

APPENDIX B: 1003 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT DISTRICT APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC

1003 SIG applications will be evaluated using the criteria shown below. Each section of the application will be rated from 0 to 3 points. Sections of the 1003 SIG applications are weighted differently. Each section will be scored from 0 to 3 and multiplied by the weight factor indicated below. Plans can receive up to 102 possible points. 1003 SIG is a competitive grant; awards and award amounts will be based on the quality and transformative potential of the application.

Application Components							
The Local Education Agency (LEA) has included all required components of the 1003 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application, and the school's plan incorporates evidenced-based interventions. Should the application score 0 points on either of the two indicators, the application will not be considered for award. An application cannot receive 1 point or 2 points for the Application Components section.							
Indicator	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	Indicator Score:	Weight Factor:	Points Per Indicator:
Items submitted include: Completed Application, including District Information and school selection, District application, School plan, Budget proposal; Completed Statement of Assurances.	A score of 0 points will be awarded if any of the following are true about the application: The district has not submitted completed application by the deadline.			The district has submitted completed application. Where applicable, the district has answered questions using less than or equal to the maximum number of allowable characters.		1	
Because ESSA requires the state to award 1003 SIG funding to schools with the highest need, Title I schools identified as Turnaround schools according to the CT Next Generation Accountability System receive priority points.	The school for which the district is applying for 1003 funding is identified as a Title I Focus school according to the CT Next Generation Accountability System.			The school for which the district is applying for 1003 funding is identified as a Title I Turnaround school according to the CT Next Generation Accountability System.		2	
Because 1003 SIG can only be used to support activities that meet ESSA's top three tiers of evidence (strong, moderate, promising), grant applications must identify the evidence-base level of each of the priorities and strategies identified. The grant application must also include the source to substantiate the evidence-base level.	The School Plan does not include both the evidence-base level for each of the proposed priorities and strategies and the source to substantiate that the proposed priority and strategy has strong, moderate or promising evidence-base.			The School Plan includes both the evidence-base level for each of the proposed priorities and strategies and the source to substantiate that the proposed priority and strategy has strong, moderate or promising evidence-base.		2	
Total Points for Application Components							

Part I: District Application							
The district must describe its strategy and structure to support school turnaround efforts at the district level. Specifically, the district must describe central office capacity to support low-performing schools, conditions that will enable bold reform, ongoing monitoring and accountability structures, and a sustainable and thoughtful financial resourcing strategy.							
Indicator	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	Indicator Score:	Weight Factor:	Points Per Indicator:
Section 1. District Capacity and Organizational Structure. The district must demonstrate that it has the readiness, capacity, and intentional organizational	The district describes an approach to school turnaround that lacks meaningful detail, raises concerns about the district's understanding of issues related to school turnaround	The district describes a general approach to school turnaround that is not related to student outcomes and requires additional information in	The district describes a theory of action, strategy or approach to school turnaround that is realistic and is related to student outcomes.	The district describes a strong, clear, and compelling theory of action, strategy or approach to school turnaround that describes a specific, rigorous criteria related to student		3	

