

LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965



Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Box 480 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Application due:

July 14, 2010

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, or age in its programs and activities. Inquiries related to Department programs and to the location of services, activities, and facilities that are accessible by persons with disabilities may be directed to the Jefferson State Office Building, Civil Rights Compliance (Title VI/Title IX/504/ADA/Age Act), 5th Floor, 205 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480; telephone number 573-526-4757 or Relay Missouri 800-735-2966.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (The Department)
LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application
Directions and Guidance

**School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965**

The School Improvement Grants (SIG) program is authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must “award grants to States to enable the States to provide sub-grants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with section 1116.” From a grant received pursuant to that provision, a State educational agency (SEA) must sub-grant at least 95 percent of the funds it receives to its local educational agencies (LEAs) for school improvement activities. In awarding such sub-grants, an SEA must “give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate — (A) the greatest need for such funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans under section 1116.” The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the “greatest need” for SIG funds and the “strongest commitment” to ensuring that such funds are used to raise substantially student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State. (*Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, U.S. Dept. of Ed., January 20, 2010*)

The Department encourages grant applicants to review the regulations and guidance on the United States Department of Education web site at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html> and <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/faq.html>.

Submit an original and three copies postmarked by July 14, 2010 to the following address:

Federal Instructional Improvement
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
205 Jefferson Street, PO Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0480

Narratives must be typed, and restricted to 10-12 pt. font size. All sections of the application must be completed and submitted in section order. Documentation should follow the completed application. Documentation provided with the application must be clearly labeled with the section number it addresses and the district’s county district code in the upper right corner of each page.

DIRECTIONS

“Part II: LEA Requirements” of the Updated SEA School Improvement Grant Application requires The Department to develop an LEA/district application.

An SEA must develop an LEA/District Application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs/districts. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs/districts.

The information in the tables in the application form is copied directly from Part II of the SEA application. The requirements for each section are in these tables. As stated above, The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) may ask for “other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds...” Unless otherwise directed, the LEA/District will complete the application by providing information and documentation required in the “LEA/District Response” under parts B, Descriptive Information and C, Budget Information. Documents should be created and organized as outlined in the application and attached to the application when it is submitted to the Department.

Suggestions for preparing to complete the LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application:

Before starting the grant preparation process, the LEA/district should refer to the information in Appendices A-E to help determine the level of detail required in the LEA/District Application.

Directions:

LEA/District Program and Contact Information: Provide the name and contact information for the LEA/District’s board-authorized federal programs representative and the School Improvement Grant contact person. Send a copy of this page to the Federal Instructional Improvement Section at the Department as soon as the LEA/District begins the planning process. Keep the Department informed if the information changes.

Section A: Schools to be Served: The Department will provide the LEAs/districts with a list of the schools that are eligible to be served in Tiers I, II, and III. The LEA/district will indicate in the application which schools it intends to serve and which interventions it plans to implement.

Section B: Descriptive Information: The LEA/district will provide information in Section B that details its plans for serving schools in Tiers I, II, and III. The information should be in enough detail for the grant evaluators to determine how the LEA/district has made decisions and how it plans to implement interventions and improvement activities in each school it commits to serve.

Section C: Budget: Budgets for LEA/district activities and school activities should be submitted with enough detail for the application evaluators to determine the direct alignment from the needs analysis, to the plans, and to the budget. Budgets are required to detail all available resources that will be used to operate the Tier I and II schools the LEA commits to serve, the LEA-level activities to support the interventions and improvement activities in Tier I, II, and III schools, and the improvement activities in Tier III schools.

Section D: Assurances: Check the boxes in this table to include the assurances in the application.

Section E: Waivers: The LEA/district must check each waiver that the LEA/district will implement. If the LEA/district does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA/district must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

LEA/district approval for the Department to provide direct services: Section 1003 (g) permits SIG funds to be used for the SEA (the Department) to provide and arrange for direct services to the LEAs/districts and the schools. Examples of these services would include but not be limited to common training, coaching, mentoring and other services and activities that would support preparation of the LEA/District Application and the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the selected interventions and improvement activities in LEAs/districts and selected schools.

Signature: The Local Board of Education’s authorized representative and superintendent (if not the authorized representative) are required to sign the grant application.

Timeline for the SIG application process:

Please note: The Department expects the LEAs/districts to begin the implementation of interventions and improvement activities during the 2010-2011 school year.

March 1-May 7, 2010:

- The Department will release the projected list of Tier I, II, and III schools to the LEAs/districts.
- LEAs/districts conduct a thorough needs analysis of each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it intends to commit to serve.
- LEAs/districts collect necessary data, involve stakeholders, and begin developing LEA/District Applications based on the draft LEA/District Application.
- The Department collaborates with the LEAs/districts to assist in determining capacity and commitment to serve Tier I and Tier II schools.
- The Department will use information from collaboration with the LEAs/districts to help determine the allocation of funds to the participating LEAs/districts. (This step is intended to help make some preliminary estimates of how the funds can be distributed among the LEAs/Districts in “greatest need” with consideration to serving LEAs/Districts in several regions of the state and the funds that are available. Missouri believes that ongoing communication and support during the application planning as LEAs/Districts determine their commitment and capacity to serve schools is very important. Missouri also believes ongoing communication will expedite the process and reduce time consuming negotiation after the applications are evaluated.)

