****

**Request for Application (RFA) for**

**Direct Student Services (DSS)**

**Title I Sec.1003 [a]**

**Every Student Succeeds Act**

|  |
| --- |
| **CFDA Number: 84.010A**  **Deadline to Submit RFA:**  **February 26, 2018** |

|  |
| --- |
| *This is only a Request for Application (RFA) and does* ***NOT*** *constitute an award. Should this RFA result in an award, the LEA Superintendent/Charter Director will be notified by an official award letter. Only upon receipt of an award letter, signed by Secretary Designate Ruszkowski, may the LEA/charter school submit a Budget Adjustment Request (BAR).* |

**New Mexico Public Education Department**

**300 Don Gaspar Ave,**

**Santa Fe, NM**

**87501**

**New Mexico Public Education Department: Direct Student Services**

1. **Background**

Sec. 1003A (a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), allows states to set-aside three percent of their Title I allocation to carry out a program of Direct Student Services (DSS).

Prior to making the determination to set aside these funds, the PED sought input from a variety of local educational agencies (LEAs) as required under the law. As part of this outreach, some LEAs raised concerns regarding the impact of funds flowing to a smaller number of LEAs and about services being delivered through alternative providers. There was also support expressed for providing additional resources for LEAs facing the greatest challenges, particularly those with a high number or percentage of struggling schools identified for improvement and for providing educational options that may not otherwise exist for students in these schools.

PED is setting aside funds for DSS to address challenges which have vexed many of New Mexico’s lowest-performing schools and students for years. By offering a wide range of new opportunities to students and providing parents a greater role in selecting additional educational interventions for their students, DSS will provide a strong return on investment.

1. **Purpose**

The purpose of this initiative is to provide expanded educational options for students in schools identified as “comprehensive support and improvement” or “targeted support and improvement.” More specifically, the program intends to support the following outcomes:

* Create opportunities for students to participate in courses not otherwise available to them at their school, particularly advanced placement;
* Expand access to innovative CTE and postsecondary courses that empower students to complete approved programs of study or attain transferrable college credit, including those encompassed in the Workforce Improvement Opportunities Act;
* Target interventions and supports for students in the elementary grades so that they attain the necessary literacy and math skills for success in middle school and beyond;
* Provide expanded access for personalized learning opportunities, including high-quality tutoring; and
* Provide transportation funding to students that choose to exercise their ability around intra-district school choice.

1. **Eligibility**

Any New Mexico LEA is eligible to apply for DSS. Charter schools, as defined in NMSA 22-8B-2, are eligible to apply.

1. **Program Priorities**

Pursuant to Sec. 1003A(b)(2) of ESEA, the State must prioritize awards under this competition to LEAs that, when compared to other LEAs in the state, are serving the highest percentage of schools that are:

* Identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement under Section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of ESEA; or
* Identified by the State for targeted support and improvement plans under Section 1111(d)(2) of ESSA.[[1]](#footnote-1)

In addition to the priorities outlined above, PED will prioritize applicants that:

* Demonstrate how their DSS proposal expands the reach of their Highly Effective and Exemplary teachers, as identified through the NMTEACH evaluation system, to identified student sub-group population(s);
* Align targeted funding initiatives, such as Principals Pursuing Excellence, K-3+, Results Driven Accountability, NM Out-of-School Time, 21st Century Learning Grant, etc., to the DSS proposal; and
* Align their DSS proposal to current district initiatives.

1. **Funding**

The available funds for FY18 are $3,537,854.00. PED is making multi-year awards (2017-2019) through the period of available funds[[2]](#footnote-2).The estimated number of awards is 50.

.

