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**Note:** The following version of the application is intended as a reference document for instructions and grant application planning purposes.

**Applications for the Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI) Grant must be submitted in** [**GAINS**](https://colorado.egrantsmanagement.com/)**.**

Submission of application materials either in hard copy or via

e-mail will not be accepted.

The application window will open in GAINS on September 27, 2024, and close on Wednesday, December 4, 2024, at 4 pm.

[More information about GAINS is available on CDE’s website.](https://www.cde.state.co.us/gains)

# Accessing GAINS

**School District and BOCES Applicants**

* Contact your district Local Access Manager (LAM) to receive access to GAINS. Documentation and training on this process for LAMs is available on [CDE’s GAINS Training webpage](https://www.cde.state.co.us/gains/gainstrainings).

**Charter School Applicants**

* Complete the [Charter School GAINS Access Request Form](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/6cb9159d35894e76b6875bebc7232d56)

**Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI) Application**

**Applications Due: Wednesday, December 4, 2024, by 4 pm**

# Introduction and Purpose

With the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and with revisions to the state’s Educational Accountability Act (HB 18-1355), Colorado has taken the opportunity to change the way school improvement funds (1003a through ESSA and the School Transformation Grant through HB 18-1355) are awarded to Local Education Agencies (LEAs). Rather than multiple applications on separate timelines, CDE now streamlines school improvement opportunities into a single application and uses a “needs-based approach” to award services and funding. This new approach has been designed to: maximize impact on student learning; incentivize innovative ideas; create a fair and transparent process; increase efficacy and efficiency; provide greater predictability to LEAs; and prioritize LEAs with high numbers or high percentages of low-performing schools. Ultimately, the intent is to develop a robust process of matching schools’ needs with rigorous, evidence-based strategies and adequate resources. Additionally, awarded funds are intended to enhance districts’ and schools’ ability to meet the ESSA and state requirements (e.g., stakeholder engagement, improvement plan, and implementation of evidence-based interventions) in a way that directly benefits students.

Colorado has committed to aligning federal and state accountability to the greatest degree possible. These grant funds are aimed at districts with schools that are designated as (1) Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS), Targeted Support and Improvement (TS) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (A-TS) under ESSA and (2) Priority Improvement, Turnaround, or On Watch through the state accountability system. Specific eligibility and prioritization requirements are detailed in the information sheets for each service.

The application is to be completed by the LEA on behalf of any of its eligible schools. District activities in support of identified schools are also allowable. The application has been organized into four different routes: exploration supports, district designed and led, offered supports, and other programming. The routes have different criteria and funding amounts. A summary of the routes and the individual services can be found below. They are also summarized in the [Menu of Supports.](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiapplicationroutes) Additional detail (e.g., eligibility criteria, prioritization guidelines, evaluation requirements, local commitments) for each program or opportunity are included in the links.

# EASI Application Routes

**Exploration Supports**

The primary purpose of the Exploration Supports route is to help schools and LEAs gather information about their needs and plan for future action. Exploration support includes diagnostic reviews, stakeholder engagement, improvement planning, and early implementation. Schools may select a holistic or specialized review and districts may select strategic planning or specialized review and planning.

For each school and/or LEA, select the Diagnostic Review that will address current needs. On the next page, each school and/or LEA will select either a holistic review (schools) or district strategic planning (district) OR the type of specialized review (schools - AEC/Online or Language Learner Partnership) that is being requested. **Note:** A change from previous years, each option will now include funding and support for a diagnostic review, stakeholder engagement, improvement planning and early implementation funds. The selection of these components does not need to be made individually.

The exploration supports include:

* School Diagnostic Review and Planning
	+ Holistic Review (facilitated by an external partner)
	+ Language Learner Partnership (facilitated by CDE)
	+ AEC and Online Review (facilitated by CDE)
	+ Stakeholder and Community Engagement
	+ Improvement Planning
	+ Early Implementation
* District Specialized Review and Planning (facilitated by CDE)
	+ Language Learner Partnership (for Districts and Schools)
	+ Stakeholder and Community Engagement
	+ Improvement Planning
	+ Early Implementation
* District Strategic Planning (facilitated by an external partner)
	+ Systems review and analysis
	+ Stakeholder and Community Engagement
	+ Improvement Planning
	+ Early Implementation

More information is available on the [Exploration Supports webpage](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/explorationsupports).

**District Designed and Led Improvement Strategies**

LEAs have a plan or are already implementing a plan that meets the needs of identified schools and is interested in pursuing grant funds to support activities. More information is available on the [District Designed and Led Improvement Strategies webpage](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/districtdesignedstrategies).

**Offered Services**

LEAs interested in applying for an existing CDE support aimed at improving school systems. Services may include a comprehensive approach that includes planning and implementation phases.

* [Accountability Pathways](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/exploration-accountabilitypathways)
* [Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (COMTSS)](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/districtwide-comtss)
* [Connect for Success](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/cdeofferedservices-connectforsuccess)
* [School Turnaround Leadership Development Program](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/turnaroundleadership)
* School Transformation Network
* [Rigorous Action through Redesign](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easirigorousactionthroughredesign)

**Other Services**

LEAs and schools interested in applying for participation in a board-level support aimed at improving school systems or need support for an upcoming school closure or school consolidation. Additional Information:

* [Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/facilitatedboardtraining)
* School Transitions

# Eligible Applicants

LEAs with schools identified (1) under ESSA as Comprehensive Support (CS), Targeted Support (TS) or Additional Targeted Support (A-TS) and/or (2) under state accountability as Priority Improvement, Turnaround, and On Watch are eligible to apply for funds and services. An LEA includes:

* A School District applying as a district and on behalf of eligible schools and charter schools;
* A Board of Cooperative Services (BOCES) applying on behalf of districts with eligible schools and charter schools; and
* The Charter School Institute (CSI) applying as the LEA and/or on behalf of eligible schools.

**Note:** Applications will not be accepted from individual non-charter schools and must be authorized and submitted through the LEP.

**Charter Schools:**

Pursuant to [C.R.S. 22-30.5-104 (11)](https://advance.lexis.com/documentpage/?pdmfid=1000516&crid=f793ddcd-a668-40c2-88c9-13152b4e624f&nodeid=AAWAAEAACAACAAE&nodepath=%2FROOT%2FAAW%2FAAWAAE%2FAAWAAEAAC%2FAAWAAEAACAAC%2FAAWAAEAACAACAAE&level=5&haschildren=&populated=false&title=22-30.5-104.+Charter+school+-+requirements+-+authority+-+rules+-+definitions.&config=014FJAAyNGJkY2Y4Zi1mNjgyLTRkN2YtYmE4OS03NTYzNzYzOTg0OGEKAFBvZENhdGFsb2d592qv2Kywlf8caKqYROP5&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fstatutes-legislation%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A65MT-X293-CGX8-0095-00008-00&ecomp=8gf59kk&prid=b437b07b-e138-4d15-acfc-74ff860597f5), a charter school may choose to apply apart from their authorizer for a competitive grant program created by a federal or state statute or program. The charter school is considered the LEP only for the purposes of applying and determining eligibility. A charter school’s authorizer will be the fiscal agent, if funded.

* A charter school that applies for a grant shall provide to its authorizing district:
	+ A copy of the grant application at the time the application is submitted to CDE; and
	+ If the charter school receives the grant moneys, a summary of the grant requirements, a summary of how the charter school is using the grant moneys, and periodic reports on the charter school’s progress in meeting the goals of the grant as stated in its application.
* If a charter school intends to apply for a grant that the school’s authorizing school district is also intending to apply for, the charter school shall seek to collaborate with the school district in the application and to submit the application jointly. If the charter school and the school district are unable to agree to collaborate in applying for the grant, the charter school may apply for the grant independently or in collaboration with other charter schools.

For more information regarding Colorado’s accountability system please visit [CDE's Accountability, Performance and Support webpage](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability). Applications must be authorized and submitted through the LEA and will not be accepted from individual schools. **Note:** A charter school’s authorizer will be the fiscal agent, if awarded funds.

LEAs should select the appropriate route for the school/district based upon current needs. LEAs are encouraged to work with their assigned District Support Lead or reach out to the CDE contacts listed on the cover page of this application for additional assistance to determine an appropriate fit.

The school’s type of identification - whether federal (i.e., CS, TS, A-TS), state (i.e. Priority Improvement, Turnaround, On Watch) or both - determines the opportunities for services and for funding. Below is a table that illustrates program options and eligibility. While CDE will work to ensure that all eligible LEAs have access to support services, some opportunities have limited space, capacity, or funding. In those cases, priorities for awards are listed on the specific program information page in the [Menu of Supports](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiapplicationroutes).

***Program Options and Eligibility***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exploration Supports Route**Exploration Activities (i.e., diagnostic review, community engagement, improvement planning) | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **District Designed and Led Improvement Strategies Route**District Designed and Led- Implementation SupportDistrict Designed and Led- Major Improvement Strategy | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **Offered Services Route****Accountability Pathways*** School or District in Year 4 of 5 of Priority Improvement or Turnaround or a school that has action directed by State Board of Education
 |  | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (COMTSS)** | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **Connect for Success*** No current Transformation Network
 | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **School Turnaround Leadership Development (both general and SPED)** | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **School Transformation Network*** No current Connect for Success
 | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **Rigorous Action through Redesign*** School in Year 2 or 3 Priority Improvement or Turnaround or Year 3 or 4 of Comprehensive Supports (CS) Lowest 5% or Low Graduation rate
 | ESSAIdentified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **Other Services****Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement**  |  | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |
| **School Transitions**  | ESSA Identified Only | ESSA and State Clock | State Clock Only |

The list of identified schools meeting the criteria for each opportunity can be found online on the [EASI website](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiappresourcesandtechnicalassistance) or in **Attachment A**. Specific program eligibility can also be found by visiting the EASI website.

***Program Priority***

Available grant funding will be distributed to LEAs that submit an application that meets the criteria within their chosen route(s). All applications will be reviewed and scored based on the rubrics included for each support. In the event the amount requested exceeds the amount available, applications that receive a fundable number of points will be prioritized. Each school will receive a point value based on a group of indicators (e.g., school improvement status, duration of status, currently receiving funds) that were ranked to ensure that schools most in need receive improvement funds. A list of schools, their prioritization score and the calculator used to arrive at the number is available in **Attachment A**.

In addition, priority will be given to LEAs or the Charter School Institute based on the concentration of schools within a district or the Institute implementing priority improvement or turnaround plans.

# Available Funds and Duration of Grant

Each year, approximately $16.5 million is available for awards through a combination of funds from ESSA and the state’s School Transformation Grant. The amount of funding an LEA may apply for or get awarded is dependent on the chosen route(s) and eligibility status of schools.

Duration of funds is dependent on the selected service, successful participation in program activities, and is contingent on CDE’s Title I award from the U.S. Department of Education and appropriations from the Colorado legislature.