Please note: LEAs/districts may accelerate the following timeline, and the Department will evaluate each complete application within a week of receiving it. Once an LEA/District Application has been approved, SIG funds will be made available within five days.

Upon receiving U.S. Dept. of Ed. approval of the SEA Application: (Projected date, April 2, 2010)

- The final application will be distributed to the LEAs/districts within one week. (Projected date, April 5, 2010)
- The LEAs/districts will have fifteen days to: (Projected date, April 20, 2010)
 - declare their commitment to serve schools,
 - submit a projected list of schools it may commit to serve, and the intervention model or improvement activities and, if feasible, an estimate of the SIG funds that will be budgeted for each school.
- LEAs/Districts attend a service/support provider meeting at the Department (Projected date, April 27, 2010)
- SEA will make service/support provider assignments (Projected date, April 30, 2010)
- LEAs/Districts will have forty-five days from the service/support provider assignment to submit preliminary content and may submit a final application. (Projected date, June 14, 2010)

- LEAs/Districts will have seventy-five days from the service/support provider assignment to complete and submit the final LEA/District Application. (Projected date, July 14, 2010)
- The Department Federal Instructional Improvement, Federal Grants Management, and Federal Discretionary Grant staff will screen the applications for completeness and organize the applications in preparation for the evaluation team review
- The Department will convene evaluation teams to review the applications. (Projected dates, July 15-16, 2010)
- The Department will consult with LEAs/districts to get additional information or amend the grant applications to ensure compliance with regulations. (Projected dates, July 19- July 20, 2010)
- The Department will make final determinations and approvals three days after the evaluation teams complete their review or applications needing questions answered or corrections made have been reviewed again. (Projected date, July 19-21, 2010)
- The Department will make funds available to approved LEAs/districts no later than July 23, 2010. Or five days after final approval of the LEA/District Application.

SIG Grant Monitoring and Annual Renewal

Department staff and/or designated support team staff will meet quarterly with LEA/district-level staff and school principals responsible for the intervention and improvement activities. The LEA/district will provide documentation of implementation measures and leading indicator measures for each school served. Department staff and /or designated support team staff will make not less than one school visit each month to monitor implementation. The school visits will include classroom observations and staff, student, and parent interviews.

The Department's Federal Instructional Improvement and Accountability and Accreditation Sections will receive quarterly reports from the LEAs/districts and a report from the support team staff. These reports will document the schools' and the LEAs'/districts' progress toward implementation of the selected interventions and improvement activities. Data from quarterly measures of the required and LEA/district-identified leading indicators along with formative student assessment data will be reported also. Department staff will evaluate these formative reports to determine if the LEAs/districts and schools have demonstrated fidelity to implementation plans and/or inform the work of the support teams. Missouri believes that ongoing collaboration and support, frequent communication, observation, and reporting with timely constructive feedback will help ensure fidelity to implementation and permit timely changes in plans and activities in need of improvement.

At the end of each school year, the Department will receive a summative report from the LEAs/districts and a report from the support teams. The Department will evaluate strategy implementation fidelity and progress and the required and LEA/district-identified leading indicator data. Each school's state assessment data will also be reviewed.

At the end of the first year of implementation, the Department will base its decision on whether to renew an LEA's/district's SIG for one or more Tier I or Tier II schools on the Department's evaluation of implementation progress and fidelity to the implementation plan. The Department will consider the level of implementation of the plan's strategies, adherence to timelines, full funding of the strategies, LEA/district support, data systems in place and trained upon, policies and practices have been modified, ongoing professional development is in place, and other strategies and activities. Measures of leading indicators and annual student achievement results will be evaluated. During and at the end of the first year of implementation of the selected interventions and improvement activities, fidelity to implementation will be weighted more heavily in the evaluation. If it is determined that the LEA/district has not substantially demonstrated its commitment to and progress on the implementation plan in one or more of its schools, SIG funding will not be renewed for the Tier I or Tier II school(s).

At the end of the second year, if a school or schools have not made progress on a majority of the leading indicators and have not met student achievement goals, the Department will conduct an in-depth evaluation of the processes and practices in the LEA/district and school(s) related to the improvement activities and interventions. The results of the evaluation will be used along with the leading indicator and achievement data to determine if the SIG grant will be renewed.

LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application
Title I, Section 1003 (g) of ESEA

DIRECTIONS

Mail the completed form to: Federal Instructional Improvement, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, PO Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480.

Questions, contact Federal Instructional Improvement: Phone: (573) 751-9437; Fax: (573) 522-1759; or e-mail to: webreplyimprfii@dese.mo.gov; Visit The Department's website at: dese.mo.gov

LEA/DISTRICT AND PROGRAM CONTACT INFORMATION

LEA/DISTRICT/AGENCY NAME Kansas City, Missouri School District			COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE 048078
NAME OF BOARD-AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE John Covington, Ed. D	ADDRESS 1211 McGee Street	CITY, STATE, ZIP Kansas City, MO 64106	
E-MAIL ADDRESS jwmcovington@kcmsd.net	TELEPHONE NUMBER 816-418-7616	FAX NUMBER	
NAME OF GRANT CONTACT H. MiUndrae Prince, PhD Kirsten Braman, Director of Fed Programs	ADDRESS 1211 McGee Street	CITY, STATE, ZIP Kansas City, MO 64106	
E-MAIL ADDRESS mprince@kcmsd.net kbraman@kcmsd.net	TELEPHONE NUMBER 816-418-7462	FAX NUMBER 816-418-7409	

THE DEPARTMENT'S APPROVAL

For Department use only.

