement monitoring process. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for ***both*** the school and the district.  District-level staff support is clear and adequate to ensure fidelity of implementation at the school-level. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for the school ***OR*** the district.  District-level staff support is limited. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are vague or omitted.  No district-level staff support is provided. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| * 1. Pathways to Success School Leadership Team | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The description of the School Leadership Team contains all necessary persons ***AND*** the description is clear. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The description of the School Leadership Team contains all necessary persons ***BUT*** the description is vague or confusing. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The School Leadership Team lacks any of the following: high school principal, high school counselor, middle school principal, middle school counselor, individuals with decision-making authority from both the LEA and IHE, and a design consultant assigned by MDE. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. External Providers\*    1. Contract for Daily Management    2. Contract for Specific Services    3. Scope of Work | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The plan meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The district describes an internal process for monitoring the effectiveness of services provided by External Providers. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The plan includes a comprehensive, proposed scope of work for the External Provider(s).  The scope of work includes quantitative performance measures. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The plan includes a vague proposed scope of work for the External Provider(s).  The scope of work includes limited quantitative performance measures. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The scope of work does not adequately define expectations for the performance of External Providers. | 0 | *No points awarded during the initial review.*  *\*Pathways Schools are required to contract with an MDE-approved technical assistance provider but are not required to contract with additional providers. If the school chooses to contract with External Providers, the school must have a clear plan for services.* |
| * 1. MDE-Approved Technical Assistance Provider |  | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school attaches a signed MOU with an MDE-approved technical assistance provider. |  | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school does not provide a signed MOU with an MDE-approved technical assistance provider. | 1 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 2 |
| 1. Family and Community Engagement 2. Written Communications Plan | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  Example distribution materials about the transition are provided in the proposal.  Parents and community members will be offered multiple methods (meetings, hotlines, dedicated email) of asking questions regarding the transition. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Media outreach will begin several months in advance of transition and is likely to reach all affected parents and most community members.  Parents and community members will be offered multiple opportunities to ask questions regarding the transition.  Transition services are well-defined, individualized, and easily accessible to children and their families. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Media outreach lacks a clear timeline.  ***AND/OR***  Media outreach is unlikely to reach all affected parents.  Parents and community members will be offered one opportunity (e.g., one meeting) to ask questions regarding the transition.  Transition services are clear but minimal. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Media outreach is vague or confusing.  ***OR***  No plans for media outreach are proposed.  No opportunities to ask questions are proposed.  Transition services are vague or confusing.  ***OR***  No transition services are proposed. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Engagement In School Improvement | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The proposal includes a highly structured, Board-approved, school-wide plan to engage parents and community members.  The proposal includes a plan or process to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the engagement efforts. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Opportunities for meaningful engagement are clear and numerous.  Engagement plans include multiple opportunities for parents to review school performance and participate in decision-making about school improvement plans.  The proposal is designed to strengthen or expand current involvement activities using SIG funds. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are limited.  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are shallow: no parents will have a formal role in decision-making about school improvement plans. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are too vague or too confusing to evaluate.  No opportunities for engagement are given. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Sustainability | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school makes a particularly compelling case for how it will sustain reforms through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. This case synthesizes information from the entire proposal (plan and budget) which attests to the sustainability of the reforms. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school makes a clear case for how it will sustain reforms through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. This case synthesizes information from the entire proposal (plan and budget) which attests to the sustainability of the reforms. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s case for sustaining the reforms is mostly clear, ***BUT*** it lacks a description of how the school will support one of the following: quality implementation, human capital development, or on-going community engagement. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s response is vague or confusing.  The school does not describe how it will sustain reforms. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| **PART III TOTAL** | | | | | | **53** |

1. Operations and Support Systems—Closure

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Allocation of Financial Resources | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  All additional sources of revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some sources of additional revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Use of additional revenue does not align with the school proposal or the school’s needs.  Explanations of how resources will support/align with the SIG proposal are vague or confusing. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* =2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Facilities | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Evidence is provided to substantiate that the proposed consolidated facility is a better facility than the closed school for all students. ***OR***  The school has clear plans and available funding for making the consolidated school “state of the art” for all students. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Proposed consolidated facility is adequate to meet the needs of the new school population.  ***OR***  The school has clear plans and available funding for making changes required for facility adequacy. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Proposed consolidated facility may require changes to accommodate additional students or students of a different age,  ***BUT***  the school’s facility plan or finances for making facility changes are unclear. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Proposed consolidated facility may require changes to accommodate additional students or students of a different age,  ***BUT***  the school’s facility plan and finances for making facility changes are unclear. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Parent and Community Outreach and Engagement 2. Outreach Prior to School Closure | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  Example distribution materials about the consolidation are provided in the proposal.  Parents and community members will be offered multiple methods (meetings, hotlines, dedicated email) of asking questions regarding school closure. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Media outreach will begin several weeks in advance of consolidation and is likely to reach all affected parents and most community members.  Parents and community members will be offered multiple opportunities to ask questions regarding school closure.  Transition services are well-defined, individualized, and easily accessible to children and their parents. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Media outreach lacks a clear timeline.  ***AND/OR***  Media outreach is unlikely to reach all affected parents.  Parents and community members will be offered one opportunity (e.g., one meeting) to ask questions regarding school closure.  Transition services are clear but minimal. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Media outreach is vague or confusing.  ***OR***  No plans for media outreach are proposed.  No opportunities are proposed.  Transition services are vague or confusing.  ***OR***  No transition services are proposed. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Engagement In School Improvement | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The proposal includes a highly structured, Board-approved, school-wide plan to engage parents and community members.  The proposal includes a plan or process to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the engagement efforts. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Opportunities for meaningful engagement are clear and numerous.  Engagement plans include multiple opportunities for parents to review school performance and participate in decision-making about school improvement plans.  The proposal is designed to strengthen or expand current involvement activities using SIG funds. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are limited.  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are shallow: no parents will have a formal role in decision-making about school improvement plans. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are too vague or too confusing to evaluate.  No opportunities for engagement are given. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| **SECTION TOTAL** | | | | | | **27** |