Funds from this opportunity must be used to supplement and not supplant any federal, state, and local funds currently being used to provide activities. Each year, all post award revisions should be approved by June 30 for obligation and spending. Funds should be obligated by September 30 and requested by November 1 of each award year. Funds should be obligated by June 30 and schools are able to request reimbursement on federal funds through September 30. A district/school have limited carry over of funds during the duration of the grant as detailed on the grant award letter. However, this amount should be reasonable and based on the school’s grant and/or improvement plan and approval must be obtained. Note: At the end of participation in the grant period, any non-requested federal funds will be rescinded by CDE and any unspent state funds should be returned to CDE.

# Cross-Cutting Elements

To be awarded funds under this application, proposals must meet requirements under ESSA and state law, including requirements for stakeholder engagement, planning, use of evidence-based interventions (EBI), and evaluation and reporting. While overarching expectations for each of these elements are described here, specific programs may have more detailed requirements outlined in the program portion of the application. In looking at the evaluation rubrics, note that expectations vary based upon the level of implementation (e.g., planning/exploration, early implementation, advanced implementation).

***Stakeholder Engagement***

State and federal expectations highlight the importance of stakeholder engagement (e.g., building leadership, teachers, parents, and other members of the community) throughout the school improvement process. Schools identified under ESSA (i.e., Comprehensive, Targeted, Additional Targeted) and under the state accountability system (i.e., Priority Improvement, Turnaround) have specific requirements that serve as a common foundation to build from. For example, the state-required school accountability committee could be one of the stakeholder groups consulted during the planning and the implementation phases required for ESSA. At a minimum in this application, all proposals will need to address how stakeholders are involved in a meaningful and relevant way in the development and implementation of proposed activities.

***Improvement Planning***

Improvement plans are one of the tangible ways that districts and schools document their intentions for improving outcomes for students. As all opportunities within this application expect schools to have a solid plan in place or are supportive of the development of a solid plan, the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) provides a convenient mechanism for capturing the specific ESSA and state requirements. There are different planning expectations for Priority Improvement, Turnaround, CS, TS, and A-TS schools within the planning process. For additional details, see the [Accountability Handbook](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/stateaccountability) State and federal planning expectations are also summarized in these resources, including the [UIP Quality Criteria Rubric](http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/uip_general_resources) (including ESSA requirements).

Each school’s specific requirements are also available in the pre-populated report in the Online UIP. Schools/districts with Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan types, schools/districts that are On Watch, and all CS schools (regardless of their state plan type) must complete the UIP and corresponding requirements by October 15 for review and public posting.

For guidance and suggestions on how to approach improvement planning in the absence of state and local data, refer to the [Unified Improvement Planning](http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip) webpage for special resources tailored to this time. LEAs may also apply for improvement planning support through the Exploration route of the EASI grant application.

***Evidence-Based Interventions***

Evidence-Based Interventions (EBI) are practices or programs that have proven to be effective in leading to a particular outcome. The kind of evidence described in ESSA has generally been produced through formal studies and research.

Under ESSA, there are four levels of evidence:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tier 1: Strong Evidence** | Supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies. |
| **Tier 2: Moderate Evidence** | Supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies. |
| **Tier 3: Promising Evidence** | Supported by one or more well-designed and well implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias). |
| **Tier 4: Demonstrates a Rationale** | Practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action are supported by research, and have some effort underway by an SEA, LEA, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness. |

In making awards for this application, ESSA requires schools to have strong, moderate, or promising evidence (Tiers 1-3) to support them. To ensure the best fit, selected strategies must also demonstrate an alignment to the contextual fit framework proposed by Horner, Blitz and Ross[[1]](#footnote-2):

* Evidence base: Provides evidence that strategy meets Tier 1-3 strategy
* Need: Strategy is linked to needs assessment
* Precision: A clear definition of the proposed intervention
* Efficiency: There is a reasonable adoption period and a likelihood of sustainability after the grant cycle
* Skill: Staff have the skills or will be trained adequately to obtain skills for implementation
* Cultural relevance: Intervention and outcomes are valued by stakeholders
* Resources: Time, materials, staff
* Organizational support: District and school staff are supportive and involved

In determining the best fit, other state and federal requirements should be considered. For example, reading interventions in early elementary grades should meet the more rigorous standards of the READ Act which has already vetted many reading interventions. For more information, see the [READ Act website](http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readact/programming) for additional information.

For more information around selecting EBIs, resources can be found on CDE’s [ESSA Planning Requirements webpage](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements). CDE has created a number of strategy guides to help schools and districts better understand what research says about common EBI strategies. These guides can be found on CDE’s [UIP Major Improvement Strategy Guides webpage](https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/strategyguides).

***Reporting***

Each LEA that receives an EASI grant is required to report, at a minimum, the following information annually to CDE:

* Update online system to reflect any revision to activities and budget;
* A description of challenges, successes and lessons learned from implementation of grant-funded activities or strategies; and
* An Annual Financial Report (AFR).

All sites that are awarded EASI funds are expected to reference their activities within their improvement plan (e.g., UIP). CDE will monitor these plans in different ways depending upon the type of identification and the type of selected service. See individual program information sheets for more details. Additional information is also tailored to the school within their UIP pre-populated report.

CDE will also conduct evaluations of all school improvement-funded grants. As CDE evaluates its programs and offerings, districts may be contacted to participate in additional ways (e.g., brief surveys, site visits, including bright spot visits, and interviews). This will help the state to offer a broader array of effective supports. If any additional information becomes necessary, CDE will work with the Educational Data Advisory Committee (EDAC) and LEAs to ensure that information is collected with the permission of the grantee(s) and with as little burden on the schools and districts as possible.

**Additional reporting requirements are indicated in the following specific program support documents and can be accessed on the** [**EASI website**.](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiapplication)

***Reasonable and Necessary***

For any district applying for funds, the request must be grounded in the local needs. Given that there is a finite amount of funding, requests should be reasonable and necessary. The following guidance can be used in determining what is reasonable and necessary.

When determining what is reasonable, consider that the type and amount of cost should not exceed what a “prudent person” would pay under the same circumstances.

When determining what is necessary, consider that the cost should be for an activity or function that is generally recognized as ordinary and required for the institution to operate the program. The cost must be essential to fulfill regulatory requirements for proper and efficient administration of the program.

Generally allowable costs are:

* Customary (e.g., interventionist or coaching salaries and benefits, professional development opportunities based on need);
* Allowed by circulars, regulations, policy, and guidance;
* Disclosed in the budget submitted to the State agency; and
* Approved in advance through the budget.

# Data Privacy

CDE takes seriously its obligation to protect the privacy of student and educator Personally Identifiable Information (PII) collected, used, shared, and stored. PII will not be collected through the EASI Grant. All program evaluation data will be collected in the aggregate and will be used, shared, and stored in compliance with CDE’s privacy and security policies and procedures.

**Note:** Documents submitted as part of the application must not contain any personally identifiable student or educator information including names, identification numbers, or anything that could identify an individual. All data should be referenced/included in the aggregate and the aggregate counts should be redacted to remove small numbers under n=16 for students or n=5 for educators.

Information reported to CDE in relation to grant activities is not confidential and is subject to public request. Awarded grantees should ensure reported information does not contain Personally Identifiable Information (PII) or confidential information.

# Application Technical Assistance

Technical Assistance will be offered throughout the application window in the following forms:

***Individual Technical Assistance***

Individual Technical Assistance is available to applicants in the planning of proposals upon request. **Note:** there may be a high volume of requests closer to the application due date; please allow adequate time for response. Technical assistance will be provided by CDE staff upon release of the application. To request technical assistance or to facilitate the planning process for the application from a CDE staff member, applicants may contact the [CDE-assigned District Support Lead](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/sqscontacts) or:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Application Questions** | Laura Meushaw | Meushaw\_L@cde.state.co.usLindsay Cox | Cox\_L@cde.state.co.us  |
| **Online Application Technical Assistance** | Grants Program Administration | GAINS@cde.state.co.us |
| **Budget Questions** | Werner Hagemann | hagemann\_w@cde.state.co.us |
| **For District-Specific Questions** | Contact the [CDE District Support Lead](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeawards/easi-contacts#coordinators) assigned to the district. |
| **Exploration Supports Route** |
| Exploration Activities (Diagnostic Review, Community Engagement, Improvement Planning) | Lauren Hesse | Hesse\_L@cde.state.co.us |
| **District Designed and Led Improvement Strategies Route** |
| District Designed and Led-Implementation SupportDistrict Designed and Led-Major Improvement Strategy | Lindsay Cox | Cox\_L@cde.state.co.us |
| **Offered Services Route** |
| Accountability Pathways | Andy Swanson | Swanson\_A@cde.state.co.us |
| Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (COMTSS) | Kristen Brown, Ph.D. | Brown\_Kristen@cde.state.co.us |
| Connect for Success | Laura Meushaw | Meushaw\_L@cde.state.co.us |
| School Turnaround Leadership Development | Lindsay Cox | Cox\_L@cde.state.co.us |
| School Transformation Network | Nicole Monet | Monet\_N@cde.state.co.us |
| Rigorous Action through Redesign | Andy Swanson | Swanson\_A@cde.state.co.us |
| **Other Services** |
| Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement School Transitions | Dan Jorgensen | Jorgensen\_D@cde.state.co.usLindsay Cox | Cox\_L@cde.state.co.us |

***EASI Kick-Off***

LEA and school staff are invited to participate in exploration and planning event designed to provide key information about the EASI grant process, routes and services, highlight available supports, and available funding. Attendees will connect virtually with CDE staff, learn more about the CDE-offered services, and have time to ask questions about the application process and/or routes and services.

Representatives from districts and schools identified for improvement and support under state and federal accountability requirements are encouraged to attend. Suggested team members include:

* Superintendent;
* LEA leadership (e.g., principal, supervisor, Chief Academic Officer, Accountability Coordinator, Directors of Title I, Special Education, and English Language Development);
* Federal programs staff; and
* Principals of eligible schools.

**EASI Kick- Off Event Details**

**Date:** October 16, 2024

**Location:** Virtual

Registration Link will be available on [EASI website](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiappresourcesandtechnicalassistance).

***EASI Online Resources***

The [EASI website](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiapplication) is a “one-stop” location for all things EASI including:

* The EASI Application Planning Document that can be used as a guide for planning responses.
* The EASI Menu of Supports and Information Sheets that provide requirements, eligibility, timeline, and reporting for each support.
* Details on the Advisory List of Providers

***CDE’s Advisory List of Providers***

CDE released a Request for Information in June of 2024 with the purpose of updating the [Advisory List of Providers](https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/cde-advisory-list-of-providers). The Advisory List is a way for CDE to vet and maintain an inventory of high-quality, proven school and district improvement partners. Four EASI routes - School Holistic Diagnostic Review, District Strategic Planning, Rigorous Action through Redesign, and School Turnaround Leadership Development - require that schools and districts select a provider from this list. Providers may be used to support other routes such as District Designed and Led and Accountability Pathways. The Advisory List includes providers in the following categories:

**Diagnose & Plan Partners**

* School Holistic Reviews and Improvement Planning
* District Strategic Planning (holistic or targeted at one or more key district systems)

**Implementation Partners**

* Improvement Implementation Support (school and district levels)
	+ School Turnaround Leadership Development (STLD)
* Accountability Pathway Partners

# Review Process and Notification

Applications will be reviewed based on the applicable rubric associated with the support to ensure they contain all required components. To be considered for participation in each route selected, LEAs and schools must meet all the requirements listed in each applicable scoring section. In cases where LEAs are applying for multiple schools, a single school with a weak application will not necessarily prevent awards or release of funds for other schools or the LEA. Applications that do not meet all requirements may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application to an approvable level. There is no guarantee that submitting an application will result in funding or funding at the requested level. If CDE receives more grant requests than available funding, CDE may take into consideration the status of current and previous EASI grant awards. Applicants will receive notification of application status by **Friday, January 31, 2025. All award decisions are final.**

# Submission Process and Deadlines

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **September 27, 2024** | EASI Application Available |
| **October 16, 2024** | **Virtual EASI Kick-Off**  |
| **Wednesday, December 4, 2024** | Applications must be completed and submitted through [GAINS](https://colorado.egrantsmanagement.com/) by **Wednesday, December 4, 2024, at 4:00 pm**. |
| **December 5, 2024 - January 31, 2025** | Review of Applications |
| **Friday, January 31, 2025** | Applicants will be notified of application status. |
| **February 2025** | LEAs receiving grants will work with CDE to finalize grant activities, budget, and implementation timeline. |

# Required Elements

The online application is organized in the order below. See evaluation rubrics for specific selection criteria.

**Part I: Applicant Information and Program Assurances**

**Part II: LEA Application Summary**

This section will be completed for any LEA applying for services and/or funds.

 **Application Narrative** [answered as applicable to routes selected]

Exploration Supports

District Designed and Led Improvement Strategies

Offered Services

Other Services

**Attachments** [to be uploaded in the online system]

Provider Scope of Work or MOU

* Required for any EASI support that includes a MOU or contract with an external provider (e.g. Exploration Supports, Rigorous Action through Redesign, School Turnaround Leadership Development)

Additional Supporting Documentation (if applying to listed service)

* COMTSS Team C-DIT Agreement Form
* Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement- Board Agreement Form

**Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI)**

**Applications Due: Wednesday, December 4, 2024, by 4 pm**

Applicants will complete their application in [GAINS](https://colorado.egrantsmanagement.com/).

# Part I: Applicant Information and Program Assurances

|  |
| --- |
| Application ContactThe person that CDE should contact if there are any questions or additional information needed for this application. |
| **Name:** |  | **Title:** |  |
| **Telephone:** |  | **E-mail:** |  |
| **Authorized Representative** |
| **Name:** |  | **Title:** |  |
| **Telephone:** |  | **E-mail:** |  |
| **EASI Program Contact**The person that CDE should contact for any questions regarding a particular support |
| **Name:** |  | **Title:** |  |
| **Telephone:** |  | **E-mail:** |  |
| **Fiscal Manager** |
| **Name:** |  | **Title:** |  |
| **Telephone:** |  | **E-mail:** |  |

*Applicant may add a row in GAINS for additional contacts.*

# EASI Program General Assurances

**Applicants will agree to the below Assurances within the Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI)** **application in GAINS. An upload of this document is not required.**

* The LEA will ensure that the control of funds provided to the LEA under each program, and title to property acquired with those funds, will be in a public agency or in an eligible private agency, institution, organization, or Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities, and that a public agency, eligible private agency, institution, or Indian Tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing statutes (§8306(a)(2)(A & B)).
* The LEA will administer each program covered by the ESEA application in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications (§8306(a)(1)), including but not limited to federal education program laws, the Title regulations in 34 CFR Part 200, the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), and the Education Department Federal Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 76, (except for 76.650-76.662), 77, 79, 81, and 82, 2 CFR 3485, and the Uniform Grants Guidance in 2 CFR 200 and 3474.
* The appropriate Authorized Representatives must read and check the boxes to indicate that the applicant understands and intends to comply with the corresponding program requirements. The applicant must agree to all assurances understanding that if certain requirements don't apply to the applicant's current context, that the applicant would meet the requirements if the situation were to become applicable.
* The LEA will adopt and use proper methods of administering each program, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program and the correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation. (§306(a)(3)(A&B)).
* The LEA will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the SEA, the Secretary, or other Federal officials (§8306(a)(4)).
* The LEA will use fiscal control and fund accounting procedures that will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to that agency under each program (§8306(a)(5)).
* The LEA will submit such reports to the State educational agency (which shall make the reports available to the Governor) and the Secretary as the State educational agency and Secretary may require to enable the State educational agency and the Secretary to perform their duties under each such program (§8306(a)(6)(A)).
* The LEA afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and considered such comment before the application was submitted (§8306(a)(7)).
* The LEA will provide, on a request made by military recruiters or an institution of higher education, access to the name, address, and telephone listing of each secondary school student served by the LEA, unless the parent of each student has submitted the prior consent request which, upon receiving, prohibits the LEA from releasing such information without the prior written consent of the parent (§8528).
* The LEA will ensure that a student who is attending a persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary school, or who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense while in or on the grounds of a public elementary or secondary school, will be allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school (§8532).
* The LEA will ensure that all funds received under ESEA will be used to supplement and not supplant those from other sources otherwise available to continue current or past efforts.
* Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d through 2000d-4) to the end that no person in the United States shall; on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Education. (34 C.F.R. Part 100)
* To the extent applicable, the LEA will include in its local application a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede equal access to, or participation in, the program.
* A student shall not be admitted to, or excluded from, any federally assisted education program on the basis of a surname or language-minority status. Section 1112(e)(3)(A-D).
* The LEA certifies that no policy of the LEA prevents, or otherwise denies participation in, constitutionally protected prayer in public elementary schools and secondary schools (§ 8524(b)).
* Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794), no qualified handicapped person shall, on the basis of handicap, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity which receives Federal financial assistance. (34 C.F.R. Part 104).
* Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-34) and its implementing regulations which prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability by public entities ((28 C.F.R. Part 35), or with Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §§12181-89) and its implementing regulations which prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability by covered public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards established in the implementing regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 36) whichever is applicable.
* Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. §1681-1683), as amended by Pub. L. 93–568, 88 Stat. 1855 (except §904 and §906 of those Amendments) which is designed to eliminate (with certain exceptions) discrimination on the basis of sex in any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, whether or not such program or activity is offered or sponsored by an educational institution as defined in this part (34 C.F.R. Part 106).
* Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. §6101 et seq.), as amended, and its implementing regulations, prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance. The Act permits federally assisted programs or activities, and recipients of Federal funds, to continue to use age distinctions and factors other than age that meet the requirements of the Act (34 C.F.R. Part 110).
* The LEA will provide reasonable opportunities for participation by teachers, parents, and other interested agencies, organizations, and individuals in the planning for and operation of each program (20 USC §1232e(b)(5)).
* The LEA will ensure that any application, evaluation, periodic program plan or report relating to each program will be made readily available to parents and other members of the general public (20 USC §1232e(b)(6)).
* The LEA has adopted effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators participating in each program significant information from educational research, demonstrations, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices developed through such projects (20 USC §1232e(b)(8)).
* The LEA will ensure that no ESEA funds will be used to acquire equipment (including computer software) in any instance in which such acquisition results in a direct financial benefit to any organization representing the interests of the purchasing entity or its employees or any affiliate of such an organization (20 USC §1232e(b)(9)).
* The LEA has adopted appropriate procedures to implement the terms of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (20 U.S.C. §1232g) and its regulations (34 C.F.R. Part 99).
* The LEA will ensure that the pupil rights delineated in 20 U.S.C. §1232h are protected.
* The LEA must comply with the requirements under the Gun-Free Schools Act (ESEA §8561), and the Nonsmoking Policy for Children’s Services (ESEA §8573).
* To the extent authorized by law, the LEA shall indemnify, save and hold harmless the State, its employees and agents, against any and all claims, damages, liability and court awards including costs, expenses and attorney(s)’ fees incurred as a result of any act or omission by it, or its employees, agents, subcontractors or assignees in its operation of the programs.
* The LEA will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B and D (Assurances for Non-Construction and Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.
* With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the SEA will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” when required (34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix B); and the SEA will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers.
* In consideration of the receipt of these grant funds, the applicant and all organizations involved in this application—including local education agencies and community-based organizations— (subsequently referred to as “the applicant(s)”) agree to comply with the certifications, assurances and provisions included here and in the Grant Award Letter (GAL). The applicant(s) also certifies that they will meet all program and pertinent administrative requirements, including the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), 2 CFR Part 200 (Uniform Grants Guidance) Accounting Circulars, and the U.S. Department of Education’s General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) requirements.
* Further, the applicant(s) and all relevant governance of the applicant organization(s) certify that they understand all the rules and regulations associated with the receipt of these ESEA funding, including those not specifically enumerated above, and will take action to ensure the applicant(s) comply with all such requirements.
* The Colorado Department of Education may terminate a grant award upon thirty days’ notice if it is deemed by CDE that the applicant is not fulfilling the requirements of the funded program as specified in the approved project application, or if the program is generating less than satisfactory results.

**Duplication of Benefits**

Federal or State funds generally cannot be used to pay for the exact same cost or activity already paid for from another source of funding. This is sometimes referred to as a prohibition on duplication of benefits (DOB), or “double-dipping.” Entities using multiple funding sources should be aware of the different authorities and program requirements for each funding source, being careful to avoid DOB in instances where they are paying for similar costs or activities from multiple sources. (2CFR200.302) Subrecipients should avoid a duplication of benefits for any federal or state award. A duplication of benefits occurs when the amount of the assistance (i.e., funding) to a beneficiary exceeds the total allowable assistance (i.e., based on the total allocable expenses) to that beneficiary for that purpose.

1. Applicant certifies no duplication of benefits resulting in this funding will occur. If awarded, the Awardee (applicant) will notify in writing CDE should this occur.

**Fraud, Waste and Abuse**

Recipients of grant funds are responsible for taking steps to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse. Fraud Waste and Abuse can come in many forms, such as:

* Embezzlement, bribery, or other public corruption involving federal or state funds;
* Serious mismanagement involving federal or state programs or funds;
* Theft or misuse of Federal student aid to include knowledge of fraud, waste, or abuse involving a financial aid administrator or other entity official(s), or knowledge of fraud, waste, or abuse involving a student loan servicer or collection agency;
* Knowledge that your entity is not complying with regulations or laws involving Federal student aid or other federal or state program or operation requirements;
* Conflicts of interest-violation of arm’s length agreements;
* Contract and procurement irregularities;
* Theft or abuse of government property;
* Employee misconduct; or
* Ethics violations by officials.