The Department AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	DATE	TOTAL APPROVED
			\$

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA/district must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA/district must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA/district commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA/district will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation
Richardson Elementary	5250	X					X	
KCMSA	3080		X				X	
Westport HS	1640		X				X	
Central HS	1200		X					X
East HS	1580		X					X
Northeast HS	1340		X					X
Paseo Academy	1400			X				X
Southwest HS	3180			X				X

Note: An LEA/district that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

(NOTE: The Department will provide each LEA/district with a list of the schools that are eligible to be served in Tiers I, II, and III. The LEA/district will indicate in the application which schools it intends to serve and which intervention it intends to implement in the selected Tier I and Tier II schools.)

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA/district must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA/district commits to serve, the LEA/district must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA/district has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA/district has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s/district’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA/district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA/district must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

- (3) The LEA/district must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA/district must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's/district's application.
- (5) The LEA/district must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA/district commits to serve, the LEA/district must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA/district must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA/district must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's/district's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

[Superintendent's Letter for Grant Application.pdf](#)

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: LEA/District Response—Attach narrative and documentation requested for each item below.

- (1) Demonstrate analysis of needs and capacity to implement selected interventions
 1. Provide information that explains how your LEA/district has analyzed the needs of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school you intend to serve
 - a. discuss the most significant results of the needs analysis with supporting data
 - b. the methods used to gather the data.
 - c. list the selected intervention for each school

1. Needs Assessment for Richardson, KCMSA, and Westport High School – Closure

The persistently low measurable student academic achievement in the Kansas City, Missouri School District coupled with declining student enrollment and excess capacity in schools justified the need for more educationally focused resources to ensure for greater student learning. Prior to the recently Board approved Right-Sizing Initiative, more than 70% of District schools had fewer than 25% of their students proficient on the state assessment, less than one-third of elementary students were reading at grade level, and little to marginal capacity existed in local schools to provide the instructional leadership needed to promote student learning to deep understanding. The statistics from the need analysis for school closure strongly suggest that at the current rate of progress, only minimal success can be achieved. In order to create a sense of urgency throughout the community

relative to the plight of public education for Kansas City students, District leadership called for a radical transformation and right-sizing of the District unlike anything experienced in prior years including the desegregation period. Closing schools in the Kansas City, Missouri School District will not in and of itself improve student achievement. It will, however, allow the District to streamline operations and appropriately allocate its limited resources to fewer buildings. Such closure permits the District to remedy excessive waste, equitably deploy the best of its human capital, expand educational programs and services in fewer schools, and significantly enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

During the Right-Sizing Community Forums, the committee collected feedback from community stakeholders regarding their concerns about the negative effects that under-utilized schools and over extended use of human and financial resources have on a quality school experience for students enrolled in KCMSD. A series of scorecards provided the background information for the first of several key right-sizing initiatives to transform teaching and learning in the Kansas City, Missouri School District. The scorecards provided information in four critical areas---academic performance, building conditions and infrastructure, enrollment and demand for high quality schools and programs, and other special program considerations. This first phase of the right-sizing process used data from the scorecards along with input from a community task force, community forums, and economic indicators to identify those schools which must be closed in order to ensure that resources available to the District are managed effectively to provide the best possible education to students. Following the closure process, the District's leadership team presented a comprehensive plan to deliver the necessary instructional and support systems needed to move KCMSD forward in achieving its mission as a transformational, multi-cultural urban education system to *“produce fully-equipped global citizens through a relevant, dynamic and rigorous curriculum, facilitated by culturally sensitive, highly skilled effective and committed educators that provide a safe, nurturing environment for each student to learn every day in every subject without exception.”*

Needs Assessment for Central High School, East High School, and Northeast High School – Transformation Model

The 2006 Council of Great City Schools *Review of the Instructional Program, Operations and Business Services of the Kansas City, Missouri School District* described a struggling district where students achieved well below their peers statewide. The report also described the district as one where public confidence appeared to be fragile as enrollment numbers steadily declined. As in the past as well as in its current existence, the school district continues to face some serious challenges. The district has not seen improved results in student achievement at the high school level primarily because of the way the various reforms were structured and implemented.

Student performance over the past few years has seen some variable trends in school improvement. For example, the first table below provides graduation rates over the past four years.

Table 1: Graduation Trends for the District

2006-2009 Official Graduation Rates and 2010 Projected* Graduation Rate				
Year	2007	2008	2009	2010*
Total Number of Graduates	1,301	1,290	1,032	861
Cohort Dropouts	418	577	576	813
Graduation Rate (%)	75.7	69.1	64.2	51.4

Although KCMSD is a declining enrollment district, the percentage of student graduating on time is still an area of concern.

Another area that the District has a need to address is student suspensions. Research clearly shows that there is a positive relationship between the days that students are in school and their academic performance. Table 2 below provides a breakdown of the types of suspensions students have received over the last few years. It is encouraging to note that between 2009 and 2010 suspension rates in all three categories have decreased.

