Item	Exceeds standard	Meets standard	Partially meets standard	Does not meet standard	Weight	Points	Explanation	Grand Total
I. Introduction A. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School	Not Applicable.	Form <i>meets the following:</i> Form is complete.	Not Applicable.	Form is missing any of the Following:			Does not meet standard = 0 Meets standard = 2	
				☐ Designation, ☐ Accountability Label, ☐ Selected Intervention, ☐ NCES ID, or ☐ MSIS Code.	1			
		Offeets standard		Oboes not meet standard				
B. Alignment with the Needs Assessment 1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Proposal meets all of the following: Provides a clear, indepth discussion of the school's needs in each area. Provides both quantitative and qualtitative 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 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	
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard				
2. Intervention Model Selection	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets all of the		ļ				
	following: The narrative explains in detail how the choice of the intervention model is aligned with school needs.	_ ·	Proposal meets at least one of the following: The needs assessment data weakly supports the school's model	Proposal meets any of the following: The needs assessment data does not justify the school's model selection.	3		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9	
	following: The narrative explains in detail how the choice of the intervention model is aligned with school needs. Oxceeds standard	following: The needs assessment data supports the school's model Offeets standard	the following: The needs assessment ☐ data weakly supports	following: The needs assessment data does not justify the school's model selection. Choes not meet standard	3		Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9	
3. Baseline Data and Performance Goals	following: The narrative explains in detail how the choice of the intervention model is aligned with school needs.	following: The needs assessment data supports the school's model Oleets standard Proposal meets all of the	the following: The needs assessment data weakly supports the school's model	following: The needs assessment data does not justify the school's model selection.	2		Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6	

C. 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	
D. Foundtion Laid through Priority/Focus Schools Process or Previous SIG Process	©Exceeds standard Not Applicable.	Oleets standard 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 produced strong, sustained student achievement gains.	Orartially meets standard 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 If the school had a previous SIG award, it only produced weak or unsustained student achievement gains.	Coes not meet standard 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	

E. Implementation Milestones 1.	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets at least one of	Proposal meets any of the		•	Does not meet standard = 0	
Pre-Implementation or Planning Year	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.	following: Activities are clear and allowable. Activities are assigned to specific individuals (by name and/or Activities have a clear timeline and identified evaluation metric. Activities are necessary to the successful implementation of the school proposal.	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.	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		Partially meets standard = 2 Meets standard = 4 Exceeds standard = 6	
	OExceeds standard	OMeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard				
2. 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	
	Cexceeds Statidato	Occ.o standard	·	Coes not meet standard				
PART I TOTAL	Turnaround = 49 points availab	le	29 points is 60% of points available					
Preferential Points:							I	
	Any school proposal for a school	ool that has never received SIG ma	ay be awarded 10 preferential poi	nts in this section. Evidence must b	e found in	Section D.		

II. Teaching and Learning							
A. Curriculum 1. 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. Omeets standard	Not Applicable	Proposal meets any of the following: The school does not use the state standards as the basis of the school's curriculum. Oboes not meet standard	2	Does not meet standard = 0 Meets standard = 6	
2. 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	
	Œxceeds standard	Meets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			

2 7		10		la		10	
3. Vertical alignment	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets at least one of the following:	Proposal meets at least one of the following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3	
	Jollowing:	Johowing:	the jollowing:	the jollowing:		Meets standard = 6	
	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 provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in each subject area/grade. OR	The school has provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in some subjects/ grades.	The school has not provided a working link to, or other evidence of, the existence of pacing guides in any subject area/grade. AND		Exceeds standard = 9	
	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	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	The school lacks clear plans, including a timeline and persons responsible, for developing pacing guides for the remaining subject 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	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.	3		
	cross-grade planning.	planning.	unclear.	for cross-grade planning.			
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Orartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			
B. Instruction	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets at least one of	Proposal meets any of the		Does not meet standard = 0	
1. Instructional improvements	following:	following:	the following:	following:		Partially meets standard = 2	
	Proposed instructional improvement strategies are clear, innovative, and effective. Proposed instructional improvements are aligned to school needs as identified by the needs assessment. Proposed instructional improvements will cover all grades/subject	Proposed instructional improvement strategies are clear and effective. Proposed instructional improvements are aligned to school needs as identified by the needs assessment. Proposed instructional improvements will cover tested grades/subject areas.	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.	Current or proposed plans for instruction are vague or confusing. No alignment between proposed instructional improvements and needs assessment. Instructional improvements are not addressed or do not indicate a change from current practice.	2	Meets standard = 4 Exceeds standard = 6	
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Orartially meets standard	Oboes not meet standard			l