Entities are required to have a procedure or methodology for timely reporting, in writing, of any noted violations that may potentially affect the federal or state award. (2CFR200.113)

Applicant certifies there are sufficient internal controls in place to reduce or eliminate the possibility of fraud, waste and abuse with these, or any funds within their agency, and if an instance occurs. If awarded, the Awardee (applicant) will notify CDE in writing.

**Conflict of Interest**

The applicant hereby certifies that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, there are no present or currently planned interests (financial, contractual, organizational, or otherwise) relating to the work to be performed under the contract or grant resulting from this award that would create any actual or potential conflict of interest (or apparent conflicts of interest) (including conflicts of interest for immediate family members: spouses, parents, children) that would impinge on its ability to render impartial, technically sound, and objective assistance or advice or result in it being given an unfair competitive advantage. In this clause, the term “potential conflict” means reasonably foreseeable conflict of interest. The applicant further certifies that it has and will continue to exercise due diligence in identifying and removing or mitigating, to the Government's or Colorado Department of Education’s satisfaction, such conflict of interest (or apparent conflict of interest).

Applicant certifies there are sufficient internal controls in place to reduce or eliminate the possibility of any conflicts of interest with these, or any funds within their agency. If awarded, the Awardee (applicant) will notify CDE in writing. (2CFR200.112)

The Colorado Department of Education may terminate a grant award upon thirty days’ notice if it is deemed by CDE that the applicant is not fulfilling the requirements of the funded program as specified in the approved project application, or if the program is generating less than satisfactory results.

Project modifications and changes in the approved budget must be requested in GAINS and approved by CDE before modifications are made to the expenditures.

* **Certification**
Applicant does hereby certify that all facts, figures, and representations made in this application are true, correct, and consistent with the statement of certification. Furthermore, all applicable statutes, regulations, and procedures for program and fiscal control and for records maintenance will be implemented to ensure proper accountability of funds distributed for this project. All records necessary to substantiate these items will be available for review by state and federal monitoring staff. All progress reports and the final report requested through this grant program will be filed on time.

*Approvals for this grant must be captured in GAINS from the following personnel:*

* *Applicant Authorized Representative*
* *Applicant Fiscal Manager*

**Note:** For Charter School applicants, the above personnel must be from your authorizing district or CSI.

**Additional EASI Support Assurances**

Applicants are expected to read each EASI support assurance before applying for funding. If an assurance is not applicable to you because you are not providing the service or activity, select "N/A."

Exploration Assurances

District Designed and Led Assurances

Accountability Pathways Assurances

Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Assurances

Connect for Success Assurances

School Transformation Network Assurances

School Turnaround Leaders Development Assurances

Rigorous Action Through Redesign Assurances

Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement Assurances

School Transition Assurances

# Part II: Narrative and Budget

Responses should be completed in the online application. Although the system will save your work in progress, applicants may find it useful to compose answers in a separate document and copy them into the form.

For those applicants that have previously received funding from Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI) Grant, the expectation is that the narrative responses will include references to that award, where applicable. For example, discuss how the funds contributed to the program and what still needs to be accomplished. Applicants should demonstrate ongoing and improved capacity in the program and a well-developed plan for sustainability.

**Narrative Questions:**

**LEA Application Summary**

*All applicants should complete the LEA Application Summary to provide context for participation in EASI.*

[Responses not to exceed 500 words/2,500 characters with spaces]

1. Provide context for the LEA’s motivation for participating in the EASI program. Include the following:
	* A description of the LEA’s current system of support, in particular for schools identified under the state and federal systems.
	* An overview of the top priority challenges the LEA and the identified school(s) face. The description should be organized by the [Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fourdomains/) (i.e., culture shift, instructional transformation, leadership, and talent development).
2. Explain how, if awarded, the LEA will support its identified schools (i.e., CS/TS/ATS, Priority Improvement, and/or Turnaround) to ensure that school improvement services, activities, and/or grants are on track and in alignment with their improvement plans and ultimately exit the federal and/or state designations and sustain improvements.
3. Provide evidence that stakeholders (e.g., building leaders, teachers, parents) input was gathered to inform have been this proposal and the feedback provided by stakeholders. Include:
* General summary of opportunities where multiple stakeholders were involved in influencing the proposed activities.
* General summary of outcomes of the stakeholder interactions and opportunities.

**Exploration**

The primary purpose of the Exploration Supports route is to help schools and LEAs gather information about their needs and plan for future action. The Exploration Support route includes diagnostic reviews, stakeholder engagement, improvement planning, and early implementation. Schools may select a holistic or specialized review and districts may select strategic planning or specialized review.

In recognition that sites may complete their exploration phase and be ready for implementation prior to the next EASI application window, LEAs/schools may include funding for early implementation to begin some of the improvement activities. Since those activities will likely not be identified at the time of application, the school/LEA may use a placeholder for these funds in the budget. CDE will approve the specific use of the funds at a later date.

Instructions: Complete the question below for the LEA and/or for all schools participating in the Exploration Supports Route. The GAINS system will prompt applicants to choose either District or School level with the following questions tailored to the selected location. For the LEA and/or each applying school, select the Diagnostic Review that will address current needs. Note: Each option may include funding and support for a diagnostic review, stakeholder engagement, improvement planning and early implementation funds.

1. Describe why the LEA has selected Exploration as the best route for the identified school(s) and/or LEA. Describe the need for Exploration funds and address any connections to identification for improvement through the state and/or federal identification system.

Note: CDE may also consult publicly available documents (e.g., UIP, SPF) to better understand the current LEA/school environment.

1. Describe the process used and why the school/LEA selected the provider(s) and/or exploration service(s) (Note: CDE is the provider AEC and Online School Reviews and Language Learner Partnership).

Note: If you selected a provider external to CDE for Exploration Supports, upload a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (e.g., duration, expectations, deliverables, timeline) and/or and scope of work with the selected provider and/or facilitator that aligns with the budget request on the “Supporting Documentation Uploads” page. If a finalized MOU is not available prior to award, a draft MOU or SOW is acceptable.

**District Designed and Led – Implementation Support**

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by choosing to apply for “DDL-Implementation Support,” the LEA seeks to receive funding to continue the implementation of an evidence-based improvement strategy based on either a recent external diagnostic review or prior EASI support in the last two years.

Complete each of the questions below for each District Designed and Led – Improvement Strategy. The proposal can cover a single school, multiple schools and/or the district. If multiple schools are included, ensure each response reflects each included school. District-level applications are acceptable, but please note that any school-level expenditures must be for an EASI eligible school.

1) Select the major improvement strategy. *(The LEA will select a number for each proposed strategy which will be linked to the activities supporting that strategy within the budget.)*

2) What is the name of the major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention being continued from either a recent external diagnostic review or eligible EASI support participation?

3) In one paragraph, briefly describe the major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention.

4) What schools are participating in this major improvement strategy and indicate their eligibility for DDL- Implementation Support? Schools must have either had an external diagnostic review or participated in an eligible EASI support in the last two years.

* For schools with a recent external diagnostic review, include the provider, date, and focus of the review.
* For schools that recently participated in an eligible EASI support, please indicate the name of the EASI support and EASI Cohort or initial award year.

5) For each school, briefly describe why the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention being continued is aligned to the needs of the school.

* For schools with a recent external diagnostic review, name the top 1-3 prioritized areas from the review and explain how they are aligned with proposed major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention.
* For schools that recently participated in an eligible EASI support, discuss the evidence of success from the participation in that support and how it is aligned to the current needs of the school and the identified strategy for improvement. Evidence may include student data analysis, systems or implementation analysis, or a review of annual performance targets and success indicators.

6) What are the key actions or implementation milestones involved in the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? What staff members or school community groups will be involved in each key action? How do these key actions relate to the proposed budget?

7) Why does the school(s) need additional implementation support? For each included school, briefly describe what progress the school has made at implementing the major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention. Also, include why and how additional implementation support will further the improvement effort of the school.

8) Will the school(s) partner with an external provider? If so, please explain the process used to select the provider and clearly describe the role of the external provider in the improvement effort. Districts are highly encouraged to work with a vetted provider found on the CDE Advisory List of Providers.

9) What are the expected student outcomes from the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? Identify at 1-3 student-level measures this improvement effort aims to positively impact.

10) What is the plan for sustaining the knowledge and work involved with the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention after the grant funding ends?

***District Designed and Led - Major Improvement Strategy***

Instructions: Complete each of the questions below for each District Designed and Led- Major Improvement Strategy. By choosing to apply for “DDL-Major Improvement Strategy,” the LEA seeks to receive funding to implement a CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide based on a need identified through a recent (internal or external) diagnostic review, current data trends, S-CAP review, or UIP documentation.

District Designed and Led applications may be at a single-school, multiple-schools, or at the district level. The proposal can cover a single school, multiple schools and/or the district. If multiple schools are included, ensure each response reflects each included school. District-level applications are acceptable, but please note that any school-level expenditures must be for an EASI eligible school. Responses should reference and align to the identified CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide.

1. What CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide is being implemented in the school or district?
* Attendance Strategy Guide 2.0
* Coaching Strategy Guide 2.0
* Data Driven Instruction Strategy Guide 2.0
* Family-School Community Partnership (FSCP) Strategy Guide 2.0
* High Dosage Tutoring Strategy Guide 2.0
* Professional Learning Community (PLC) Strategy Guide 2.0
* Trauma-Informed Education Strategy Guide 2.0
* Note- Additional items may be added to this list during the application window.
1. Is this a district-wide major improvement strategy or focused on one or more select schools? Briefly describe the rationale for the approach.
2. What schools are participating in this major improvement strategy?
* Note- If a district-wide major improvement strategy, only EASI eligible schools may receive school-level funding support.
1. Does the school or district have the necessary preconditions in place? If not, how will this be addressed with support from this grant or other improvement initiatives?
2. Considering the contextual fit, why is the selected major improvement strategy a good fit at the participating school(s) or district?
3. Why is the selected major improvement strategy needed? Include connections between the contextual fit in the CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide and current supporting evidence to demonstrate the need for the selected strategy. Current support evidence may include current data trends, diagnostic review (internal or external), S-CAP review, or UIP documentation.
4. Considering the core components and the recommended implementation approach (i.e. sequentially or concurrently), describe the core components the district or school plans to implement in Year 1 (2024-25), Year 2 (2025-26), and Year 3 (2026-27).
* In this response, include a description of the current state and how it compares to the respective core component of focus. Clearly identify the gap and how funds will support the improvement effort.
* Note- The implementation plan must include a focus on the established core components, but it may be appropriate for an implementation plan to focus on a subset of the core components outlined in the CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide.
1. What are the key actions or implementation milestones involved in the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? What staff members or school community groups will be involved in each key action? How do these key actions relate to the proposed budget?
2. Will the school(s) partner with an external provider? If so, please explain the process used to select the provider and clearly describe the role of the external provider in the improvement effort. Districts are highly encouraged to work with a vetted provider found on the CDE Advisory List of Providers.
3. What are the expected student outcomes from the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? Identify at 1-3 student-level measures this improvement effort aims to positively impact.
4. If offered, would your school or district be interested in participating in a Learning Cohort related to the selected major improvement strategy? Yes/No
* Note- Options and offerings of Learning Cohorts are dependent on available funds and the number of interested districts. Indicating interest in participating does not guarantee the offering of a Learning Cohort focused on the selected major improvement strategy.
* Learning Cohorts may include site visits, virtual or in-person convenings, and professional development opportunities.