1. Operations and Support Systems—Whole-School Reform

| **Item** | **Exceeds** | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Allocation of Financial Resources | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  All additional sources of revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Some sources of additional revenue will support/align with the SIG proposal and the school’s needs. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Use of additional revenue does not align with the school proposal or the school’s needs.  Explanations of how resources will support/align with the SIG proposal are vague or confusing. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* =2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. School Leadership | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal provides a compelling description of how the model will address the school leadership needs of the school. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal clearly describes how the model will address the school leadership needs of the school. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the school leadership needs of the school is weak. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the school leadership needs of the school is vague or confusing. | 3 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Partially meets standards = 3*  *Meets standard = 6* |
| 1. Organizational Structures and Management 2. Governance    1. Proposed Governance Structure    2. District-Level Staff | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Plan meets all items in the “meets standards” column.  School improvement is clearly a district-wide priority as demonstrated by an internal school improvement monitoring process. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for ***both*** the school and the district.  District-level staff support is clear and adequate to ensure fidelity of implementation at the school-level. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for the school ***OR*** the district.  District-level staff support is limited. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are vague or omitted.  No district-level staff support is provided. | 2 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 2  *Meets standard* = 4  *Exceeds standard* = 6 |
| 1. Whole-School Reform Model Developer | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school attaches evidence that a whole-school reform developer has agreed to support the school. | *Not applicable.* | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school does not provide evidence that a whole-school reform developer has agreed to support the school. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| 1. Family and Community Engagement 2. Alignment | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal provides a compelling description of how the model will address the engagement needs of the school. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal clearly describes how the model will address the engagement needs of the school. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the engagement needs of the school is weak. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The proposal’s description of how the model will address the engagement needs of the school is vague or confusing. | 3 | *Does not meet standard = 0*  *Partially meets standards = 3*  *Meets standard = 6* |
| 1. Engagement In School Improvement | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The proposal meets all of the items in the “meets standards” column.  The proposal includes a highly structured, Board-approved, school-wide plan to engage parents and community members.  The proposal includes a plan or process to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the engagement efforts. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  Opportunities for meaningful engagement are clear and numerous.  Engagement plans include multiple opportunities for parents to review school performance and participate in decision-making about school improvement plans.  The proposal is designed to strengthen or expand current involvement activities using SIG funds. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are limited.  Opportunities for engagement are clear ***BUT*** they are shallow: no parents will have a formal role in decision-making about school improvement plans. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  Opportunities for engagement are too vague or too confusing to evaluate.  No opportunities for engagement are given. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| 1. Sustainability | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school makes a particularly compelling case for how it will sustain reforms through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. This case synthesizes information from the entire proposal (plan and budget) which attests to the sustainability of the reforms. | Proposal meets ***all of the following***:  The school makes a clear case for how it will sustain reforms through support for quality implementation, human capital development, and on-going community engagement. This case synthesizes information from the entire proposal (plan and budget) which attests to the sustainability of the reforms. | Proposal meets ***at least one of the following***:  The school’s case for sustaining the reforms is mostly clear, ***BUT*** it lacks a description of how the school will support one of the following: quality implementation, human capital development, or on-going community engagement. | Proposal meets ***any of the following***:  The school’s response is vague or confusing.  The school does not describe how it will sustain reforms. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Partially meets standard* = 3  *Meets standard* = 6  *Exceeds standard* = 9 |
| **PART III TOTAL** | | | | | | **48** |

Budget

| **Meets** | **Does Not Meet** | **Weight** | **Total Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Budget ***meets all of the following***:  Cover sheet is completed and attached.  Cover sheet aligns with the 5-year budget summary sheet. | Budget ***meets any of the following***:  Cover sheet is not completed or attached.  Cover sheet does not align with the 5-year budget | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| Budget ***meets all of the following***:  Budget narratives for all items are clear. | Budget ***meets any of the following***:  Budget narrative for any item is not clear. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| Budget ***meets all of the following***:  Budget items/narratives are supported by the pages referenced in the plan. | Budget ***meets any of the following***:  Budget item/narrative is not supported by the pages referenced in the plan. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| Budget ***meets all of the following***:  All plan elements that require funding are reflected in the budget or narrative. | Budget ***meets any of the following***:  Plan elements that require funding are not reflected in the budget or narrative. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| Budget ***meets all of the following***:  All budget items follow EDGAR cost principles (are reasonable, necessary, and program-related). | Budget ***meets any of the following***:  All budget items do not follow EDGAR cost principles (are reasonable, necessary, and program-related). | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| Budget ***meets all of the following***:  The annual allocation request per school for any year is no less than $50,000 and no more than $2,000,000. | Budget ***meets any of the following***:  The annual allocation request per school for any year is less than $50,000 or more than $2,000,000. | 3 | *Does not meet standard* = 0  *Meets standard* = 6 |
| **BUDGET TOTAL** | | | **36** |