<p>structure to support turnaround efforts in its lowest-performing schools, including a description of its strategy pertaining to school turnaround, an overview of its capacity and staffing structure, and the technical assistance and supports it will provide.</p>	<p>and/or has not related school turnaround to student outcomes. The district application vaguely indicates that the district has capacity by identifying staff at both the district and school levels responsible for implementing the selected interventions but does not describe how specific expertise or experiences will enable them to implement interventions or how they will provide support and technical assistance. The district fails to describe both organizational strengths and organizational weaknesses and provides little to no evidence that it has the necessary capacity to implement selected interventions.</p>	<p>order to be considered reasonably comprehensive and transformative. The district indicates it has some capacity by identifying staff at both the district and school levels who will be responsible for implementing the selected interventions but does not adequately describe how their expertise and experiences will enable them to successfully implement interventions or how they will provide support and technical assistance. The district describes its organizational strengths and weaknesses. The district addresses some of the organizational weaknesses but does so in ways that do not appear to be sufficient to successfully implement interventions.</p>	<p>The district application indicates the district has sufficient capacity by identifying staff at both the district and school levels who will be responsible for implementing the selected interventions and generally describes how their expertise and experiences will enable them to successfully implement interventions and provide support and technical assistance. The district describes its organizational strengths and weaknesses. The district addresses most of the organizational weaknesses in ways that demonstrate successful implementation of interventions is possible.</p>	<p>outcomes. The district clearly indicates it has sufficient capacity to support turnaround by identifying staff at both the district and school levels who will be responsible for implementing the selected interventions, by indicating specific supports and technical assistance each will provide, and by providing specific evidence about how their expertise and experiences will enable them to successfully implement the selected interventions. The district has clearly described its organizational strengths and weaknesses and has demonstrated it has the organizational capacity to implement the selected interventions. The district describes how it will address weaknesses so they will not hinder successful implementation.</p>			
<p>Section 2. District Support for Development of School Improvement Plans. The district must describe how it provided support to schools in the development of school improvement plans which include evidence-based interventions.</p>	<p>The district provides little to no description about specific measures it took to support the school in the development of school improvement plans. The district does not describe how it assisted the school in finding evidence-based interventions.</p>	<p>The district provides a summary of support to schools in the development of school improvement plans but does not describe specific detail about how it assisted the school in finding evidence-based interventions. The district describes a process that does not include school personnel in development of the school plan.</p>	<p>The district describes a general approach for supporting the school in development of a school improvement plan which includes evidence-based interventions. The district describes a process that allowed school autonomy, with guidance from the district, in the selection of interventions it will implement.</p>	<p>The district describes a detailed approach for how it supported the school in the selection of evidence-based interventions. The district describes a process that allowed school autonomy, with guidance from the district, in the selection of interventions it will implement. The district indicates specific district personnel who supported the school.</p>		2	

<p>Section 3. Accountability and Monitoring. The district must describe tools and processes it will implement to create shared accountability for results at the school and district levels, including systems, tools, and processes to monitor the fidelity of the plan implementation, leading and lagging performance indicators; and, how the school and district use data to drive ongoing decision-making.</p>	<p>The district provides little to no evidence that specific, multiple measures have been selected or will be used consistently throughout the 1003 grant period to evaluate annual goals and/or leading indicators and to make adjustments to selected interventions. Evaluation measures will not be administered three times per school year.</p>	<p>The district describes steps it will take to measure progress on annual achievement goals, intervention goals, and leading indicators, but the process does not appear to be systematic and/or may not include evaluation of annual achievement goals, intervention goals or leading indicators. The district describes a process for making adjustments to the selected interventions if the school is not on track to meet its goals. The district provides general information regarding evaluation measures to be used, which lacks multiple details regarding the timeline for administration, the person(s) responsible, and the specific ways the school will use data to inform decision-making through a system of shared accountability. Evaluation measures will be administered at least three times per school year.</p>	<p>The district describes a general systematic process for how it will measure progress on annual achievement goals, intervention goals, and leading indicators, and describes a systematic process for making adjustments to the selected interventions if the school is not on track to meet its goals. The district provides general information regarding evaluation measures to be used which may lack details regarding the timeline for administration, the person(s) responsible, and the specific ways the school will use data to inform decision-making through a system of shared accountability. Evaluation measures will be administered at least three times per school year.</p>	<p>The district describes a detailed, systematic process for how it will measure progress on annual achievement goals, intervention goals, and leading indicators, and describes a systematic process for making adjustments to the selected interventions if the school is not on track to meet its goals. The district has clearly identified the multiple evaluation measures to be used, the timeline for administration, the person(s) responsible, and the specific ways the school will use data to inform decision-making through a system of shared accountability. Evaluation measures will be administered at least three times per school year.</p>		3	
<p>Section 4. Review of External Partners. The district must describe the rigorous review process it will use to recruit, screen, select and evaluate any external partner with whom the district will contract to ensure the external partner is working to implement evidence-based interventions.</p>	<p>The district fails to identify how it will review external partners. The district does not identify how it will ensure that external partners will be implementing strong, moderate or promising evidence-based interventions; or, the district does not adequately describe its review process.</p>	<p>The district provides a description of how it will review external partners, but it does not indicate how it will ensure that the interventions provided by the external partner have strong, moderate or promising evidence-base, or the description creates too man additional questions for the grant reviewer to adequately understand the review process.</p>	<p>The district provides a general, systematic process for evaluating the external partners to ensure any intervention the partner provides has strong, moderate or promising evidence of effectiveness.</p>	<p>The district provides a detailed, systematic process for evaluating the external partners to ensure any intervention the partner provides has strong, moderate or promising evidence of effectiveness.</p>		2	

The balance of Part I of the scoring rubric continues on the next page.