1. **Project Period**

For applications, the full project period for this grant is three years. Continuation funding after each period of the project is contingent upon progress toward meeting achievement goals, leading indicators, fidelity of implementation of required actions, and maintenance of all grant requirements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Period Timeline** | |
| Applications Released by PED | December 5, 2017 |
| Letter of Commitment to PED (Appendix A) | January 26, 2018 |
| Applications Due to PED | February 26, 2018 |
| Announcement of Awards | March 2018 |
| Planning Period for LEA/Schools | March 2018 to June 30, 2018 |
| Year-One Implementation Period | July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 |
| Year-Two Implementation Period | July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 |
| Year-Three Implementation Period | July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 |

1. **Letter of Intent**

LEAs should submit a Letter of Intent (LOI) designating the specific schools and DSS services for which applications will be submitted.

The LOI should be submitted electronically through the Priority Schools Bureau email portal available at the following link: [ped.psb@state.nm.us](mailto:ped.psb@state.nm.us). The LOI should be received by 3:00 p.m. on January 26, 2018.

1. **Full Application Submission**

Complete applications **must** be submitted electronically through the Priority Schools Bureau portal available at the following link: [ped.psb@state.nm.us](mailto:ped.psb@state.nm.us).

In addition, one original application plus one hardcopy **must** be mailed by postal service to:

New Mexico Public Education Department

Attn: Debbie M. Rael

Deputy Cabinet Secretary, School Transformation

Room 123

300 Don Gaspar Avenue

Santa Fe, New Mexico 85701

Complete hardcopy applications **must** be postmarked by February 26, 2018, and complete electronic copies must be submitted through the Priority Schools email portal ([ped.psb@state.nm.us](mailto:ped.psb@state.nm.us).) no later than 4:00 p.m. on February 26, 2018.

1. **Budget Requirements**

The budget documents requested in response to this RFA must identify and explain funded costs for activities that are necessary to carry out all aspects of the program.

* **Budget Narrative**

The budget narrative, described in the Proposal Narrative sections of this RFA, should identify and explain all funded costs for the entire project period.

* **Budget Summary Chart (Appendix D)**

This chart summarizes the budget for the entire project period, three years of implementation.

1. **Additional Budget Guidance - Appropriate Costs**

Funds are intended to *supplement* and *support* school reform efforts by funding ***specific*** initiatives designed to promote targeted and sustainable school improvement. The actions and practices identified through each category of the project narrative drive the appropriate costs.

Appropriate costs are those costs that are directly connected to the actions and to sustaining the practices prompted in the categories of the project narrative (e.g., expanding course access, extended/expanded learning time, etc.).

As stipulated under Section 1111(c) of ESSA, LEAs receiving a DSS award:

* May use not more than one percent of its award for outreach and communication to parents about available DSS;
* May use not more than two percent of its award for administrative costs related to DSS; and
* Shall use the remainder of the award to pay the costs associated with providing DSS.

1. **Budgeting and Planning for Sustainability**

In budgeting and planning for sustainability, LEAs should be certain to support critical, ongoing activities through reliable and stable funding sources. In budgeting and planning for sustainability, funds should support but not serve as the sole source of funding for this work.

1. **Reporting Requirements**

The lead points of contact at the LEA, responsible for oversight, monitoring, and support of DSS are required to participate in progress site visits and monitoring telephone calls with PED.

In addition, LEAs will be responsible for submitting monthly, quarterly and/or annual reports on school progress[[3]](#footnote-3) that may include, but are not limited to:

**NM DASH**

* NM DASH Feedback Tool for each school (2x a year)

**Leading Indicators**

* Student attendance and school average daily attendance
* Attendance by instructional staff and staff average daily attendance
* Interim assessment data
* Student course completion data
* Instructional staff turnover rate
* NMTeach ratings
* In-school and out-of-school suspension rates and average in-school and out-of-school suspension rates by total school and broken down by sub-group
* Chronic absenteeism rates
* Dropout rates
* Number of students completing advanced coursework by subgroup (e.g., advanced Placement/ International Baccalaureate, college pathways or dual enrollment classes [high schools only])
* Other program evaluation and indicator data as needed