**Offered Services**

***Accountability Pathways***

Instructions: Accountability Pathways is intended to support LEAs and schools with planning for and implementing the statutory options, or pathways, for persistently low-performing schools and LEAs. For those nearing the end of the Accountability Clock, the grant can support exploring the pathways, taking thoughtful action, and increasing readiness for discussions with the State Board of Education. For those who receive a directed action from the state board, the grant can support implementation of the approved pathway plan.

Complete each of the questions below for all eligible schools and/or LEA participating in Accountability Pathways activities. If multiple schools are applying and eligible, ensure responses clearly delineate the schools participating within each response. The GAINS system will prompt applicants to choose either District or School level with the following questions tailored to the selected location.

1. What are the key transformation strategies this grant will support for developing and implementing a pathways plan? Describe how these key strategies will prepare the school or LEA for either a potential accountability hearing or implementation of directed action.
2. Who will, or does, comprise the working leadership team focused on developing and/or implementing the Accountability Pathways? What position does each person hold, and how is each role situated in the organization to provide influence over key changes. Who will be the facilitator or point person for the team?
* **Note:** At a minimum, the leadership team should include one district leader from the Superintendent’s leadership team with the authority to work with the local charter, include the charter school leader contact and contact for the authorizer who oversees the school’s accountability.
1. What structures and resources are in place, or may need to be created, for a pathways plan to be developed and implemented in the school or LEA?
2. Does the school or LEA intend to work with or currently work with an external partner to develop and implement an Accountability Pathways plan?
* If so, who is the external partner and how did the school select this partner? In the response, describe the partner’s track record of success and demonstrated experience in turnaround school improvement strategies.
* If not, what is the rationale and approach to internally developing and implementing a pathways plan? In the response, describe the capacity of the school or LEA team to facilitate pathway plan development, key strategies this grant will support, and how these strategies prepare the school or LEA for a potential accountability hearing.
1. How does the school or LEA plan to collaborate with the CDE team to ensure requirements of the accountability systems are fulfilled?

***Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (COMTSS)***

**Instructions:** Complete each of the questions below to indicate the LEA’s plan to participate in the Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (COMTSS) Grant.

1. Identify the goals the LEA hopes to accomplish through involvement in Colorado Multi-tiered System of Support (COMTSS).
2. Describe the current efforts of the district's COMTSS District Implementation Team (C-DIT) to align initiatives and provide high-quality professional development and technical assistance to local schools. If there is no C-DIT, address whether the district has the capacity to establish one focused on aligning initiatives and providing high-quality professional development and technical assistance to local schools. Also describe the executive level members (including the Superintendent) who will be included on the team, as well as the C-DIT lead and their qualifications to facilitate team meetings.
3. Describe the current priorities of the LEA, and how COMTSS will fit within those priorities. Be sure to include the other initiatives (e.g., School Transformation Network, Connect for Success Grant Program, Early Literacy Grant Program) your LEA is currently involved in, the number of schools involved, and the timeline of their participation.

REMEMBER: Complete and submit the [COMTSS Team Membership Form (PDF)](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/co_mtssmembershipform) and upload this document when prompted on the "Supporting Documentation Uploads" page.

***Connect for Success***

Instructions: Complete each of the questions below for all schools participating in the Connect for Success Grant. If the LEA is requesting that multiple schools participate in the Network, use the "Add Row" feature to include a separate response for each school within the textboxes for the questions below.

1. Clearly articulate how this grant opportunity will strengthen the school’s ability to meet the needs of all students.
2. Describe how the district will support the school’s participation in opportunities to connect with, learn from, and work with High Achieving Schools, other Connect for Success grantees, and CDE representatives (Implementation Manager assigned to the school).
3. Describe any school or district structures, teams, or other mechanisms (e.g., networks, coaches) that will help monitor and implement plans for this grant.
4. Describe any other grant programs in which you are currently participating. Outline how this program(s) will align with current funding and support existing initiatives.

***School Transformation Network***

Instructions: Complete each of the questions below for all schools participating in the School Transformation Network. If the LEA is requesting that multiple schools participate in the Network, use the "Add Row" feature to include a separate response for each school within the textboxes for the questions below.

1. Provide a detailed explanation of why you are interested in joining the School Transformation Network.
2. Describe your schools’ current strengths in relation to each of the [Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement:](https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/fourdomainsdiagnosticrubric) school culture; instruction; leadership; and talent development. This information must be provided by the school leader for the 2024-25 school year.
3. Describe the most urgent needs at your school. Explain why you selected these areas as crucial to school success. This information must be provided by the school leader for the 2024-25 school year.
4. Describe how the district currently supports the school. Indicate who will be your district “partner” (e.g., principal supervisor) and why and how the person was selected. This information must be provided by the district partner.
5. Successful participation in the Network includes the school leader and the district partner (principal supervisor) attending and implementing professional learning; tracking, monitoring, and reflecting on major improvement strategies and goals through monthly performance management sessions with CDE; and regular coaching of teachers. In what ways will these activities support your current leadership strengths and what challenges do you anticipate? This information must be provided by the school leader and the district partner.

***School Turnaround Leadership Development (STLD) Program***

LEAs selecting **School Turnaround Leadership Development Program** are asked to respond to the sections below. Note: this year there are two School Turnaround Leadership Development (STLD) programs: General STLD and STLD for leaders working with students with disabilities. Please see EASI website and fact sheets for more information.

Instructions: Complete the table below to identify leaders who will participate in the School Turnaround Leadership Development Program. Each leader may be assigned one or multiple sites (schools) in the district. Select one leadership provider per leader. Ensure all schools chosen for the School Turnaround Leadership Development Program are included in the table. Use the "Add Row" button below the question to build the table.

*Participants*

1. List each individual leader proposed to participate in a leadership development program. For each individual, provide:
* First and last name
* Current Leadership Role/Title
* Email and phone number
* Assigned site(s) (or districtwide)
* Which leadership provider seems to be the best fit?

More information on each leadership provider is available on the [School Turnaround Leadership Development Program webpage.](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/turnaroundleadership)

*Turnaround Leadership Provider and LEA/School Plan*

1. For each identified provider(s) for which you are requesting funding, address the following:
* Explain why each provider was selected;
* Identify the goals the leader/LEA/CSI/school hope to accomplish through involvement in STLD; and
* Explain how the chosen program directly addresses the needs of the leader/LEA/CSI.
1. For each school or the LEA, please describe how the LEA will ensure the selected candidates are able to implement strategies from the chosen program and how the provider’s programming aligns to other efforts in the district.
2. For each provider program identified, describe the steps you will take to ensure participants understand the program requirements and ensure timely completion of the programs’ application. **(**[See School Turnaround Leaders Development program description](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/districtwide-turnaroundleaders)**)**.
3. For each provider program identified, describe how you will monitor the progress of each participant on an ongoing basis. ([See School Turnaround Leaders Development program description](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/districtwide-turnaroundleaders))
4. Identify the individual(s) in the district and school(s) who will be responsible for submitting required evaluation data found in the Information Sheet ([See School Turnaround Leaders Development program description](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/districtwide-turnaroundleaders)). Please provide their name, title, and contact information.

***Rigorous Action through Redesign***

Instructions: Complete each of the questions below for all schools participating in the Rigorous Action through Redesign. If the LEA is requesting that multiple schools participate in redesign work, include a separate response for each school by adding a row.

1. School redesign, in the context of this grant, is a process facilitated by a CDE approved external partner that includes a deep comprehensive review of the existing school systems and structures (e.g. people, time, resources, school model, alignment to Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement) driven by a representative school-design team. What does redesign mean to the school and how does that align to the description of this grant? Describe how this redesign is more significant than previous change efforts.
2. How will the fundamental mission, vision, values, school model, and/or academic programming of the school either change or be reinforced through this redesign work?
3. Why is this moment right for the school, system, and community to engage in this redesign opportunity?
4. What will success look like at the school as a result of the redesign work?
5. What systems and structures would be reformed and how?
6. What specific student outcomes would improve?
7. Who will comprise the working redesign team? What position does each person hold, how are their roles situated within the broader organization, and what is their influence over key changes? Note: At a minimum, a redesign team must include a district point of contact/partner and school leader(s).
8. What structures are in place, or may need to be created, for the working redesign team members to regularly collaborate, lead change efforts, and include other partners/stakeholders? Include a description of the following:
9. Describe the approach to managing ongoing school operations and efforts while providing space for longer term redesign efforts.
10. Describe how the LEA will support flexibility and innovation needed to implement redesign.
11. Identify key stakeholder groups who will be involved in redesign efforts and their respective role in the process.
12. Who is the proposed external partner for the redesign process? How did the school select this external partner? Describe the selection based on the following criteria:
13. Successful track record of engaging in school design across multiple settings with demonstrated outcomes in similar schools
14. Proven process and protocols for facilitating multi-year school design
15. Demonstrated experience/expertise in elements school design for schools serving similar student populations and grade levels
16. Demonstrated experience facilitating stakeholder engagement and design teams in driving and informing school design

**Other Services**

***Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement Program***

**Instructions:** Complete each of the questions below for the LEA participating in the Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement.

*Readiness*

1. Provide context for the district's motivation for participating in the board support. Include, at a minimum:
* Describe why the district and local board has elected to participate in the program.
* Describe current local board strengths.
* Briefly describe the governance experience of the current board members including number of terms (including end dates) and years served on the school board.
* Describe what the superintendent and local board are hoping to obtain from participating and how it will help the district meet their performance goals.
* Describe the process used (or will be used) to select the facilitator external to the district. If the facilitator has been identified, provide details on the expertise and background knowledge of the facilitator(s) to effectively complete the expected work (e.g., experience in Colorado education context, expertise in working with local boards, etc.).
1. Describe the most urgent needs of your local board regarding the facilitation of improved student outcomes. Explain why you selected these areas as being crucial to the district’s success.

*Commitment*

1. Describe any anticipated challenges or barriers that might prohibit full participation and commitment in the support.
2. Describe the plan for overcoming any such challenges or barriers, including any steps CDE can take to support or accommodate the plan.