<p>Section 5. Alignment of Resources. The district must describe its strategy or approach to aligning other Federal, State and local resources to carry out school improvement activities and to address resource inequities.</p>	<p>The district provides a description of its strategy or approach to aligning Federal, State and local resources to carry out school improvement activities that is unclear. The district fails to address how it identified resource inequities and how it will address resource inequities.</p>	<p>The district provided a limited description of its strategy or approach to aligning Federal, State and local resources to carry out school improvement activities. The description of how the district identified resource inequities and how it will address those inequities is unclear and/or does not describe how it will ensure resource inequities do not develop again beyond the grant period. The process for identifying resource inequities was limited to examination of possible inequities in technology and access to high-quality curriculum resources.</p>	<p>The district provided a general description of its strategy or approach to aligning Federal, State and local resources to carry out school improvement activities. The description of how the district identified resource inequities and how it will address resource inequities provides is clear and addresses how it will ensure resource inequities do not develop again beyond the grant period. The process for identifying resource inequities included examining possible inequities in many of the following: distribution of quality teaching staff, technology, interventions for students with disabilities and English Learners, access to high-quality curriculum resources, transportation and before- and after-school programming.</p>	<p>The district provided a detailed description of its strategy or approach to aligning Federal, State and local resources to carry out school improvement activities. The description of how the district identified resource inequities and how it will address them provides is clear and addresses how it will ensure resource inequities do not develop again beyond the grant period. The process for identifying resource inequities includes examining possible inequities in distribution of quality teaching staff, technology, interventions for students with disabilities and English Learners, access to high-quality curriculum resources, transportation and before- and after-school programming.</p>		2	
<p>Section 6. Conditions for Success. The district must describe how it will modify its practices and policies to allow the school additional autonomy in exchange for additional accountability and to allow for full implementation of interventions outlined in the school plan.</p>	<p>The district provides a summary of how schools will receive additional autonomy but limits the areas of autonomy to one of staffing, scheduling/calendaring, budgeting, or programming. The district provides a general summary of the accountability it will add as a result of the additional autonomy. The district provides little or no information to show that the school will be given any operational flexibility to implement the selected 1003 reform model.</p>	<p>The district provides a limited summary of how schools will receive additional autonomy but does not include one or more of the areas of staffing, scheduling/calendaring, budgeting, and programming. The district provides a general summary of the accountability it will add as a result of the additional autonomy. The district provides a summary of the changes that could take place to allow for more operational flexibility at the school level but changes are inadequately explained.</p>	<p>The district provides a general summary of how schools will receive additional autonomy in the areas of staffing, scheduling/calendaring, budgeting, and programming. The district provides a general summary of the accountability it will add as a result of the additional autonomy. The district provides a general summary of the changes that will take place to allow for more operational flexibility at the school level, but some details are lacking that demonstrate how or when the change will occur.</p>	<p>The district provides a detailed description of how schools will receive additional autonomy in the areas of staffing, scheduling/calendaring, budgeting, and programming. The district describes in detail the additional accountability it will add as a result of the additional autonomy. The district provides a detailed description of all changes it will make to allow operational flexibility at the school level and specifically indicates the changes in practice and procedures to allow this flexibility to take place.</p>		2	

The balance of Part I of the scoring rubric continues on the next page.

<p>Section 7. School Budget. The district must commit to thoughtful and strategic resourcing, including investments in high-yield evidence-based interventions. The district must describe major expenditures and ensure that 1003 SIG funds supplement, not supplant, all state and local funds it would have received in the absence of 1003 SIG funds.</p>	<p>The district provides a description of expenditures associated with the selected 1003 evidence-based interventions which raises substantial concerns about the district's understanding of, or ability to, implement the selected 1003 evidence-based interventions. The district provides little to no evidence to demonstrate its ability to implement the selected 1003 school evidence-based interventions without supplanting state and local funds it would receive in the absence of the 1003 SIG funding.</p>	<p>The district provides a limited description of major expenditures associated with the selected 1003 evidence-based interventions which does not clearly explain expected return on investment or impact on student achievement. The district's response requires additional information in order to fully demonstrate its ability to implement the selected 1003 school evidence-based interventions without supplanting state and local funds it would receive in the absence of the 1003 SIG funding.</p>	<p>The district provides a general summary description of major expenditures associated with the selected 1003 evidence-based interventions along with expected return on investment and impact on student achievement, giving a clear and realistic rationale for expenditures. The district demonstrates its ability to implement the selected 1003 school evidence-based interventions without supplanting state and local funds it would receive in the absence of the 1003 SIG funding.</p>	<p>The district provides a detailed description of each major expenditure associated with the selected 1003 evidence-based interventions along with expected return on investment and impact on student achievement, giving a clear and compelling rationale for expenditures. The district demonstrates the readiness of the district to successfully implement the selected 1003 school evidence-based interventions without supplanting state and local funds it would receive in the absence of the 1003 SIG funding.</p>	<p>2</p>	
Total Points for Part I: District Application						

Part II of the scoring rubric begins on the next page.