Table 2: District Suspensions by Type

Suspension Type	2007	2008	2009	2010
Long Term Suspension	92	48	61	41
Out of School Suspension	2337	1961	1352	1239
In-School Suspension	2344	1370	1022	489

Many of the District’s students, families and community members believe that high schools have some redeeming qualities that engender pride in some accomplishments although students’ academic performance levels in general remain significantly below state and national averages in virtually every category. Achievement gaps between students from low-income families and students from middle-to higher-income families are widening as are the lagging performance levels of students with limited English proficiency and learning disabilities. Achievement gaps between students from low-income families and students from middle-to higher-income families are widening as are the lagging performance levels of students with limited English proficiency and learning disabilities.

Beginning with the 2010-11 school year, students in grades 7-8 will be housed in all high schools. During the 2009-10 student performance reveal dismal levels of student performance in grades 7-8. The disaggregated achievement level reports showed that approximately 39% of all students in grades 7-9 were at a minimum of two years below their grade level in Communication Arts and mathematics. Subgroups are shown below:

Table 3: Percentage of 7-9 Student Performance Below Basic/Basic in Communication Arts and Mathematics

Subgroup	% Below Basic/Basic in Communication Arts	% Below Basic/Basic in Mathematics
Asian	64	62
Black	88	76
Hispanic	68	73
White	71	73
Total in Grade 7	73	70
Total in Grade 8	73	78
Total in Grade 9	71	73

Based upon the state of Missouri Cycle IV Review and being partially accredited, the district was required to develop a turnaround plan where progress would be reported to the Regional School Improvement Team (RSIT) every 90 days. Periodic RSIT reviews reveal that the district is moving in a positive direction towards improved student achievement. The most recent June, 2010 RSIT review documented the possibility of more schools meeting AYP, decreased disciplinary infractions, the adoption of a new reading program for 2010-2011, and the allocation of human and financial resources in ways that are consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the Turn-Around and Transformation Plans. Still, District administration recognizes that more must be done to improve student achievement and that incremental results are not enough. For example, student performance on the ACT and other assessment has shown dismal results.

The chart below provides information on three college level benchmarks that are used at the high school level to determine students' readiness for college entrance. The first table, Table 3, provides information on the three college readiness exams and their equivalent scores. The next two tables show the performance of students in the Kansas City, Missouri School District.

Table 4: College Readiness Benchmarks

College Course or Course Area	Test	EXPLORE Score	PLAN Score	ACT Score
English Composition	English	13	15	18
Social Sciences	Reading	15	17	21
College Algebra	Mathematics	17	19	22
Biology	Science	20	21	24

Table 5: Student Performance on the EXPLORE

School Year	English (%)	Mathematics (%)	Reading (%)	Science (%)
SY 2008	29.0	5.9	15.2	4.3
SY 2009	29.7	10.9	16.4	5.7
SY 2010	29.4	12.1	15.4	4.0

Table 6: PLAN Performance Trends- Percentage of Students Meeting College Readiness Benchmarks

Content Area	District Average	National Average
English	35.7	68.0
Mathematics	9.9	34.0
Reading	20.8	50.0
Science	5.5	22.0

The data presented in the tables above show that student performance in the KCMSD is well below the national average. Student performance on the ACT has remained somewhat stable over the past three years with achievement declining in the areas of English, reading and mathematics and increasing slightly in mathematics. Student performance data look very similar when one compares the percentage of graduates who meet ACT College Readiness Benchmarks. This data are reflected in Table 7 below that compares performance of the District's graduates over a two year period against the national average during those year. In both years, student performance was well below that of the national average.

Table 7: KCMSD Graduates Meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmarks

School Year	English (%)	Mathematics (%)	Reading (%)	Science (%)
District 2008	30.6	6.9	17.1	4.8
National 2008	68.0	43.0	53.0	28.0
District 2009	37.7	13.2	22.0	8.6
National 2009	67.0	42.0	53.0	23.0

The data are very clear: The Kansas City, Missouri School District must act quickly to incorporate programs and strategies to address low student performance. As a means of addressing the low achievement performance of students and the apparent teaching gap among teachers, the District has made a strong commitment to utilize the services of *America's Choice* and *High Schools That Work*. *High Schools That Work*, sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta, Georgia, conducted a needs assessment of the entire instructional program at five District high schools during the month of April, 2010. Teams of external and district level members observed classrooms and conducted interviews with students, teachers, parents, school and district level leadership to ascertain a clear understanding of instructional practices in academic core content and career-technical areas. On June 15, *America's Choice* will begin its work in the District as a means of assisting school leaders and teachers in working to improve student achievement in Communication Arts, mathematics and ACT performance. A major first step of *America's Choice* will be that of conducting an external and thorough needs assessment of the district's status and a comprehensive analysis of student performance data in these areas. This work shall take place the last two weeks of June, 2010. The results will be utilized to guide the professional development of staff in identified schools and to develop a framework to improve teaching and advance measureable student achievement.

2. Provide the following information as it applies to LEA/district-level activities and individual school plans and activities:
 - a. A description of recent school improvement initiatives the LEA/district has implemented in its low-achieving schools and progress of and results from those initiatives
 - i. The school improvement efforts include activities that are required or permissible activities listed in the SIG required interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools
 - ii. There is evidence of LEA/district-level support
 - iii. There is evaluation data available
 - iv. The activities have or have not been successful

Since the beginning of the 2009-10 School Year, the District has embarked on a number of initiatives and activities designed to improve teaching and learning. At the inception of the school year, primarily because of consistently low student performance and increased expectation on the part of school district leadership, building principals were issued accountability letters. These letters provided principals with their respective schools' current student performance data, suspension rates, school climate survey results, attendance, etc. Also included in the letter were clear and concise superintendent's expectations for improvement in all areas. All principals and assistant principals were non-renewed in April 2010 and were required to reapply in they had continued interest in returning to the District as a local school administrator. The superintendent revisited accountability letters during the interview process and principals were provided an opportunity to articulate progress in remedying identified deficiencies. Assistant Principals were provided an opportunity to articulate the value they added to the process.