**Lagging indicators**

* Student achievement rates
* State assessment data disaggregated by sub-group
* Student achievement rates compared to the State
* Student achievement rates compared to the LEA
* Student growth data
* College readiness data
* Graduation and transition data

**Behavioral and Academic Data**

* Evidence that the LEA has a multi-tiered framework with proven evidence-based practices that improve behavioral and academic outcomes for students.
* Evidence that the school implements the practices that support students in a Multi-Tiered System of Support model to ensure that struggling students receive the targeted and intensive supports they need.
* PED-approved K-3 assessment used to measure student growth, inform instructional practice, and identify professional development needs.
* School-developed and/or LEA-directed formative/interim assessments used by the school to determine the likelihood of meeting academic achievement targets and determine the impact of instructional practice.

1. **Scoring Guide**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Section** | **Points Possible** |
| Needs Assessment | **N/A** |
| What type(s) of DSS opportunities will the LEA provide students | **N/A** |
| Who, if any, will offer high-quality tutoring services? | **NA** |
| Program goals | **20** |
| Key elements of program design (see below) | **50** |
| *Ensure program aligns to best practices with high potential for success* | *25* |
| *Ensure parental and school awareness of DSS opportunities* | *15* |
| *Ensure sufficient options to provide meaningful choice to parents* | *10* |
| Program alignment | **10** |
| Program management | **10** |
| Program monitoring and evaluation | **10** |
| **TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE** | **100** |

1. **Review and Ranking of Applications**

Only complete applications from eligible LEAs received at PED by the due date will be accepted.

All complete applications will be reviewed and rated by external reviewers. All complete applications will be reviewed and rated by at least two reviewers.

1. The scores of the first two reviewers will be totaled and then averaged to arrive at the final score for each application using the percentage.
2. If there is a difference of 7 points or more between the two reviewers’ scores, a third reviewer will review the application.
3. The two scores mathematically closest to each other will be averaged for the final score unless the difference between the third review score and the first two are equidistant; in which case the third reviewer’s score will solely be used.
4. Total scores will be rank ordered using the percentage scored on the application.
5. LEAs will be selected in order of rank after accounting for required prioritization as stipulated in IV Program Priorities above; however, not all applying schools in an LEA may be selected dependent on funding availability.
6. **Continuation or Redistribution of Funding**

Continuation funding after each period of the project is contingent upon progress toward meeting achievement goals, leading indicators, fidelity of implementation of required actions, and maintenance of all grant requirements.

If a subgrantee fails to comply with Federal statutes, regulations or the terms and conditions of this award, the SEA may impose additional conditions, as described in §200.207 Special Conditions (below).

If the SEA determines that noncompliance cannot be remedied by imposing additional conditions, the SEA may take one or more of the following actions, as appropriate in the circumstances:

1. Temporarily withhold cash payments pending correction of the deficiency by the subgrantee
2. Disallow all or part of the cost of the activity or action not in compliance.
3. Wholly or partly suspend or terminate the award.
4. Recommend the USED initiate suspension or department proceedings as authorized under 2

CFR part 180.

1. Withhold further Federal awards to the project or program[[4]](#footnote-4).

The SEA may impose additional award conditions[[5]](#footnote-5) as needed, which may include the following:

1. Requiring payments as reimbursements rather than advance payments;
2. Withholding authority to proceed to the next phase until receipt of evidence of acceptable performance within a given period of performance;
3. Requiring additional, more detailed financial reports;
4. Requiring additional project monitoring;
5. Requiring the subgrantee to obtain technical or management assistance; or
6. Establishing additional prior approvals.

If any funded LEAs withdraw or become ineligible within the first year of funding due to not progressing toward meeting achievement goals, leading indicators, fidelity of implementation of required model actions, and maintenance of all grant requirements, the leftover funds may be used to fund the next highest ranking applications.