Part II: School Plan							
The district must provide a comprehensive and bold plan to improve student achievement which first identifies school needs and opportunities to select an appropriate school reform model and then articulates strategies to advance school performance in the areas of talent, academics, culture and climate, and operations, while meeting all the requirements under the selected reform model.							
Indicator	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	Indicator Score:	Weight Factor:	Points Per Indicator:
<p>Needs Assessment and Significant Strengths, Growth Areas and Resource Inequities. The district must describe the needs assessment informed by the school audit, referencing the Needs Assessment Tool, and</p>	<p>A needs assessment was not conducted for the school, or the needs assessment did not reference the Needs Assessment Tool. The district provided limited or no information on the process used to assess the school, including instruments used and</p>	<p>The district conducted a needs assessment using the Needs Assessment Tool that identifies school needs but does not relate these needs to deficiencies in student achievement or does not address root causes for the deficiencies. The summary of</p>	<p>The district conducted a rigorous needs assessment using the Needs Assessment Tool. The needs assessment evaluates strengths and deficiencies in student achievement to identify clear needs and implies a general connection</p>	<p>The district conducted a rigorous needs assessment that evaluates the strengths and deficiencies in student achievement. The needs assessment identifies clear strengths and needs and describes a clear, logical connection between how addressing</p>		4	

<p>summarizing the school's strengths and needs based on a root cause analysis. The district must describe the process used to complete the needs assessment, including how family and community stakeholders were engaged in the process and how the specific needs of family and community were identified.</p>	<p>stakeholder participants. The needs assessment did not clearly identify the needs of families and the community and/or did not adequately consider family and community input.</p>	<p>school strengths and growth areas is limited to a list without specific explanation. The district provides a general overview of the process used to conduct the needs assessment which does not sufficiently describe a process for analyzing assessment findings. The needs assessment does not clearly identify the specific needs of families and the community.</p>	<p>between how the identified need will result in increased student achievement. The district has identified a root cause for each deficiency which is limited in scope or only describes symptoms of the problem without identifying all possible causal effects. The district provided an overview of the processes used to assess the school.</p>	<p>the identified needs will result in increased student achievement. The district identifies the root cause for each deficiency and defines the problem, provides evidence of the problem from the school data and audit, and identifies all possible causal factors. The district provides an overview of a specific and effective needs assessment process and describes a range of perspectives from all district, school, family, and community stakeholders. The needs assessment clearly identifies the needs of families and the community.</p>			
<p>Overarching School Improvement Goals. The district must develop three S.M.A.R.T. goals aligned to specific deficiencies uncovered by the needs assessment and aligned to performance targets in Step 1. S.M.A.R.T. goals must include each of the following required elements: specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time-bound.</p>	<p>S.M.A.R.T. goals are missing multiple elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound) and/or are not aligned to specific deficiencies in student achievement in math and reading uncovered in the needs assessment and to performance targets.</p>	<p>S.M.A.R.T. goals are minimally aligned to specific deficiencies uncovered in the needs assessment and to performance targets in Step 1. S.M.A.R.T. goals may be missing two of the required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>	<p>S.M.A.R.T. goals are aligned to specific deficiencies in math and reading uncovered in the needs assessment and are aligned to performance targets but are missing one of the required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>	<p>S.M.A.R.T. goals are aligned to specific deficiencies in student achievement in math and reading uncovered in the needs assessment and are aligned to performance targets in Step 1. S.M.A.R.T. goals focus on improvement of specific root causes of deficiencies. The S.M.A.R.T. goals include all the required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>		1	