ALL schools are now required to assemble school based leadership teams and develop school improvement plans in June and submit purchase orders for the expenditure of funds with the completed plan. Plans will be reviewed with the entire faculties during the early return in August for final school wide approval. This new process will protect valuable instructional time, teaching, learning and the implementation of the School Improvement Plan can began on the first day of school. Teaching from "bell to bell" will now be the norm. Anything less shall be unequivocally unacceptable.

Once the entire senior leadership team was put in place, the focus began on the "right sizing" of the district. In order to save the district millions of dollars and to reallocate more funds to fewer schools, the leadership team began the process of closing schools. The plan called for the closing of

26 of the district's 61 schools. Team members collected and analyzed data on all schools so that decisions to close buildings would be based on objective and not subjective criteria. Community Forums were held throughout the district December 10, 12, 14, 15, and 17, 2009. Late winter meetings were also held February 16-19, 2010. The meetings provided district leadership opportunities to hear from various communities to listen to, make, and attempt to understand their concerns and collect and answer any questions community members may have had. The state's Commissioner of Education also visited the district to offer advice on closing schools in the district.

While district leadership was participating in Community Forums on school closings, the members were also working with various constituents on developing the district's Transformation Plan that would be unveiled after the School Board's vote. The purpose of the Transformation Plan would be that of providing a documented account based on best practices on how the "new" district would operate. All areas of the district from early childhood education to financial accountability and legal services would all be included in this document. Members of the senior leadership team presented the plan to the School Board in February. Each leadership team member also has the responsibility of making sure that the items in his/her area are accomplished by the scheduled due date. Anyone who has had the opportunity to visit the superintendent's conference room will see a conference room that has been transformed from a standard conference room to a "war" room that has white boards outlining various tasks that must be accomplished before August 30, 2010, the first day of school for the 2010-11 school year.

Curriculum and Instruction continues to be a major focus for the District. Teachers are currently working to develop local curricular frameworks in the four core content areas (in all grades) that are directly aligned to state, national and international standards. Learning 360, a web-based technology application, will integrate curriculum maps, model lessons, resources, common assessment, individualized learning plans, and a student/parent portal. This eliminates the need for teachers to continue the outdated system of writing lesson plans almost always geared toward whole group instruction that principals never checked and teachers never receive feedback.

In *Child Development 101*, the student teacher is taught that developmental stages are different for each child. Children get their teeth at different times, walk at different times, create a sentence at different times, learn primary colors at different times, and learn the alphabet at different times. The student teachers are taught to understand that children develop at different rates. However, when children get to first grade, the current curriculum dictates that they must learn at the same time, on the same page, on the same day, in the same way, sitting in the same seat, and tested with the same test. Children who do not perform in robotic sameness are considered a failure. Failure of this kind is devastating, as these "failing" students eventually perceive themselves as not capable of functioning within the whole education process (Lee and Budzisz, 2010). This is a process that KCMSD now knows to be wrong for its students. As a result, KCMSD, via a standards based approach, will take children from where they are, with full acceptance of all their differences and realities, forward to their ultimate success, going at their best rate, monitoring this "best rate" to assure that ALL CHILDREN have their fair chance at success.

Most recently, the district began its first of ten days of professional development for principals. The first two and one half days which was held June 5-7 included greetings from board members

regarding the work ahead for the upcoming school year and a movie entitled *The Principals' Story*, a documentary produced by the Wallace Foundation that gave principals an inside view of the working lives of two principals in “turnaround” schools which were similar in both demographics and performance to many of those in the KCMSD. The superintendent then guided a discussion of the movie. The next day included a tour of the district with principals and district level leaders. The purpose of this tour was to give principals an idea of the environments from which students come and to make them more sensitive to the need to consider all factors when educating children as many of them come from poverty-stricken and drug infested environments. Hence, the need is for principals to have a visual understanding of children’s home environments as a means to better serve them. Principals also received an overview of the district’s Transformation plan and were given opportunities to ask questions about areas unclear to them.

Principals, along with a team of teachers and a parent representative from their school, will participate in a three-day workshop that will include an overview of the school improvement planning process as well as the use of school data to guide teaching and student learning June 22-24, 2010. Completing their plans at this time will allow them to plan for the year and submit various requisitions related to their School Improvement Plans in a timelier manner to ensure that all needed instructional items are in the buildings no later than the first week of school. School Improvement Plans will be monitored throughout the school year by a team of district and school level personnel.