**LEA Direct Student Services Application Cover Sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA Information** | |
| **LEA/State Charter Name:** Click here to enter text. | **LEA NCES ID #:** Click here to enter text. |
| **Mailing Address:** Click here to enter text. | |
| **Phone:** Click here to enter text. | **Fax:** Click here to enter text. |
| **Superintendent/Charter Director:** Click here to enter text. | **Email:** Click here to enter text. |
| **Title I Director:** Click here to enter text. | **Email:** Click here to enter text. |
| **Federal Programs Director:** Click here to enter text. | **Email:** Click here to enter text. |
| **Business Manager:** Click here to enter text. | **Email:** Click here to enter text. |
| **Comprehensive Support and Intervention or Targeted Support and Intervention Schools LEA Lead:** Click here to enter text. | **Email:** Click here to enter text. |

**DSS RFA Application**

**Proposal Requirements**

1. The proposal narrative should **not exceed 15 pages** (not including required charts, forms, and requested artifacts submitted as appendices).
2. It should betyped, single-spaced, with LEAs addressing each of the subsections by entering text where indicated.
3. Font may NOT be less than 12 pt., Sans Serif at 100%.
4. Charts and forms do not require 12pt Times New Roman font.
5. The complete LEA application including budgets, charts, and forms, will be posted on the PED ESSA webpage.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA Direct Student Services Application** | |
| **LEA Name:** | Click here to enter text. |
| **Submitting on Behalf of (name of school):** | Click here to enter text. |

1. **Needs Assessment**

*Please provide a copy of a needs assessment that has influenced the focus and design of your DSS program.*

1. **What type(s) of DSS opportunities will the LEA provide students?**

Extended learning day or week

Course access (AP, CTE, dual-credit, credit recovery, accelerated learning)

K-5 literacy and/or mathematics instruction

Personalized learning, including high-quality tutoring

Intra-LEA transportation for students in struggling schools to attend high-performing schools

1. **If the LEA is offering high-quality tutoring, who will provide tutoring services?**

LEA educators rated Effective or higher on NMTEACH evaluation system

External approved provider (see below)

Both

*Educators rated Effective or higher on the NMTEACH evaluation system automatically qualify as a high-quality tutoring provider; therefore, LEAs that utilize educators that qualify are not required to contract with external approved providers to offer these services to students and families.*

**NOTE: High-quality tutoring**

Pursuant to Sec. 1003A(e)(2) of ESEA, the State must compile and maintain an updated list of State-approved high-quality academic tutoring providers that:

* Is developed using a fair negotiation and rigorous selection and approval process;
* Provides parents with meaningful choices;
* Offers a range of tutoring models, including online and on campus; and
* Includes only providers that –
  + Have demonstrated a record of success in increasing students’ academic achievement;
  + Comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local health, safety, and civil rights laws; and
  + Provide instruction and content that is secular, neutral, and non-ideological.

1. **Program Goals (20 points)**

*Will the proposed program(s) be available to all students throughout the district?*

Yes

No

*If yes, what sub-group population(s) achievement gap will the proposed program(s) aim to reduce (check all that apply)?*

Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged

English Learners compared to non-English Learners

Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities

Native American compared to non-Native American

Black compared to non-Black

Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic

*If yes, how will the LEA prioritize services for those students who are the lowest-achieving, including those in comprehensive and targeted schools?*

Click here to enter text.

*If no, identify schools that will be eligible for participation in the proposed program(s) and the corresponding student learning goals as it relates to closing the achievement gap between identified sub-group population(s) compared to non-sub-group population(s) (ex. students with disabilities vs. students without disabilities).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School(s)** | **School(s) Classification** | **Sub-Group Population(s) Served** |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |
| Click here to enter text. | Comprehensive support and improvement  Targeted support and improvement  N/A | Black compared to non-Black  Economically disadvantaged compared to non-economically disadvantaged  English Learners compared to non-English Learners  Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic  Native American compared to non-Native American  Students with disabilities compared to student without disabilities |

1. **Key elements of program design (50 points)**

*Describe how the LEA proposes to implement DSS in accordance with ESEA and other requirements set forth under this application with respect to the following objectives:*

* 1. **Ensure program(s) aligns to best practices with high potential for success (25 points)**

*Provide a description of the proposed program(s) and evidence-base for their inclusion into the DSS opportunity.*

Click here to enter text.