***School Transitions***

Instructions:Complete the questions regarding the context for the school closure. Then, reference the [CDE Family-School-Community Partnership Strategy Guide 2.0](https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/strategyguide-fscpv2) where indicated in the open response questions.

1. If applicable, what is the school being closed? What grade levels does the closing school currently serve?
2. What other schools are involved or impacted in the school closure or school consolidation process?Clearly identify the name of any receiving schools and the projected enrollment (percentage and estimated count) of the student body at each receiving school.
3. What is the reason (e.g. performance, declining enrollment, facilities) and timeline for the school closure or school consolidation?
4. Has the school closure or school consolidation been approved by the local school board? Yes/No
	1. If the school closure has been approved by the local school board, when was that decision approved?
	2. If not, what is the projected timeline for the final decision on the school closure?

*Reference the* [*CDE Family-School-Community Partnership (FSCP) Strategy Guide 2.0*](https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/strategyguide-fscpv2) *to respond to the following questions.*

1. Considering the core components of the FSCP Strategy Guide, identify and describe the core component(s) the schools and district will focus on to assist in the transition and integration of students, staff, and families as a result of the school closure.
	1. In this response, include a description of the current state and how it compares to the respective core component of focus. Clearly identify the gap and how funds will support the improvement effort.
	2. Note- The implementation plan must include a focus on the established core components, but it may be appropriate for an implementation plan to focus on a subset of the core components outlined in the CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide.
2. What are the key actions or implementation milestones involved in the implementation of the selected core components of the FSCP Strategy Guide? What staff members or school community groups will be involved in each key action?
	1. In this response, clearly outline the activities for the current (2024-25) and beginning of the following school year (2025-26).
3. How do these key actions relate to the proposed budget?
4. Will the school(s) partner with an external provider? If so, please explain the process used to select the provider and clearly describe the role of the external provider in the improvement effort. Districts are highly encouraged to work with a vetted provider found on the [CDE Advisory List of Providers](https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/cde-advisory-list-of-providers), but may select another external provider if needed.
5. What are the anticipated student outcomes from the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention?
	1. Identify 1-3 student, staff, family, or community level measures this improvement effort aims to positively impact.

**EASI Budget**

Complete your proposed program budget in GAINS.

# Evaluation Rubrics and Application Scoring

The following criteria will be used by reviewers to evaluate the application. For the application to be recommended for funding, it must receive the points noted in each section and all required elements must be addressed. An application that scores below points needed may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to a fundable level. An application that receives a score of zero on any required elements will not be funded without revisions.

# LEA Application Summary

All applicants should complete the LEA Application Summary to provide context for participation in EASI.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Provide context for the LEA’s motivation for participating in the EASI program. Include the following:
	* A description of the LEA’s current system of support, in particular for schools identified under the state and federal systems.
	* An overview of the top priority challenges the LEA and the identified school(s) face. The description should be organized by the [Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fourdomains/) (i.e., culture shift, instructional transformation, leadership, and talent development).
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Explain how, if awarded, the LEA will support its identified schools (i.e., CS/TS/ATS, Priority Improvement, and/or Turnaround) to ensure that school improvement services, activities, and/or grants are on track and in alignment with their improvement plans and ultimately exit the federal and/or state designations and sustain improvements.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Provide evidence that stakeholders (e.g., building leaders, teachers, parents) input was gathered to inform have been this proposal and the feedback provided by stakeholders. Include:
* General summary of opportunities where multiple stakeholders were involved in influencing the proposed activities.
* General summary of outcomes of the stakeholder interactions and opportunities.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

# Application Narrative

*Answered as applicable to routes selected.*

**Exploration Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Describe why the LEA has selected Exploration as the best route for the identified school(s) and/or LEA. Describe the need for Exploration funds and address any connections to identification for improvement through the state and/or federal identification system.

Note: CDE may also consult publicly available documents (e.g., UIP, SPF) to better understand the current LEA/school environment. | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Describe the process used and why the school/LEA selected the provider(s) and/or exploration service(s) (Note: CDE is the provider AEC and Online School Review and Language Learner Partnership).
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| If you selected a provider external to CDE for Exploration Supports, upload a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (e.g., duration, expectations, deliverables, timeline) and/or and scope of work with the selected provider and/or facilitator that aligns with the budget request on the “Supporting Documentation Uploads” page. If a finalized MOU is not available prior to award, a draft MOU or SOW is acceptable. | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

**District Designed and Led Evaluation Rubrics**

This opportunity is a competitive process - to be considered for funding, applicants must score at least the required points noted in the table below out of the possible points available. Applications that score below the required points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Path**: District Designed and Led – Implementation Support | **Possible Points:** 36 | **Required Points:** 24 |
| **Path**: District Designed and Led – Major Improvement Strategy | **Possible Points:** 36 | **Required Points:** 24 |

***District Designed and Led – Implementation Support***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Select the major improvement strategy. (The LEA will select a number for each proposed strategy which will be linked to the activities supporting that strategy within the budget.)
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. What is the name of the major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention being continued from either a recent external diagnostic review or eligible EASI support participation.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. In one paragraph, briefly describe the major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. What schools are participating in this major improvement strategy and indicate their eligibility for DDL-Implementation Support? Schools must have either had an external diagnostic review or participated in an eligible EASI support in the last two years.
* For schools with a recent external diagnostic review, include the provider, date, and focus of the review.
* For schools that recently participated in an eligible EASI support, please indicate the name of the EASI support and EASI Cohort or initial award year.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. For each school, briefly describe why the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention being continued is aligned to the needs of the school.
* For schools with a recent external diagnostic review, name the top 1-3 prioritized areas from the review and explain how they are aligned with proposed major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention.
* For schools that recently participated in an eligible EASI support, discuss the evidence of success from the participation in that support and how it is aligned to the current needs of the school and the identified strategy for improvement. Evidence may include student data analysis, systems or implementation analysis, or a review of annual performance targets and success indicators.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What are the key actions or implementation milestones involved in the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? What staff members or school community groups will be involved in each key action? How do these key actions relate to the proposed budget?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Why does the school(s) need additional implementation support? For each included school, briefly describe what progress the school has made at implementing the major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention. Also, include why and how additional implementation support will further the improvement effort of the school.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Will the school(s) partner with an external provider? If so, please explain the process used to select the provider and clearly describe the role of the external provider in the improvement effort. Districts are highly encouraged to work with a vetted provider found on the CDE Advisory List of Providers.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What are the expected student outcomes from the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? Identify at 1-3 student-level measures this improvement effort aims to positively impact.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What is the plan for sustaining the knowledge and work involved with the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention after the grant funding ends?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

***District Designed and Led – Major Improvement Strategy***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What [CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide](https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/strategyguides) is being implemented in the school or district?
* Attendance Strategy Guide 2.0
* Coaching Strategy Guide 2.0
* Data Driven Instruction Strategy Guide 2.0
* Family-School Community Partnership (FSCP) Strategy Guide 2.0
* High Dosage Tutoring Strategy Guide 2.0
* Professional Learning Community (PLC) Strategy Guide 2.0
* Trauma-Informed Education Strategy Guide 2.0
* Ninth Grade Success Strategy Guide 2.0
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Is this a district-wide major improvement strategy or focused on one or more select schools? Briefly describe the rationale for the approach.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. What schools are participating in this major improvement strategy?
* *Note- If a district-wide major improvement strategy, only EASI eligible schools may receive school-level funding support*.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Does the school or district have the necessary preconditions in place? If not, how will this be addressed with support from this grant or other improvement initiatives?
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Considering the contextual fit, why is the selected major improvement strategy a good fit at the participating school(s) or district?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Why is the selected major improvement strategy needed? Include connections between the contextual fit in the CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide and current supporting evidence to demonstrate the need for the selected strategy. Current support evidence may include current data trends, diagnostic review (internal or external), S-CAP review, or UIP documentation.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Considering the core components and the recommended implementation approach (i.e. sequentially or concurrently), describe the core components the district or school plans to implement in Year 1 (2024-25), Year 2 (2025-26), and Year 3 (2026-27).
* In this response, include a description of the current state and how it compares to the respective core component of focus. Clearly identify the gap and how funds will support the improvement effort.
* Note- The implementation plan must include a focus on the established core components, but it may be appropriate for an implementation plan to focus on a subset of the core components outlined in the CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What are the key actions or implementation milestones involved in the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? What staff members or school community groups will be involved in each key action? How do these key actions relate to the proposed budget?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Will the school(s) partner with an external provider? If so, please explain the process used to select the provider and clearly describe the role of the external provider in the improvement effort. Districts are highly encouraged to work with a vetted provider found on the CDE Advisory List of Providers.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What are the expected student outcomes from the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? Identify at 1-3 student-level measures this improvement effort aims to positively impact.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

**Offered Services Rubrics**

***Accountability Pathways***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What are the key strategies this grant will support for developing and implementing a pathways plan? Describe how these key strategies will prepare the school or LEA for either a potential accountability hearing or implementation of directed action.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Who will, or does, comprise the working leadership team focused on developing and/or implementing the Accountability Pathways? What position does each person hold, and how is each role situated in the organization to provide influence over key changes. Who is the facilitator or point person for the team?
* Note: At a minimum, the leadership team should include one district leader from the Superintendent’s leadership team with the authority to work with the local charter, include the charter school leader contact and contact for the authorizer who oversees the school’s accountability.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. What structures and resources are in place, or may need to be created, for a pathways plan to be developed and implemented in the school or LEA?
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Does the school or LEA intend to work with or currently work with an external partner to develop and implement an Accountability Pathways plan?
* If so, who is the external partner and how did the school select this partner? In the response, describe the partner’s track record of success and demonstrated experience in turnaround school improvement strategies.
* If not, what is the rationale and approach to internally developing and implementing a pathways plan? In the response, describe the capacity of the school or LEA team to facilitate pathway plan development, key strategies this grant will support, and how these strategies prepare the school or LEA for a potential accountability hearing.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. How does the school or LEA plan to collaborate with the CDE team to ensure requirements of the accountability system are fulfilled?
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

***Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (COMTSS)***

Applicants must score at least 12 points out of the 18 possible points to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 12 points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Identify the goals the LEA hopes to accomplish through involvement in Colorado Multi-tiered System of Support (COMTSS).
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe the current efforts of the district's MTSS District Implementation Team (C-DIT) to align initiatives and provide high-quality professional development and technical assistance to local schools. If there is no C-DIT, address whether the district has the capacity to establish one focused on aligning initiatives and providing high-quality professional development and technical assistance to local schools. Also describe the executive level members (including the superintendent) that will be included on the team, as well as the C-DIT team lead and their qualifications to facilitate team meetings.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe the current priorities of the district, and how COMTSS will fit within those priorities. Be sure to include the other state-level initiatives (e.g., School Transformation Network, Connect for Success Grant Program, Early Literacy Grant Program) the LEA is currently involved in, the number of schools involved, and the timeline of their participation.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The COMTSS C-DIT Membership Form (Attachment B) was submitted with all requested information.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