Additional professional development for all staff members will be held throughout the summer and the school year. Such scheduled activities include the following:

Professional Development for SY11

- National Institute for School Leadership
- Professional Learning Communities
- Positive Behavior Support
- Using Assessment Data to inform Instruction
- Building Formative Assessments
- Building Essential Unit Maps
- Developing Cross Curricular Units
- E-tools for building capacity and enhancing learning: Learning 360, Observation 360, PD 360, *Successmaker*, Data Dashboard, My Learning Plan, Acuity
- Instructional Best Practice Workshops: DI, Non-Linguistic Representation, Project-based Instruction
- Using America’s Choice Framework to Improve Student Achievement at the Secondary Level
- Mentoring: 1st/2nd year teachers/principals
- Data Informed Leadership
- Inter Rate Reliability: instructional/curriculum audits
- Fidelity of Implementation in Core Content
- Booster Sessions: Core Content

- **SIOP**
- **Book Studies**
- **Speakers Bureau**
- **Fiscal Management/Accountability**
- **Due Process**
- **Building Professional Improvement Plans**
- **Performance Based Assessment**
- **Building Climate/Culture**
- **Pyramid of Interventions**
- **Standards Based Instruction**
- **Creating Mission/Vision**
- **Developing School Improvement Plans**

- b. Plan details that explain how the LEA/district will implement the required and selected permissible activities of the selected intervention (s)
 - i. There is a detailed improvement plan for each school to implement the interventions and improvement activities

District leadership is implementing a new procedure for the development of the School Improvement Plan. The new procedure moves the planning process away from the ineffective method of plan development which normally takes place prior to the opening of school or during the first one or two weeks of the new school year. Plans developed within this timeframe were still being reviewed during the month of September by district administrators and resulted in wasted valuable instructional time. The new procedure now allows principals to work with school-based leadership teams to develop plans during the month of June.

School based budgets must be included in the plan and clearly demonstrate that the budget is directly aligned to goals and objectives outlined in the plan. Purchase orders are required to be submitted with plans so that instructional materials and supplies required by the plan can be in place by the first day of school. Any purchased services may now be pre-arranged and aligned to the professional development scheduled outlined in the plan. Principals and the local school based leadership teams will review the plan with respective school faculties during the first few days of teachers' return to school for consensus. Plan may be modified at this time should there be a need. This new process allows teachers to begin teaching on the first day, and the school to implement the School Improvement Plan on the first day rather than waiting until months later.

Although MAP data is not available to schools until August, Principals and school based leadership teams may utilize Acuity data (tightly aligned to MAP and has proven to be an accurate predictor of student performance outcomes) for preliminary planning purposes. All plans are required to address school improvement activities based upon the significant findings of the needs analysis for each school.

District officials will conduct quarterly "Instructional Audits" with each school's administration and leadership team. The Instructional Audit will include various district level personnel who will focus on the implementation of the School Improvement Plan as well as faculty and staff member's understanding of the plan; district officials will also conduct walk-throughs of randomly selected

classrooms and hold interviews with various school based stakeholders. School and District level administration will conduct classroom visits utilizing an electronic walk-through form (via Ipads) that will provide immediate feed back to teachers, and will report walk-through results to the data ware-house in order to track the effectiveness of teachers' instructional delivery methods. When instructional weaknesses are identified, appropriate professional developed will be assigned, provided and required via the Professional Development 360 Program, also linked to the district's data ware-house system. Prior to implementation, all plans shall be approved by the District's Title I Office to ensure that Tier I, Tier II and other permissible interventions are included in the plan.

- ii. The plan is written in a format consistent with the requirements of Missouri's planning, budget, and reporting system. (See Appendix C for additional information.)
 - iii. The plan is based on improvement activities focused on the significant findings of the needs analysis
 - iv. Procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the strategies
 - v. The plan is based on improvement activities focused on the significant findings of the needs analysis
 - vi. Procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the strategies
 - vii. The plans indicate that the required activities of the selected interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools will be implemented
 - viii. The plans indicate that appropriate permissible activities of the selected interventions will be implemented
- c. How the LEA/district will support the interventions and improvement activities at the central office level
- i. Planned LEA/district-level activities are listed
 - ii. Responsible staff are identified
 - iii. Staff responsibilities and expectations are listed

Please see the attached District Improvement Plan. Under Goals 1 and 2, the District identifies the strategies, interventions, person responsible, dates of implementation, and any action steps necessary to successfully implement the strategies for transformation. Goal 3, all objectives and strategies identify the instructional resources that will be needed to implement the plan. Goal 5, all objectives and strategies, discusses the role District leadership and our partnership with America's Choice will monitor and evaluate the transformation plan.

(2) If the LEA/district is not planning to serve all Tier I schools, please attach a list of the schools you do not plan to serve and explain why you have determined that your LEA/district does not have the capacity to serve those schools.

An LEA/district might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools by documenting efforts such as its unsuccessful attempts to recruit a sufficient number of new principals to implement the turnaround or transformation model; the unavailability of CMOs or EMOs willing to restart schools in the LEA/district; or its intent to serve Tier II schools instead of all its Tier I schools. An LEA/district may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools based on its intent to serve Tier III schools.

Kansas City, Missouri School District is committed to serving all Tier I and Tier II schools through closure and transformation models.