<p>Specific Interventions to Address Identified School Reform Priorities. The district must identify a core set of evidence-based interventions/strategies aligned to overarching school improvement goals and to the school's reform priorities, including a narrative summary of each priority and a S.M.A.R.T. goal which focuses on measurement of actions taken toward meeting specific school priorities.</p>	<p>Specific priorities and strategies described by the district are too numerous to implement with sustainability; are not directly focused on improvement of growth areas identified on the needs assessment; or strategies/interventions do not have strong, moderate, or promising evidence-base. The district may have failed to describe at least one strategy focused on improving chronic absenteeism if the school's chronic absenteeism rate is above the 10 percent state target. Aligned S.M.A.R.T. goals focus on measurement of actions taken toward meeting the identified priorities and strategies, but are missing two or more of the required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>	<p>It is unclear whether the number of specific priorities and strategies described by the district represent a manageable number to allow for sustainability. It is not clear how the priorities and strategies selected are aligned to deficiencies uncovered in the needs assessment, and it is likely that not all priorities and strategies clearly align to the needs. At least one of the proposed strategies focuses on improving chronic absenteeism if the school's chronic absenteeism rate is above the 10 percent state target. Aligned S.M.A.R.T. goals focus on measurement of actions taken toward meeting the identified priorities and strategies. Each of the S.M.A.R.T. goals are missing one of the required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>	<p>The district generally described how identified strategies are likely to provide supports that will improve deficiencies or growth areas uncovered in the needs assessment. The district has generally described how selected strategies are likely to build the capacity of school administration and staff to continue improvement beyond the grant period. At least one of the proposed strategies focuses on improving chronic absenteeism if the school's chronic absenteeism rate is above the 10 percent state target. Aligned S.M.A.R.T. goals focus on measurement of actions taken toward meeting the identified priorities and strategies and have all required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>	<p>The district provides detailed description of the reform priorities and strategies, including how the priority aligns to specific deficiencies uncovered in the needs assessment. The identified priorities and strategies represent a manageable number to allow for sustainability and allow for immediate effective implementation. At least one of the proposed strategies focuses on improving chronic absenteeism if the school's chronic absenteeism rate is above the 10 percent state target. Aligned S.M.A.R.T. goals focus on measurement of actions taken toward meeting the identified priorities and strategies. Each of the S.M.A.R.T. goals include all the required elements (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound).</p>		4		
<p>School Budget. The district must complete a budget proposal for year 1 of the four year cohort period. If the proposed school is a Title I Focus School, a minimum proposal of \$50,000 per year is required. If the school is a Title I Turnaround School, a minimum proposal of \$200,000 is required. No school may receive more than \$500,000 annually. The budget proposal must include each proposed cost item showing alignment to priorities and strategies, detailed budget justification and cost basis, and the total proposed 1003 SIG investment for each cost.</p>	<p>The district has submitted a budget proposal but does not adhere to 1003 SIG annual minimum requirements of at least \$50,000 per year for a Title I Focus School or \$200,000 per year for a Title I Turnaround School. The budget does not adhere to the maximum annual requirements of \$500,000 per year for any eligible school. Expenditures do not align to the school plan. The proposed budget includes multiple line items that are not clearly aligned to specific priorities and strategies proposed by the district. The description of each expenditure is limited to simply naming the expenditure. The proposed budget is reasonable but includes two or more cost items that are not proportional to proposed grant activities or are not clearly aligned to proposed priorities and strategies.</p>	<p>The district has submitted a budget proposal with at least \$50,000 proposed for a Title I Focus School or \$200,000 for a Turnaround School. The budget does not exceed the maximum annual award of \$500,000. The district provides minimal budget justification and cost basis for each line item it proposes, making it difficult to determine how some expenditures align to proposed grant activities. The proposed budget is reasonable but includes one or two cost items that are not proportional to the proposed grant activities.</p>	<p>The district has submitted a budget proposal with at least \$50,000 proposed for a Title I Focus School or \$200,000 for a Turnaround School. The budget does not exceed the maximum annual award of \$500,000. The budget is reasonable, and all cost items are proportional to grant activities. For each expenditure, a description is provided which aligns to the school plan and includes minimally a summary of each expense, costs per unit, and number of units.</p>	<p>The district has submitted a budget proposal with at least \$50,000 proposed for a Title I Focus School or \$200,000 for a Turnaround School. The budget does not exceed the maximum annual award of \$500,000. The budget is reasonable, and all cost items are proportional to grant activities. For each expenditure, a detailed description is provided which clearly aligns to the school plan and includes minimally a summary of each expense, costs per unit and the number of units.</p>		4		
Total Points for Part II: School Plan								
TOTAL POINTS FOR 1003 APPLICATION								
Reviewer Comments								
Overall Strengths of the LEA Application:	Overall Weaknesses of the Application:							