* 1. **Ensure parental and school awareness of DSS opportunities (15 points)**

*How will the LEA use available DSS funds (up to one percent of their grant award) for outreach and communication to parents about DSS?*

Click here to enter text.

*How will the LEA ensure that parents have adequate time and information to make a meaningful choice prior to enrolling their child in a DSS program?[[6]](#footnote-6)*

Click here to enter text.

*How will the LEA ensure on-going outreach to parents/families?*

Click here to enter text.

*How will the LEA demonstrate the level of commitment that principals, teachers and parents would have in implementing the proposed DSS program?*

Click here to enter text.

* 1. **Ensure sufficient options to provide meaningful choice to parents (10 points)**

*Describe how the LEA will use funds made available under the grant to pay the per student costs associated with the proposed opportunities.*

Click here to enter text.

*If the LEA is offering public school choice as part of their DSS application, how will the LEA ensure sufficient availability of seats in the public schools the local educational agency will make available for public school choice options?*

Click here to enter text.

1. **Program alignment (10 points)**

*Describe how the proposed program(s) align with other federal, state, and local initiatives currently underway in the LEA, including expanding the reach of Highly-Effective and Exemplary teachers to support identified student sub-group population(s) and below-the-line funding opportunities, such as Principals Pursuing Excellence, K-3+, Results Driven Accountability, NM Out-of-School time, 21st Century Learning Grant, etc.*

Click here to enter text.

1. **Program management (10 points)**

*Describe how the LEA will manage the services provided by DSS funds, including identifying the allocation of staff time necessary to implement and oversee a strong program and how, consistent with ESSA, no more than two percent of the award will be used to cover administrative costs.*

Click here to enter text.

1. **Program monitoring and evaluation (10 points)**

*Describe how the LEA will: (1) monitor the provision and implementation within the LEA, including how participating schools and providers will adhere to program requirements, including data collection and reporting; (2) monitor how funds are spent appropriately; (3) publicly report the results of relevant student outcomes in a manner that is accessible to parents; and (4) review each service provided by DSS and hold providers accountable for results.*

Click here to enter text.

**Appendix A: Direct Student Services Assurances**

The following assurances indicate support of the Board of Education (BOE), Local Education Agency (LEA), and School Leadership for the 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021 school years in the areas specified. By signing these assurances, the parties agree to three years full participation in the **Direct Student Services Implementation.**

If at any time a signed party does not adhere to the agreed assurances, the Request for Application will be deemed incomplete.

