|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Red Flags for 1003(a) Grants** | | |
| **Issue** | **Reason for Concern** | **Simple Solution** |
| School Name and Designation Status information is missing.   * TSI schools must provide   identified subgroup(s). | This information is needed for application review and DEED’s check on alignment. | Use the updated FY23 Condensed Application or note school name and designation on the right corner of page 2 of the application. |
| School data includes reports on student achievement with n-counts < 10. | Student privacy is not protected. | Aggregate student data within the application so that when it is publicly shared, student privacy is protected. |
| There is a disconnect between reason for designation, school data, needs, plan, goals, and the listed interventions. | The intention of school improvement funds is to address the reason for designation and the root cause of underperformance. To effect desired change and improve results, funds should be targeted to needs, including specific subgroup(s) needs. | Align interventions to reason for designation, the school’s unique situation, and the root causes of low performance. |
| Funds allocated for interventions do not match the priorities shown in school data and/or described in needs, plan, and goals. | Questions arise in reviewing applications when a need is mentioned as a priority and then is not addressed in the SIP or listed interventions. | Either address all identified needs, prioritize needs to match expenditures, or explain why a prioritized need is not addressed in this year’s interventions. |
| Interventions are not evidence-based. | This is a requirement for all 1003(a) school improvement grants. | Use What Works Clearinghouse to verify at least one of your interventions shows a strong to a moderate effect size. Check study’s target population and context against your site’s. |
| Intervention descriptions lack specificity to match intervention to a budget category, e.g., supplies or salaries. | Clarity supports understanding of what is being undertaken at the school. This assists DEED in reviewing applications. Once applications are reviewed and made public, it helps stakeholders to understand what is being done to support students. | Be as specific and as clear as possible in your intervention descriptions while maintaining narrative brevity.  For some intervention exemplars, see the *FY23 Condensed Application Exemplar* at <https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SchoolRecognition> |
| Intervention allocation exceeds DEED’s established limits, e.g., $1,000 for student incentives, $10,000 for planning. | These limits have been established to prevent potential fund misuse and to uphold federal standards for grant fund usage. | Reduce allocation to established limit.  For more information, see the *Budget Narrative Guidelines for 1003(a) Grants* at <https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SchoolRecognition> |
| Budget narratives lack specificity, e.g., list of supplies, count and cost per unit for technology devices. | This information helps DEED to understand what intervention is being planned, what items are being purchased, and whether funds are being appropriately allocated. | Add details requested.  For more information, see the *Budget Narrative Guidelines for 1003(a) Grants* at <https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SchoolRecognition> |