(3) For each of the topics listed below, describe what actions the LEA/district will take to:

1. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements for each Tier I and/or Tier II school the LEA/district commits to serve;
 - a. There is a detailed LEA/district-level plan to implement the intervention(s) including:
 - i. Responsible staff members for each strategy
 - ii. Timelines for each strategy and action step
 - iii. Funding identified for each strategy
 - iv. Implementation progress measures for each strategy
 - v. LEA/district oversight and support

Please see the attached District Improvement Plans. Under Goals 1 and 2, the District identifies the strategies, interventions, person responsible, dates of implementation, and any action steps necessary to successfully implement the strategies for transformation. Goal 3, all objectives and strategies identify the instructional resources that will be needed to implement the plan. Goal 4 identifies the objectives, strategies, funding sources, person responsible, and dates of implementation for community and parent involvement. For all of the objectives in Goal 5, the District leadership will work in concert with staff from *America's Choice* to help monitor and evaluate the implementation of the *America's Choice* initiative.

2. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - a. LEA/district application process for external providers
 - i. Request for proposals
 - ii. Memorandum of understanding
 - iii. Provider contract
 - iv. Evaluation procedures

2 a i. and 2 a ii.

The Board document preparation is, for the most part, a 3-4 week process, we are attaching a document that indicates board approval of for the preliminary work of *America's Choice* to begin.

2 a iii.

The contract included in this application includes the Scope of Work for the district partnership, for five secondary schools, delivered by *America's Choice* to be funded under this grant. The contract includes professional development and technical assistance/coaching services to be delivered to the district and the targeted schools, the commitments that the district and schools make, and the materials that are required to successfully implement the program.

PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

DISTRICT PARTNERSHIP

District Leadership (*District & Building Plans, Goal 2; Objective 1, Strategy 1*)

The superintendent and cabinet will participate in a half-day workshop focusing on implementation of the *Rigor & Readiness* initiative, based upon the District Profile. During the year, the superintendent and cabinet will be involved in a seminar series of four sessions that will focus on key topics related to the initiative, including defining rigor, making tiered interventions work, and using student results on the ACT assessment system and other student assessment data to guide instructional decision-making.

The Superintendent and cabinet will also participate in a seminar series of three sessions that will focus on key topics related to the initiative, including implementing tiered intervention, using student results on the ACT assessments to guide instructional decision-making, and managing change. The Superintendent and a cabinet member will join a network meeting of Rigor & Readiness districts to share progress, problem solve and focus on key leadership issues during the school year.

The *America's Choice* Project Manager, who appoints Cluster Leaders, who will collaborate with appropriate district staff in delivering appropriate services, based on assessed needs. The District will be sent a set of materials, which includes one copy of training and curriculum materials used in the program. The shipment will coincide with implementation expectations for that year.

America's Choice will also assign An Executive Coach to the district. This individual will meet regularly with the superintendent and cabinet members to monitor progress and problem solve any issues that arise.

Leadership Academy and Networks (*District & Building Plans, Goals 2, Objective 1, Strategy 2*)

Principals and members of the school leadership team will attend a leadership academy designed to orient them to the *Rigor & Readiness* initiative, including the College and Career Readiness Framework. A follow-up two-day session will be held mid-year. They will also attend a series of eight networks that will focus on implementation issues, problem solving and key leadership content, including:

Defining Rigor: How to judge whether a course is rigorous

Tiered Intervention: How to assess students and place appropriately to get them on the path to College and Career Readiness

Assessment Systems: How to use ACT assessments to guide student placement and instruction

Psycho-Social Supports: How to build student engagement, motivation and self-regulation

Scheduling: How to build Master schedules that respond to student needs, support team building and teacher planning, and implementation of interventions and advisory systems

Team Building (*District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1*)

A two-day team building workshop will be held for ninth grade teams that will focus on meeting protocols, use of assessment data and information to guide students on pathways to college and career readiness, and on advisory systems. The District will also make preparations to hire two (2) additional teachers at each site to assist with the implementation of the initiatives as well as two (2) additional coaches for literacy and mathematics.

ON-GRADE PROGRAM (*District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1*)

Strengthening On-Grade Instruction in Academic Reading and Writing (grades 7 and 8)

Literacy coach (or department chairperson) and two teachers from each middle school will attend a five-day professional development designed to strengthen the academic reading and writing skills of their students. The literacy training will prepare participants to immerse students into close reading and analyzing examples of a genre and then researching, organizing, drafting their own versions of the genre. Teachers will also be introduced to Genre Studies. The training will focus on organizing patterns such as chronology, general/specific, comparison, and cause and effect in the texts that students read and the texts that they write. Focused attention will be given to academic vocabulary and sophisticated syntax to elevate students' written language.

Teaching for Conceptual Understanding in Math Classrooms (grades 7 and 8)

(*District & Building Plans, Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1*)

Math coach (or department chairperson), one seventh and one eighth-grade teacher will participate in a five-day training focused on teaching for conceptual understanding in mathematics. The focus will be on teaching critical concepts that prepare students for success in higher mathematics, using the adopted materials. It will also include implementation of mathematics workshop structures to promote differentiated instruction. Teachers will analyze their curriculum against ACT benchmarks to prepare students for success in *America's Choice On Grade Level* courses and to bring increased rigor.

Implementation of *America's Choice On Grade Level* Curriculum Framework in English 9, Biology and Algebra 1

(*District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2*)

In the first year of the program, teachers of ninth-grade core courses in English, biology and Algebra 1 will participate in five -days of professional development and training focused on bringing increased rigor to their courses. *America's Choice On Grade Level* sets clear expectations for the rigor required to meet the demands of college and career readiness. Participating teachers will review *America's Choice On Grade Level* objectives, syllabi, formative assessments and end-of-course examinations and assess their own courses. They will utilize a toolbox of strategies that focuses on Depth of Knowledge in their courses. Students enrolled in these courses will take the *America's Choice On Grade Level* and Missouri end-of-course examinations. Additional *America's Choice On Grade Level* courses are added each year.