|  |
| --- |
| **LEA:** Click here to enter text. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Board of Education commits to the following:**   1. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:    1. The BOE assures that it was involved in the discussion and application process with the LEA applying on behalf of eligible schools and supports the application/s.    2. The BOE commits to supporting the superintendent in modifying practice and policy, if necessary, to enable schools and teachers to fully participate and implement Direct Student Services.    3. The BOE commits to flexibility in scheduling as it relates to Direct Student Services activities, to include but not limited to allocating time for professional development and collaboration.    4. The BOE supports the use of summative and formative assessments to assess student proficiency and reviews LEA and school growth regularly to inform superintendent’s progress toward LEA proficiency targets.    5. The BOE commits to successful completion of Direct Student Services in the event of LEA or school leadership changes.   **The LEA commits to the following:**   1. Assuring that each school the LEA proposes to serve will receive all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of funds received under Title 1, Part A, Sec. 1003a 2. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:    1. Partner with principal to establish a comprehensive school 90-day plan that is aligned with the LEA’s strategic plan    2. Partner with principal on critical decisions like staffing, scheduling, budgeting, targeted professional development, and other operational issues    3. Put into place rigorous and aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year along with efficient data collection and distribution for use at the school level    4. Proactively engage all stakeholders to acknowledge current reality and present a bold vision for the future of the school    5. Hold turnaround schools and principals accountable through a robust monitoring system as defined by the LEA 3. Ensure that conditions are in place at the school level to support turnaround, including:    1. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year    2. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader (principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings    3. Teacher action plans addressing root cause analysis of interim assessment data will be developed by all teachers and leaders prior to one-on-one teacher-leader analysis meetings    4. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs    5. Student and staff culture of learning    6. Short-cycle observation walkthroughs and one-on-one teacher-leader feedback meetings 4. Message the evidence-based intervention to all stakeholders to include school board members and collective bargaining units as necessary 5. Develop a sustainability plan prior to the end of Year 3   **School Leadership Commits to the Following:**   1. Partner with LEA leadership to create and/or align systems at the school level to support a 90-day plan aligned with the LEA’s strategic plan, including:    1. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year    2. Timely dissemination of interim assessment data to teachers    3. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader(principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings    4. Teacher action plans addressing root cause analysis of interim assessment data developed by all teachers prior to one-on-one teacher-leader analysis meetings    5. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs/grade level meeting/collaboration time    6. Student and staff culture of learning    7. Short-cycle observation walkthroughs and one-on-one teacher-leader feedback meetings 2. Align school policies and structures to provide ongoing school-site support for all teachers to support implementation of the evidence-based intervention | |
|  |  |
| President, Board of Education Signature | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Superintendent Signature | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| School Leadership Signature | Date |

**Appendix B: Certification and Approval**

I hereby certify that I am the applicant’s Superintendent/Charter Director, and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable application guidelines and instructions, and that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of this project.

I understand that this application constitutes an offer and, if accepted by the PED or renegotiated to acceptance, will form a binding agreement. I also agree that immediate written notice will be provided to PED if at any time I learn that this certification was erroneous when submitted, or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Superintendent/Charter Director Printed Name | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Superintendent/Charter Director Signature (blue ink) | Date |

**Certification and Approval**

I hereby certify that I am the applicant’s School Board President, and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable application guidelines and instructions, and that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of this project.

I understand that this application constitutes an offer and, if accepted by the PED or renegotiated to acceptance, will form a binding agreement. I also agree that immediate written notice will be provided to PED if at any time I learn that this certification was erroneous when submitted, or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Board President Printed Name | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Board President Signature (blue ink) | Date |

**Appendix C: DSS Application Rubric**

| **Direct Student Services Request for Application Scoring Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area** | **Strong Evidence**  **(4 points)** | **Moderate Evidence**  **(3 points)** | **Limited Evidence**  **(2 points)** | **Insufficient Evidence**  **(1 point)** |
| **Program Goals (20%):**  LEA utilizes Direct Student Services to set ambitious student learning goals for sub-group population(s) in schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement.   1. Direct Student Services program(s) predominately serve sub-group population(s) in schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement **OR** LEA has robust strategy to prioritize lowest-performing students. 2. LEA establishes ambitious student learning goals aimed at closing achievement gaps between sub-group population(s) and non-sub-group population(s) | * 100% of Direct Student Services program(s) serve sub-group population(s) in schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement **OR** LEA clearly guarantees and outlines the process for how all awarded funds will go to lowest-performing students first (WP4) * LEA establishes goal of eliminating achievement gap between sub-group population(s) and non-sub-group population(s) (WP4) | * 85-99% of Direct Student Services program(s) serve sub-group population(s) in schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement **OR** LEA assures all awarded funds will go to lowest-performing students first (WP4) * LEA establishes goal of reducing achievement gap by 50% or more between sub-group population(s) and non-sub-group population(s) (WP4) | * 75-84% of Direct Student Services program(s) serve sub-group population(s) in schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement **OR** LEA somewhat assures all awarded funds will go to lowest-performing students first (WP4) * LEA establishes goal of reducing achievement gap by 26-49% between sub-group population(s) and non-sub-group population(s) (WP4) | * Less than 75% of Direct Student Services program(s) serve sub-group population(s) in schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement **OR** LEA does not guarantee all awarded funds will go to lowest-performing students first (WP4) * LEA establishes goal of reducing achievement gap by 25% or less between sub-group population(s) and non-sub-group population(s) (WP4) |
| **Score (Increments of 0.50)**   .   out of 4 | **Evidence** | | | |