2. Multi-Tiered System of Supports Instructional Model/Intervention Process	Proposal <i>meets all of the following:</i>	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposals meets any of the following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 2
(IP)	The school describes a multi-tiered system of supports that exceeds State Board requirements.	The school describes a clear multi-tiered system of supports that meets State Board requirements.	The school's multi- tiered system of supports is unclear or does not meet State Board requirements.	The school provides no evidence of a multitiered system of supports.		Meets standard = 4 Exceeds standard = 6
	Current and proposed academic and non-lacademic services create a school-wide system of support for all	Proposed academic and non-academic services enhance current services to create a system of support for struggling students. Socio-emotional counseling and community-oriented services will be enhanced through SIG to meet the needs of the students.	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 the special education teachers or for selected grades.	The school's current and/or proposed academic or non-academic services are vague or confusing. The school does not propose plans for socioemotional counseling and other services or community-oriented services.	2	
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard		
3. Special populations	Proposal meets all of the following: The school has clear, evidence-based plans for enhancing instruction for all special	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	2	Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 2 Meets standard = 4 Exceeds standard = 6
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Oboes not meet standard		
4. 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
	Œxceeds standard	Offeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard		

C. Data for Instructional Decision-Making 1. 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	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 New internal assessments will be high-quality and standardized in tested	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	
	assessments will be high-quality and	assessments will be ☐ high-quality and	assessments will vary within grade-levels/	assessments are vague			
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Orartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			

2. Data-driven decision-making	Proposal <i>meets all of the</i> following:	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal <i>meets at least one of</i> the following:	Proposal <i>meets any of the</i> following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3
	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 subgroups, 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.	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 subgroups, items, and classrooms. The school's systems/policies/ procedures/ structures to support data analysis and use on a consistent basis are clear.	Limited evidence is provided that instructional decisions are informed by data. Assessment plan will provide timely data that can be analyzed by subgroups, items, OR classrooms. The school's systems/policies/ procedures/ structures to support data analysis do not provide adequate time for analysis.	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	Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9
	OExceeds standard	OMeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard		
D. Instructional Leadership and Staff Current Instructional Staff 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 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
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Partially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard		
PART II TOTAL	Turnaround = 72 points availab	ole			1	

for

Preferential Points:

- Proposals for the Turnaround model which make dual enrollment and AP/IB courses available to ALL students are eleigible for 10 preferential points. Evidence must be provided in item B.1.b. in this section
- Proposals for the Turnaround Model which incorporate high-quality pre-school using the Early Learning Collaborative model are eleigible for 10 preferential points. Evidence must be provided in item 8.2.c. in this section.
- Proposals for the Turnaround Model 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. in this section.

