**District**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **School**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**IAG Objectives**

The Intensive Assistance Grant (IAG) is designed to provide a school with intensive support for improving instruction. In part through a high-dosage infusion of funds, schools will be able to build on strengths and remove barriers to successful implementation of district identified instructional priorities. We are asking schools to reflect on how far they have come in the past year since first receiving grant funds. We want schools to look where they are today through a submission of artifacts and chart a course for the next 2 years, including a plan for how to sustain the work after the grant has ended. This will be done through: (1) A reflection upon the strengths exhibited from the past year as well as opportunities for growth. As with year one, actions for the upcoming year will align to the instructional priority the district has identified; (2) Identifying how the most pressing need(s) will be addressed with a large infusion of resources; (3) Note the key benchmarks and interim goals to measure progress and (4) provide a budget description and justification for the coming school year. **A primary focus should be on what worked in year one, what did not work, and why.**

**Section I: The School’s Instructional Priority (the written application)**

**Note: revisions to the instructional priority can be submitted as needed**

|  |
| --- |
| **District Instructional Priority (cut and paste from District Instructional Priority Submission, use FY25 if FY26 is not ready yet):** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **High Quality Instructional Materials for the subject area of focus: (if the curriculum is the same as year one, please note that and skip to the next section).** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Subject** | **Curriculum Used** | **Is the curriculum used the same as what is reported on** [**DESE’s School and District Profiles**](https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/Curriculumdata.aspx)? **If not, please** [**update**](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/data-collection.html)**.** | **Is it high quality as** [**defined by DESE**](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate/resources.html)**?** | **If not high quality, describe the school’s effort**  **to implement HQIM moving forward.** | | **ELA** |  |  |  |  | | **Math** |  |  |  |  | | **Science** |  |  |  |  | | **Social Studies** |  |  |  |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| **School Instructional Priority:** Please tell us what the district’s instructional priority looks like in your school. Feel free to copy/paste if it is the same as year one. If the priority has been updated, please note the changes below.  *Recommended resources:*   * [*Instructional Priority Protocol*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/turnaround/level4/prioritization/2-instructional-priority.docx) * *DESE’s Educational Vision for Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices* * *DESE’s Office of Language Acquisition resources for* [*English Learner Education*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/blueprint/default.html) |
| ***Given the meaningful changes for students outlined in the district’s prioritization plan, what specifically will students in this school experience in their learning because of this focus?*** |
| ***Which specific equity and opportunity gaps will this priority address?*** |
| ***What are the meaningful changes in educator practice that are the focus of this priority?*** |
| ***OPTIONAL: Include links to any related documents such as a district strategic plan, school improvement plan, etc.*** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Analysis of Strengths and Challenges:** Reflect on implementation in year one. **(Note: this is the most important section of the application.)**   Please limit your response in this section to 500 words for fewer. |
| **Data Analysis Summary**  How does the sample of teacher observations done in spring 2025 compare with teacher observations done in spring 2024?  How does the sample student work analysis done in spring 2025 compare with the student work analysis done in spring 2024? |
| **How well did the school and district do meeting the benchmarks identified in last year’s application (section 5)? What contributed to those results?** |
| **What went well? How do you know?** |
| **What did not go as well as expected? How do you know?** |
| **What successes will be leveraged and/or changes will be implemented in the coming year?** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Stakeholder Engagement:**   Please limit your response in this section to 300 words for fewer. |
| **What was learned from engaging stakeholders in the past year?** |
| **If applicable, please provide any updates to stakeholder engagement that are different from year one.** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Role Clarity:** If the approach is the same, feel free to copy/paste from last year and move to the next section.   Please limit your response in this section to 300 words for fewer.  *Recommended resource:* [*Vertical Alignment Strategy Protocol*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/turnaround/level4/prioritization/3-vertical-alignment-strategy.docx) |
| **How will the district’s central office continue to support school leaders in implementing this priority? How will the district create conditions where this work can be effective? In what ways will the district and school leverage takeaways from mid-year progress monitoring? Please note which approaches are new to this year and which are the same as the previous year.** |
| **What will the school leaders do consistently to support teacher practice to implement this priority?** |
| **What will classroom educators do consistently to support student learning and achieving the desired outcomes?** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Monitoring Implementation (at both district and school levels):** These can be updated benchmarks from year one or entirely new ones.   Please limit your response in this section to 300 words for fewer.  *Recommended resource:* [*Street-Level Data Protocol*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/turnaround/level4/prioritization/5-street-level-data.docx) *(Shane Safir & Jamila Dugan)* | | |
| **What 2-4 high-leverage interim benchmarks will you track throughout the year at both the district and school level to gauge changes in adult practice and student learning/experiences? (These should be updated from year 1 or changed completely.)**  **Ex1: By December 15 every teacher will have identified 2-3 adjustments they will make to their instruction based on feedback from observations or common planning time.**  **Ex3: By April 1, every teacher will have been observed and provided quality feedback on implementing the 2-3 adjustments they identified to their instruction.**  **Ex3: By May 1, every teacher will have been observed \_\_\_ times and provided quality feedback on their instruction.** | **Who will monitor these? (e.g., which teams and/or roles at the district and/or school level)** | **How often?**  **(e.g., weekly, monthly, on specific dates)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Resources:** What partnerships, programs, or resources will you leverage to implement this priority?  These could include external resources (e.g., supports offered by DESE or other partners) as well as internal resources (e.g., staffing, funding from TAG and other grants, etc.)   If the approach is the same, feel free to copy/paste from last year and move to the next section.    Please limit your response in this section to 300 words for fewer.  *Recommended resource:* [*District Systems portion of the Sustainable Improvement Planning guidance*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/turnaround/level4/guidance.html?section=district#accordion) |
| **Supports offered by the district:** |
| **Supports offered by DESE:** |
| **Supports offered by other partners:** |
| **Funding sources:** |
| **Staffing and other resources not captured above:** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **School Leadership:** Who is on the school’s Instructional Leadership Team and what is their role? Describe the flexibility and autonomy that the leadership team has over decisions around resource allocation, scheduling, and decisions around programs and staffing. What various stakeholders are represented on the team (e.g. academics, student support, special education, and Multilingual learners)?   If the school leadership is the same, feel free to copy/paste from last year and move to the next section.  Please limit your response in this section to 300 words for fewer. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Participants in Implementing the IAG Plan:** The team participants are expected to be reflective of the population that this grant impacts/involves. Describe the racial breakdown of your students. Describe the racial breakdown of the team implementing the grant. If there are large differences between adults and students, what are the barriers causing that? What approaches is the school considering/doing to address them?   If the participants are the same, feel free to copy/paste from last year and move to the next section.  Please limit your response in this section to 300 words for fewer. |
|  |

**Section II: Budget (this is also a written section)**

**2025-2026**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** (e.g., Professional development to all teachers to support implementation of new curriculum.) | **Connection to School Instructional Priority** (one sentence per activity) | **Description**: Provide a **brief** explanation of what the activity entails (**1-2 sentencesper activity**). Add more rows as needed. | **Cost** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Budget for Future Years: please provide a brief description of how IAG funds are tentatively planned to be used in FY27.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Budget after IAG cycle is complete: please provide a brief description of how important work at the school will be sustained after the grant funding is completed at the end of 2026-27.** |
|  |

Note: in Year 1 an interview was part of the application process. The interview portion is not required for year two.