| **Direct Student Services Request for Application Scoring Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area** | **Strong Evidence**  **(4 points)** | **Moderate Evidence**  **(3 points)** | **Limited Evidence**  **(2 points)** | **Insufficient Evidence**  **(1 point)** |
| **Program Design (50%):**  LEA proposes rigorous, evidence-based program(s) with focus on ensuring parental awareness of opportunities and providing an array of meaningful options to students and families.   1. LEA designs program that utilizes best practices as it relates to chosen DSS opportunity with rigorous selection process for providers, if applicable 2. LEA outlines clear communication strategy to increase student and family awareness of opportunity 3. LEA provides sufficient options that ensure meaningful choices for students and families | * LEA utilizes rigorous, evidence-based program(s) with track record of student achievement for incorporation into DSS opportunity (WP5a) * LEA demonstrates clear, robust communication strategy to ensure stakeholder awareness of DSS opportunity (WP5b) * LEA provides sufficient options that empower students and families with meaningful choices (WP5c) | * LEA utilizes evidence-based program(s) with track record of student achievement for incorporation into DSS opportunity (WP5a) * LEA outlines communication strategy to ensure stakeholder awareness of DSS opportunity (WP5b) * LEA provides options that empower students and families with meaningful choices (WP5c) | * LEA somewhat utilizes evidence-based program(s) with track record of student achievement for incorporation into DSS opportunity (WP5a) * LEA somewhat outlines communication strategy to ensure stakeholder awareness of DSS opportunity (WP5b) * LEA somewhat provides options that empower students and families with meaningful choices (WP5c) | * LEA does not utilize program(s) with track record of student achievement for incorporation into DSS opportunity (WP5a) * LEA does not outline communication strategy to ensure stakeholder awareness of DSS opportunity (WP5b) * LEA does not provide options that empower students and families with meaningful choices (WP5c) |
| **Score (Increments of 0.33)**   .   out of 4 | **Evidence** | | | |

| **Direct Student Services Request for Application Scoring Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area** | **Strong Evidence**  **(4 points)** | **Moderate Evidence**  **(3 points)** | **Limited Evidence**  **(2 points)** | **Insufficient Evidence**  **(1 point)** |
| **Program Alignment (10%):**  LEA clearly demonstrates how DSS opportunity aligns with federal, state, and local initiatives currently underway in the district.   1. LEA specifies how highly-effective and exemplary teachers will be utilized as part of the DSS opportunity 2. LEA provides clear, compelling rationale regarding how DSS opportunity aligns with current federal, state, and local initiatives | * LEA utilizes highly-effective and exemplary teachers, as identified by NMTEACH evaluation system, to determine eligibility to provide DSS (WP6) * LEA clearly specifies how DSS opportunity aligns with current federal, state, and local initiatives (WP6) | * LEA utilizes effective, highly-effective, and exemplary teachers, as identified by NMTEACH evaluation system, to determine eligibility to provide DSS (WP6) * LEA specifies how DSS opportunity aligns with current federal, state, and local initiatives (WP6) | * LEA provides vague assurances that only effective, highly-effective, and exemplary teachers, as identified by NMTEACH evaluation system, to determine eligibility to provide DSS (WP6) * LEA vaguely specifies how DSS opportunity aligns with current federal, state, and local initiatives (WP6) | * LEA does not utilize NMTEACH evaluation results to determine eligibility to provide DSS (WP6) * LEA does not specify how current federal, state, and local initiatives align with DSS opportunity (WP6) |
| **Score (Increments of 0.50)**   .   out of 4 | **Evidence** | | | |