***Connect for Success***

Applicants must score at least 16 points out of the 24 possible points to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 16 points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Clearly articulate how this grant opportunity will strengthen the school's ability to meet the needs of all students.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe how the district will support the school's participation in opportunities to connect with, learn from, and work with High Achieving Schools, other Connect for Success grantees, and CDE representatives (Implementation Manager assigned to the school).
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe any school or district structures, teams, or other mechanisms (e.g., networks, coaches) that will help monitor and implement plans for this grant.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe any other grant activities in which you are currently participating. Outline how this program will align with current funding and will support existing initiatives.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

***School Transformation Network***

Schools selecting School Transformation Network are asked to respond to the sections below. This opportunity is a competitive process - applicants must score at least 20 points out of the 30 possible points on the School Needs Assessment to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 20 points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Provide a detailed explanation of why you are interested in joining the School Transformation Network.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe your schools’ current strengths in relation to each of the Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement: school culture; instruction; leadership; and talent development. This information must be provided by the school leader for the 2024-25 school year.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe the most urgent needs at your school. Explain why you selected these areas as crucial to school success. This information must be provided by the school leader for the 2024-25 school year.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe how the district currently supports the school. Indicate who will be your district “partner” (e.g., principal supervisor) and why and how the person was selected. This information must be provided by the district partner and the district partner must be named and assigned for the 24-25 school year.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Successful participation in the Network includes the school leader and the district partner (principal supervisor) attending and implementing professional learning; tracking, monitoring, and reflecting on major improvement strategies and goals through monthly performance management sessions with CDE; and regular coaching of teachers. In what ways will these activities support your current leadership strengths and what challenges do you anticipate? This information must be provided by the school leader and the district partner.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

***School Turnaround Leaders Development Program***

Applicants must score at least 20 points out of the 30 possible points to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 20 points may be asked to submit revisions to bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| List each individual leader proposed to participate in a leadership development program. For each individual, provide:* First and last name
* Current role
* Email and phone number
* Assigned site(s) (or districtwide)
* Which leadership provider seems to be the best fit for their needs

More information on each leadership provider is available on the [Turnaround Leadership webpage.](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/turnaroundleadership) | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. For each [identified provider(s)](http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/turnaroundleadership) and school for which you are requesting funding, address the following:
* Explain why each provider was selected;
* Identify the goals the leader/LEA/CSI/school hope to accomplish through involvement in STLD; and
* Explain how the chosen program directly addresses the needs of the leader/LEA/CSI.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. For each school or the LEA, please describe how the LEA will ensure the selected candidates are able to implement strategies from the chosen program and how the provider’s programming aligns to other efforts in the district.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. For each provider program identified, describe the steps you will take to ensure participants understand the program requirements and ensure timely completion of the programs' application. (See School Turnaround Leaders Development program description.)
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. For each provider program identified, describe how you will monitor the progress of each participant on an ongoing basis. (See School Turnaround Leaders Development program description.)
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Identify the individual(s) in the district and school(s) who will be responsible for submitting required evaluation data found in the information sheet. ([See School Turnaround Leaders Development program description](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/districtwide-turnaroundleaders)). Please provide their name, title, and contact information.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

**Rigorous Action through Redesign**

This opportunity is a competitive process. Applicants must score at least 24 points out of the 36 possible points on School Needs Assessment to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 24 points may be asked to submit revisions to bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. School redesign, in the context of this grant, is a process facilitated by a CDE approved external partner that includes a deep comprehensive review of the existing school systems and structures (e.g. people, time, resources, school model, alignment to Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement) driven by a representative school-design team. What does redesign mean to the school and how does that align to the description of this grant? Describe how this redesign is more significant than previous change efforts.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. How will the fundamental mission, vision, values, school model, and/or academic programming of the school either change or be reinforced through this redesign work?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Why is this moment right for the school, system, and community to engage in this redesign opportunity?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What will success look like at the school as a result of the redesign work?
* What systems and structures would be reformed and how?
* What specific student outcomes would improve?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Who will comprise the working redesign team? What position does each person hold, how are their roles situated within the broader organization, and what is their influence over key changes? Note: At a minimum, a redesign team must include a district point of contact/partner and school leader(s).
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Who is the proposed external partner for the redesign process? How did the school select this external partner? Describe the selection based on the following criteria:
* Successful track record of engaging in school design across multiple settings with demonstrated outcomes in similar schools
* Proven process and protocols for facilitating multi-year school design
* Demonstrated experience/expertise in elements school design for schools serving similar student populations and grade levels
* Demonstrated experience facilitating stakeholder engagement and design teams in driving and informing school design
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

**Other Services Rubrics**

**Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement**

Applicants must score at least 16 points out of the 24 possible points to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 16 points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to an approvable level.

*Readiness*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Provide context for the district's motivation for participating in the board support. Include, at a minimum:
* Describe why the district and local board has elected to participate in the program.
* Describe current local board strengths.
* Briefly describe the governance experience of the current board members including number of terms (including end dates) and years served on the school board.
* Describe what the superintendent and local board are hoping to obtain from participating and how it will help the district meet their performance goals.
* Describe the process used (or will be used) to select the facilitator external to the district. If the facilitator has been identified, provide details on the expertise and background knowledge of the facilitator(s) to effectively complete the expected work (e.g., experience in Colorado education context, expertise in working with local boards, etc.).
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe the most urgent needs of your local board regarding the facilitation of improved student outcomes. Explain why you selected these areas as being crucial to the district’s success.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

*Commitment*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Describe any anticipated challenges or barriers that might prohibit full participation and commitment to the support.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Describe the plan for overcoming any such challenges or barriers, including any steps CDE can take to support or accommodate the plan.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

**School Transitions**

Applicants must score at least 20 points out of the 30 possible points to be approved for funding. Applications that score below 20 points may be asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to an approvable level.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What is the school being closed? What grade levels does the closing school currently serve?
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. What other schools are involved or impacted in the school closure process?Clearly identify the name of any receiving schools and the projected enrollment (percentage and estimated count) of the student body at each receiving school.
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. What is the reason (e.g. performance, declining enrollment, facilities) and timeline for the school closure?
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |
| 1. Has the school closure been approved by the local school board? Yes/No
	1. If the school closure has been approved by the local school board, when was that decision approved?
	2. If not, what is the projected timeline for the final decision on the school closure?
 | **Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information.**[ ]  | **Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required.**[ ]  |

*Reference the* [*CDE Family-School-Community Partnership (FSCP) Strategy Guide 2.0*](https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/strategyguide-fscpv2) *to respond to the following questions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Considering the core components of the FSCP Strategy Guide, identify and describe the core component(s) the schools and district will focus on to assist in the transition and integration of students, staff, and families as a result of the school closure.
	1. In this response, include a description of the current state and how it compares to the respective core component of focus. Clearly identify the gap and how funds will support the improvement effort.
	2. Note- The implementation plan must include a focus on the established core components, but it may be appropriate for an implementation plan to focus on a subset of the core components outlined in the CDE Major Improvement Strategy Guide.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What are the key actions or implementation milestones involved in the implementation of the selected core components of the FSCP Strategy Guide? What staff members or school community groups will be involved in each key action?
	1. In this response, clearly outline the activities for the current (2024-25) and beginning of the following school year (2025-26).
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. How do these key actions relate to the proposed budget?
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. Will the school(s) partner with an external provider? If so, please explain the process used to select the provider and clearly describe the role of the external provider in the improvement effort. Districts are highly encouraged to work with a vetted provider found on the [CDE Advisory List of Providers](https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/cde-advisory-list-of-providers), but may select another external provider if needed.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |
| 1. What are the anticipated student outcomes from the implementation of the identified major improvement strategy or evidence-based intervention? Identify 1-3 student, staff, family, or community level measures this improvement effort aims to positively impact.
 | 0 - Applicant did not respond to question or did not provide necessary information. | 2 - Applicant provided some information but did not answer the question in full. | 4 - Applicant provided the necessary information, and no clarification is required. | 6 - Applicant provided all information in a clear, thorough, and exemplary response. |

**Attachment A: EASI Eligibility**

***EASI 2024 Prioritization***

Available grant funding will be distributed to LEAs that meet the criteria within their chosen route(s). All applications will be reviewed and scored based on the rubrics included for each support. In the event the amount requested exceeds the amount available, applications that receive a fundable number of points will be prioritized. Each school will receive a point value based on a group of indicators (e.g., school improvement status, duration of status, currently receiving funds) that were ranked to ensure that schools most in need receive improvement funds.

Schools eligible for Accountability Pathways funding will be considered first in the allocation of state funds. Other than Accountability Pathways, school-level requests that are fundable will be awarded through state or federal funds according to the school’s priority and identification type(s). Also note, if CDE is unable to fund a complete priority point level, schools within that level will be prioritized by those furthest along in the improvement cycle and/or have never received funding. The following table outlines the priority criteria and point values that were utilized for the 2024-2025 EASI grant competition:

|  |
| --- |
| **If the school has a Federal AND a State identification, the school receives the point value for whichever identification has higher points (State or Federal), then receives 1 bonus point as per the information below.** |
| **Criteria** | **Prioritization Points** |
| **Federal (ESSA) School Identifications** |
| Comprehensive Support (CS) Lowest 5% or Low Graduation Year 4+ | 8 |
| Comprehensive Support (CS) Lowest 5%  | 6 |
| Comprehensive Support (CS) Low Graduation | 6 |
| Comprehensive Support (CS) - Persistently ATS (more than 3 years ATS for same student group) | 6 |
| Additional Targeted Support & Improvement (ATS)  | 5 |
| Comprehensive Support (CS) Lowest 5% - on Watch  | 4 |
| Comprehensive Support (CS) Low Graduation - on Watch | 4 |
| Targeted Support & Improvement (TS)  | 3 |
| Targeted Support & Improvement or Additional Targeted Support & Improvement - Not Exited by District | 2 |
| Any Federal identification – identified for Participation Only | 1 |
| **State (Accountability Clock/Performance Watch) School Identifications** |
| Year 4+ of Priority Improvement or Turnaround | 8 |
| Year 4+ on Watch (Performance/Improvement Year 4+) | 6 |
| Year 3 of Priority Improvement or Turnaround | 6 |
| Year 2 of Priority Improvement or Turnaround  | 5 |
| Year 1 of Priority Improvement or Turnaround | 4 |
| Year 2 -3 On Watch (Performance/Improvement Year 2 or 3) | 3 |
| Insufficient state data on HOLD (Prior to ISD was Years 1+ on Performance Watch) | 3 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Bonus Points** |
| School has not previously been awarded an EASI grant | 1 |
| School has both a Federal identification AND a State identification of Turnaround or Priority Improvement (exception: LEAs that did not exit ATS or TS schools) | 1 |

Notes:

* In the event that CDE receives more grant requests than available funding, CDE may take into consideration: a) The status of current and previous EASI grant awards, unspent funds, and fulfillment of prior EASI/program requirements; and b) State school identifications of Priority Improvement or Turnaround as a result of decreased due to participation.
* The list of eligible schools and awarded prioritization points may change following updates to state and federal identifications that occur through December. Updates that may change prioritization points for a school may include ESSA identification of K-2 schools and successful Request to Reconsider applications that change the state school identifications.