III. Operation and Support Systems							
A. Allocation of Financial Resources	Not Applicable.	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets at least the	Proposal meets any of the		Does not meet standard = 0	
A Allocation of Hilling Resources	rect rypheast.	following: All additional sources of revenue will support/align with the	following: Some sources of additional revenue will support/align with the	following: Use of additional revenue clearly does not align with the		Partially meets standard = 2 Meets standard = 4	
		SIG proposal and the school's needs.	SIG proposal and the school's needs.	school proposal or the school's needs. Explanations of how resources will support/align with the SIG proposal are vague or confusing.	2		
	Olot applicable	Oneets standard	Partially meets standard	Oboes not meet standard			
B. Human Resource Systems 1. Recruitment and Hiring a. School Leader	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets at least the following:	Proposal meets any of the following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6	
For Turnaround schools that do not qualify for an exemption.	The school's recruitment plan	The school's recruitment plan includes clear	The school's recruitment	The school's recruitment plan is vague or confusing.		Exceeds standard = 9	
	includes clear timelines, multiple, effective recruitment	timelines and at least one effective recruitment strategy.	unlikely to garner qualified candidates.	The school does not ☐ have a job description for the School Leader.			
	The job description for the School Leader is clear and comprehensive.	The job description for ☐ the School Leader is clear.	The job description for the School Leader is vague or confusing.	The school's process for evaluating/ selecting applicants is vague or confusing.	3		
	The school's process for evaluating applicants uses high-quality interview protocols.	The school's process for evaluating applicants is clear and thorough.					
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			
For schools qualifying for an exception	Not applicable.	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets at least one of the following:	Proposal <i>meets any of the following</i> :		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3	
		Evidence retained principal has a "track record of success in raising student achievement" is clear, quantitative, and compelling. OR	Evidence retained principal has a "track record of success in raising student achievement" is clear and, quantitative, but not compelling. OR	Evidence retained principal has a "track record of success in raising student achievement" is not clear or not quantitative.		Meets standard = 6	
		The school's recruitment plan includes clear timelines and at least one effective recruitment strategy.		Principal being retained is not "newly hired."	3		
		A rural flexibility school's description of how it will meet the intent and purpose of the requirement is compelling.	A rural flexibility school's description of how it will meet the intent and purpose of the requirement is weak.	exemption but does not qualify.			
						ı	

b. Instructional staff	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets at least one of	Proposal meets any of the		Does not meet standard = 0	
	following:	following:	the following:	following :		Partially meets standard = 3	
	The school's recruitment plan includes timelines and multiple, effective	The school's recruitment plan includes clear timelines and at least one effective recruitment strategy.	The school's recruitment plan is clear BUT is unlikely to garner qualified candidates.	The school's ☐ instructional staff recruitment plan is	3	Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9	
	The school's process for evaluating applicants reflects high expectations.	The school's process for evaluating applicants is clear and reflects high expectations.		The school's process for evaluating applicants is vague or confusing.			
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Orartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			

c. Financial incentives	Proposal meets all of the following:		Proposal meets at least the following:	Proposal meets any of the following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6	
	The school proposes SIG-funded financial ☐ incentives that are based on student performance outcomes.	The school proposes SIG-funded financial incentives and identifies any available state or federal financial incentive programs.	The school only proposes financial incentives currently available through state or other federal programs.	The school proposes no financial incentives, SIG-funded or otherwise.	3	Exceeds standard = 9	
	OExceeds standard	Oneets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			
2. Screening and Re-Hiring	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets all of the following:	Proposal meets at least the following:	Proposal meets any of the following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6	
	Plan describes indepth 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 describes how the district will screen and re-hire no more than 50% of staff. A rural flexibility school provides a compelling description of how it will meet the intent and purpose of this requirement.	Plan does not clearly describe how the district will screen and re-hire no more than 50% of current staff.	Plan does not describe how the district will determine which personnel to release or transfer. A school claims a rural flexibility exemtion but does not qualify.	3	Exceeds standard = 9	
	Œxceeds standard	OMeets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			
3. Employment Policies a. Placement	©Exceeds standard Proposal meets all of the following:	Omeets standard Proposal meets all of the following:	Orartially meets standard Proposal meets at least the following:	Obes not meet standard Proposal meets any of the following:		Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3	
	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal <i>meets all of the</i>	Proposal meets at least the	Proposal <i>meets any of the</i>	3		
	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need	Proposal meets at least the following: Placement process is clear but driven by seniority or teacher	Proposal meets any of the following: Placement process is	3	Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6	
a. Placement	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher Teacher preference is not a factor in making assignments. ©Exceeds standard	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher Teacher preference is taken into consideration but not as the most important factor.	Proposal meets at least the following: Placement process is clear but driven by seniority or teacher preference. Oartially meets standard	Proposal meets any of the following: Placement process is vague or confusing. Oboes not meet standard	3	Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9	
	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher 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 Teacher preference is taken into consideration but not as the most important factor.	Proposal meets at least 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	Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9 Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 3	
a. Placement b. Opportunities for promotion and career	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher Teacher preference is not a factor in making assignments. Cexceeds standard Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets all of the following: Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher Teacher preference is taken into consideration but not as the most important factor. Oteets standard Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets at least the following: Placement process is clear but driven by seniority or teacher preference. Oartially meets standard Proposal meets at least one of	Proposal meets any of the following: Placement process is vague or confusing. Oboes not meet standard Proposal meets any of the	3	Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9 Does not meet standard = 0	