| **Direct Student Services Request for Application Scoring Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area** | **Strong Evidence**  **(4 points)** | **Moderate Evidence**  **(3 points)** | **Limited Evidence**  **(2 points)** | **Insufficient Evidence**  **(1 point)** |
| **Program Management (10%):**  LEA identifies program manager and staff time necessary to oversee a strong program.   1. LEA identifies program manager and staff time/allocation necessary to successfully implement DSS opportunity 2. LEA outlines how not more than two percent of the award will be used to cover administrative costs | * LEA identifies specific staff member(s) for ensuring program success and definitively allocates time required to implement program (WP7) * LEA clearly guarantees how it will utilize not more than two percent of award to cover administrative costs (WP7) | * LEA identifies staff member(s) for ensuring program success and allocates time required to implement program (WP7) * LEA provides assurances that it will utilize not more than two percent of award to cover administrative costs (WP7) | * LEA vaguely identifies staff member(s) for ensuring program success and somewhat allocates time required to implement program (WP7) * LEA provides vague assurances it will utilize not more than two percent of award to cover administrative costs (WP7) | * LEA does not identify staff member(s) for ensuring program success and/or does not allocate time required to implement program (WP7) * LEA does not provide assurances it will utilize not more than two percent of award to cover administrative costs (WP7) |
| **Score (Increments of 0.50)**   .   out of 4 | **Evidence** | | | |

| **Direct Student Services Request for Application Scoring Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area** | **Strong Evidence**  **(4 points)** | **Moderate Evidence**  **(3 points)** | **Limited Evidence**  **(2 points)** | **Insufficient Evidence**  **(1 point)** |
| **Program Monitoring and Evaluation (10%):**  LEA identifies how they will monitor and evaluate program success and make adjustments, as necessary.   1. LEA has processes and guidelines in place for schools and providers to collect and report data on program implementation 2. LEA has clear process to monitor program spending 3. LEA outlines clear, robust process for reporting student outcome results to families 4. LEA outlines clear, consistent process to review and hold providers accountable for results. | * LEA outlines clear, consistent process and guidelines for schools and providers to collect and report data (WP8) * LEA outlines clear process to monitor spending (WP8) * LEA outlines robust, clear process to report program student outcome results to families (WP8) * LEA outlines clear, consistent process for holding providers accountable for results (WP8) | * LEA outlines process and guidelines for schools and providers to collect and report data (WP8) * LEA outlines process to monitor spending (WP8) * LEA outlines process to report program student outcome results to families (WP8) * LEA outlines process for holding providers accountable for results (WP8) | * LEA somewhat outlines process and guidelines for schools and providers to collect and report data (WP8) * LEA somewhat outlines process to monitor spending (WP8) * LEA somewhat outlines process to report program student outcome results to families (WP8) * LEA somewhat outlines process for holding providers accountable for results (WP8) | * LEA does not outline process and guidelines for schools and providers to collect and report data (WP8) * LEA does not outline process to monitor spending (WP8) * LEA does not outline process to report program student outcome results to families (WP8) * LEA does not outline process for holding providers accountable for results (WP8) |
| **Score (Increments of 0.25)**   .   out of 4 | **Evidence** | | | |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Templates will be provided by PED. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 2 CFR Part 200 §200.338 Remedies for Noncompliance [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. §200.207 Special Conditions [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. **NOTE:** A minimum of 30 days and a maximum of 60 days are required for parent and family engagement. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)