 

***District Prioritization***

There are several EASI routes that are awarded at the district, rather than the school level (Accountability Pathways, District Designed and Led, Exploration Services-District Strategic Planning, COMTSS, and Facilitated Board Training). Similar to school level, districts eligible for Accountability Pathways funding will be considered first in the allocation of state funds. Other than Accountability Pathways, when evaluating district-level requests that are fundable, CDE will consider the prioritization scores of the schools that will be served by the supports.

Additionally, districts with a high concentration of identified schools in the district will be awarded one bonus point for district-level EASI service requests. A district with a high concentration is one with a high percentage of schools that are either ESSA (Comprehensive Support, Targeted Support, or Additional Targeted Support) or state (Priority Improvement, Turnaround, or On Watch) identified based on the number of schools in a respective district. Districts are sorted into three bands based on the number of schools. The top quartile, based on the percentage of identified schools, in each band is considered a district with a high concentration of identified schools for purposes of prioritization in district-level EASI service requests. District-level supports that the bonus point may be added to include: District Strategic Planning, Language Learner Partnership (if serving at the district), District Designed & Led (if serving multiple schools under a common improvement strategy), COMTSS, or Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement.

**Eligible Schools and Prioritization Points**

A sortable Excel version of all Eligible Schools and Prioritization Points can be found on the [EASI website under Resources and Technical Assistance](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/easiappresourcesandtechnicalassistance). Please note that the list of schools and prioritization points may change following updates related to state and federal identifications (i.e. ESSA identification of K-2 schools and CDE’s Request to Reconsider process for state school and district identifications). Updates the eligibility and prioritization points for schools are updated as information becomes available on the website.

**Attachment B: COMTSS C-DIT Team Membership Form**

Participation requires the commitment of the district’s COMTSS District Implementation Team (C-DIT). Requirements for representation on the C-DIT include: (1) A point of contact (must be a member of cabinet-level administration), (2) general education representation, (3) special education representation, (4) early childhood representation, (5) family/community representation, and (6) representation from the other initiatives overseen by the BOCES/district. Suggested representation includes: Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Director, Assessment/Accountability Director, Special Education Director, Culture and Equity Director, Professional Development Director, Title I Director, Student Services Director, Parent Representative Co-Chair of District Accountability Committee, BOCES Director, school-level leadership, and district-level coaches. The purpose of the C-DIT is to support local Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) through professional development, technical assistance, alignment, curriculum, funding, visibility, and political support.

Responsibilities/Functions of this C-DIT include:

* Meet at least monthly with an Implementation Consultant (IC) and other COMTSS Staff, and complete tasks throughout the month;
* Complete assessments and action planning that best support local schools;
* Facilitate professional development and technical assistance for local schools related to COMTSS implementation; and
* Attend trainings provided by COMTSS Staff.

**Provide the names, titles, and signatures of those who will serve on your C-DIT:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Point of Contact[Cabinet Level Administration] |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Education Representative |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Special Education Representative |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Early Childhood Representative |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family/Community Representative |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Title/Role |  | Signature |  | Date |

# Attachment C: Financial Management Risk Assessment

**Request for Application Financial Management Risk Assessment**

|  |
| --- |
| **Organization Name:** |
| **UEI #:****Expire Date:** |

**Purpose**

This survey is intended to collect information about the capacity and ability of the applicant to manage federal and/or state grant funds. Information from the report will be used to assess an organization’s structure and capacity-building needs and identify any appropriate technical assistance and/or resources to strengthen operations. This survey is also an opportunity for GFMU staff to identify the potential technical assistance required, should the entity be awarded. No feedback will be provided from the score of this survey.

**Procedure**

Completion of this report is required. Applicant organizations are advised to make sure that the person or persons completing this form are those responsible for and knowledgeable about the organization’s financial management functions. This information will be taken into consideration as part of the grant application. Scores will determine if the organization’s level of risk to manage federal grant funds is high, medium, or low, and these scores will be utilized in determining potential awards.

**Risk Assessment**

The risk score determines the order in which CDE staff will evaluate and monitor the grant program.

* **High Risk –** A score over 20 requires **intensive monitoring and improvement** based on a thorough evaluation of the grant project.
* **Medium Risk –** A score between 8 and 20 requires evaluation of areas that **need improvement** and improving those areas based on the approved action plan.
* **Low Risk –** A score below 8 generally identifies that the program is at **lower** risk for potential waste, mismanagement, non-compliance, or fraud.

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring: The following questions will be awarded a score ranging from 0 to 25.** |
| 1. Is the applicant on the [Federal Debarment List](https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ofccp/debarred-list), including the [USDA National Disqualified List](https://www.eauth.usda.gov/eauth/b/usda/login?showmobilelinc=true&TRYIWA=TRUE&TYPE=33554433&REALMOID=06-780bbc2b-8189-490a-8fdf-d1c5b14bfc41&GUID=&SMAUTHREASON=0&METHOD=GET&SMAGENTNAME=-SM-fmKNI27Ux5IHVTgSU5TbVjchJYAUY1oBI4Jf826DhtMvMrFuudjyAnsxHEtlYhsE1KTM%2FIXHV2dKr48%2F5hYwbGMV474HJImM%2BJdB0hvusf4GcsRbLGO0YkypujXkiBCU&TARGET=-SM-HTTPS:%2F%2Fsnp.fns.usda.gov%2Fndlweb%2FWelcome.action) and registered with the Colorado Secretary of State? (If yes, no need to go further)
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 25 | 0 |
| 1. Is the entity in good standing on the Secretary of State [State 501C3 list](https://www.coloradosos.gov/ccsa/pages/search/basic.xhtml?_gl=1*7l3jj2*_ga*MjU2MDQ3MjQuMTcwNzkzMjY5NQ..*_ga_JDK6PLVHDW*MTcxMTExNzQ3MC40LjEuMTcxMTExNzc1NC4wLjAuMA..)?
 | **N/A** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 1. Is this a Federal Grant Application (or Federal Funds pass-through)?
 | **N/A** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 1. Does entity have an active, no exclusion, UEI Number ([Unique Entity ID - Sam.gov](https://sam.gov/content/duns-uei))?
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 10 |
| 1. Has the agency or principals thereof ever been suspended or debarred from receiving state or federal grants or contracts?
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1. Has the agency ever had a grant agreement terminated, through CDE or another agency?
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1. Does the agency employ a finance director with at least three years of experience in accounting at this type of entity?
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 5 |
| 1. Does the entity use a commercial/licensed financial software system?

If Yes, what system: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 5 |
| 1. Does this system ensure that grant funds are not comingled with general operating funds?
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 5 |
| 1. How many years has the organization been in existence?
 | **<2** | **2-5 Years** | **6-10 Years** | **11-14 Years** | **15+ Years** |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 1. Does the Agency have experience managing other federal, state, local or private funds?
 | **0-1 Years** | **2-4 Years** | **5-7 Years** | **8-10 Years** | **>10 Years** |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 1. Does the Agency have experience administering federal funds or other grants that provide funds for services to a comparable target population?
 | **0-1 Years** | **2-4 Years** | **5-7 Years** | **8-10 Years** | **>10 Years** |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 1. Has the entity received federal awards from the Colorado Department of Education in the past?

If Yes, which program(s) and year(s)? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 1 |
| 1. Does the entity have written procedures for procurement, time and effort (federal), and fiscal management (to include internal control procedures) of Federal or State grant funding that specifically comply with the Uniform Grants Guidance?
 | **Yes** | **No** |
| 0 | 5 |
| 1. Amount of grant award requested for this project:
 | **$300,000+** | **$200,000-$299,999** | **$100,000-$199,999** | **$50,000-$99,999** | **$0-$49,999** |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 1. Single Audit Status (answer only if you receive MORE THAN $750k in federal funding from other resources):

\*Finding refers to a material weakness, significant deficiency, or questioned costs. | **No Single Audit Performed** | **Received a Program and Fiscal Audit Finding** | **Received a Fiscal Audit Finding** | **Received a Program Audit Finding** | **No Findings** |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| 1. Financial Audit (answer if not required to have a Single Audit, but instead a standard financial audit):
 | **No Audit Performed for Prior Year** | **Financial Audit Completed for Prior Year with no Findings** | **Audit Performed for Prior Year with Findings** |
| 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 1. Submit a copy of most recent single audit or financial audit. Based on this submission, please indicate the percentage of grant budget being applied for as compared to total operating budget. (grant budget divided by total operating budget).
 | **>40%** | **31%-39%** | **20%-30%** | **6%-19%** | **<5%** |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| **Total Score:** |  |

\*As indicated on the entities most recent single audit review.

By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject this entity to immediate termination of a grant award agreement up to and including return of any disbursed funds.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Preparer Name (Typed/Printed) |  | Preparer Title (Typed/Printed) |
|  |  |  |
| Preparer Signature |  | Date |

**Attachment D: Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement Agreement Form**

Participation requires the commitment of the district’s local board of education members and superintendent. Prior to applying for the Facilitated Board Training for School Improvement, the board members should review the grant support and reach agreement on participating in the support. Participation in the support includes two phases:

Phase I- Foundations of Effective Governance

Local board of education and superintendent participate in training focused on governance. Outcomes include:

* An increased understanding of effective governance practices along with board member roles and responsibilities; and
* Create a more cohesive goal-directed board

Phase II- Foundations of Effective Governance

The focus of Phase II is supporting the academic outcomes of students. Program outcomes include:

* + Assessment of school board’s areas of strength, inconsistency, and opportunity relative to its oversight of district improvement, school improvement, and turnaround
	+ Learn from the experience of other school boards by reading and discussing case studies and other materials
	+ Understand the CDE’s Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement and how its frameworks might provider a conceptual structure for district and school improvement processes
	+ Itemize possible steps the board may take in response to information and understanding acquired through the training
	+ Develop an action plan for strengthening the school board’s effectiveness in:
		- Setting policies related to continuous district improvement, school improvement, and turnaround
		- Overseeing the implementation of these policies and implementation

By signing below, the local board of education president acknowledges the scope of the grant support and confirms that the board members have discussed the grant and collectively agreed to participate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Board President Name  |   |   |  Board President Signature |   | Date |

1. Horner, R., Blitz, C., Ross, S. (June 2014) *Investing in what works issue brief: The role of contextual fit when implementing evidence- based interventions*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes of Research. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)