Turnaround

C. Organizational Structures and Management 1. Governance 1. Governance Structure 2. District-Level Staff 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 District-level staff support is clear and adequate to ensure fidelity of implementation at the school-level. Proposal meets all of the following: Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for both the school OR the district. The proposal indudes a description of the proposed changes to the governance structure is vague or confusing. District-level staff support is limited. District-level staff support is limited. District-level staff support is limited. Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for the school OR the district. The proposal meets and of the following: Organizational charts which clearly represent lines of authority are included for the school OR the district. The proposal lacks a description of the proposed changes to the governance structure. District-level staff support is limited. District-level staff support is limited.	
Deceds standard Officets standard Office	
C. School Autonomy Not applicable Proposal meets all of the following: Evidence is provided to support 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. Autonomy relevant to school improvement at the responsibility of district-level leadership only. 2 Decisions relevant to school improvement at the responsibility of district-level leadership only.	
Olot applicable Office the American Office of	
2. External Providers Schools are not required to contract with Lead Partners. If the school chooses to contract with Lead Partners, the school must have a clear plan for services. If not, the school must address this in the interview round if the application advances. The plan includes a comprehensive, proposed scope of work includes not advances. The plan includes a comprehensive, proposed scope of work for the External Providers. The scope of work includes quantitative performance measures. The scope of work includes limited quantitative performance measures.	nitial review.

Reviewer Number: 1 Order reviewed: <insert>

Proposal <i>meets all of the following:</i> 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	
©Exceeds standard	Offeets standard	Partially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			

D. Support for Teaching and Learning	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meeets at least one of	Proposal meets any of the		Does not meet standard = 0	
I. Professional Development	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.	following: The proposal includes a comprehensive plan that provides targeted, job-embedded professional development which is The proposal includes a system for monitoring the implementation of professional development initiatives that support the school's instructional program.	the following: The proposal includes a comprehensive plan that provides targeted, jobembedded professional development BUT is not tied to staff evaluations. The proposed system for monitoring the implementation of professional development initiatives is unclear.	following: The proposal lacks a structured professional development process (not continuous, jobembedded, comprehensive, or targeted). The proposal lacks a system for monitoring the professional development outcomes.	3	Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9	
	OExceeds standard	Onleets standard	Oartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			
2. 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 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 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. Meetings' purposes are vague or omitted.	2	Does not meet standard = 0 Partially meets standard = 2 Meets standard = 4 Exceeds standard = 6	

E. Parent and Community Engagement 1. 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 innovate 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.	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	
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	Partially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			

2. Services for parents and community members		Proposal meets 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	
		Officets standard	OPartially meets standard	Opoes not meet standard			
3. Engagement in school improvement	Proposal meets the following:	Proposal meets all of the	Proposal meets at least one of	Proposal meets any of the		Does not meet standard = 0	
	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.	following: Opportunities for meaningful engagement are clear 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.	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.	following: Opportunities for engagement are too vague or too confusing to evaluate. No opportunities for engagement are given.	3	Partially meets standard = 3 Meets standard = 6 Exceeds standard = 9	
	OExceeds standard	Offeets standard	OPartially meets standard	Oboes not meet standard			
F. 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 ongoing 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 ongoing 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	
	OExceeds standard	Officets standard	Partially meets standard	Oboes not meet standard	1		
PART III TOTAL		Turnaround=125 points available	75 points is 60% of points available				
Total Points =							