TIER TWO (District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4)

Tiered Academic Intervention in Literacy

(District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 2, Strategy 3)

The literacy coach (or department chairperson) and teachers who will deliver the program will participate in an orientation to the *America's Choice* Literacy Navigator program, a Tier 2 intervention. The orientation will focus on screening students for gaps in their ability to comprehend informational text. The session will focus on using data to place students in a short-term intervention that will strengthen their performance in higher-level content courses and effective program implementation.

Tiered Academic Intervention in Mathematics

(District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 2, Strategy 3)

The math coach (or department chairperson) and teachers who will deliver the program will participate in an orientation to the *America's Choice* Mathematics Navigator program, a Tier 2 intervention, that will focus on screening students for gaps and misconceptions in their mathematics knowledge. The session will focus on using data to place students in a short-term intervention that will strengthen their performance in higher-level mathematics and effective program implementation.

TIER THREE (ACCELERATION)

Acceleration Courses in Literacy (District & Building Plans, Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 5)

Teachers who will deliver the *America's Choice Ramp-Up to Middle Grades Literacy* course, a Tier 3 intervention, will attend eight days of professional development. This double-period replacement course is designed for students who are two to four years behind in reading that will prepare them for success in on-grade courses. Teachers who will deliver the *Ramp-Up to Advanced Literacy* course will also attend eight days of professional development. This double-period course for ninth-grade students who are two to four years behind replaces the English 9 course. Students, however, receive credit for English 9, as well as an elective credit in reading.

Acceleration Courses in Mathematics (District & Building Plans, Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 4)

Teachers who will deliver the *America's Choice Ramp-Up to Pre-Algebra* course, a Tier 3 intervention, will attend eight days of professional development. This is a replacement course for students who are two to four years behind in mathematics that will prepare them for success in algebra. This course is designed for sixth or seventh graders. Teachers who will deliver *Ramp-Up to Algebra* to eighth and ninth graders who are two to four years behind will also attend eight days of professional development, as well. This course prepares students for success in Algebra 1.

Training for Coaches (District & Building Plans, Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3)

The Coaching Institute is designed to improve the skills of school-based coaches who will support successful implementation of the Rigor & Readiness initiative. Coaches will also attend the Literacy and Math Institutes, depending on their content expertise.

Diagnostic Student Assessment Data and End-of-Course Exams

(District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 1, Strategy 6)

Each school will administer the appropriate ACT assessments to students at grades 7-8-9, depending on their grade-level configurations. These assessments for Year One are:

- 7th, 8th & 9th grades: Student Readiness Inventory
- 7th, 8th & 9th grades: EXPLORE®
- Missouri End-of-Course Exams for students enrolled in English 9 and Algebra 1

In addition, schools will collect diagnostic information to guide the placement of students in interventions, using available formative assessments. Results from these assessments will be used to plan for appropriate interventions to move students along the college and career readiness pathways. Also, the data will serve as a base line for evaluating student progress over time.

On-Site Technical Assistance (District & Building Plans, Goals 3, Objective 1, Strategies 1-6)

The district will hire a Project Manager who will assign a Cluster Leader who will manage the delivery of services to the school. Each targeted secondary school will receive forty-five days of intensive on-site technical assistance and coaching over the course of the school year. This level of support reflects the need to have technical assistance and coaching for teachers at both the middle school level and high school level at the targeted schools.

School or District Commitments for Year One:

Successful implementation of the Rigor & Readiness Initiative requires that participating schools and the school district agree to the following:

1. Ensure participation by school and district staff involved in the program, including attendance at meetings, networks, and other related events.
2. Provide, at no charge to *America's Choice*, meeting facilities for all on-site or local networks, meetings, and professional development training workshops and institutes.

3. Fully implement the mathematics components of the initiative:

- **For implementation of *America's Choice On Grade Level Algebra 1***
 - Acquire and administer end-of-course examinations to students enrolled in *America's Choice On Grade Level Algebra 1*.
 - Administer formative assessments to students enrolled in *America's Choice On Grade Level Algebra 1*.
- **For implementation of Mathematics Navigator:**
 - Schedule time for students to participate in the intervention during school and/or after school hours.
 - Acquire the student materials needed to support implementation of the Mathematics Navigator program.
 - Administer the Mathematics Navigator screener to determine which students should be involved in the intervention.
 - Administer the pre- and post-tests to students for each module completed.
 - Collect data on student performance.
- **For the implementation of *Ramp-Up Math* courses:**
 - Schedule Ramp-Up classrooms as a double period course (90 minute block) with the same teacher who is being trained in the Ramp-Up course.
 - Acquire student materials needed to support implementation of *Ramp-Up to Algebra* or *Ramp-Up to Pre-Algebra* courses.
 - Administer the pre- and post-tests provided in the Ramp-Up materials to students in the Ramp-Up classrooms.
 - Administer the four assessments provided in the Ramp-Up materials that measure student progress over the course of the year.
 - Collect data on student performance.

4. Fully implement the literacy components of the initiative:

- **For implementation of *America's Choice On Grade Level English 9*.**
 - Acquire and administer end-of-course examinations to students enrolled in *America's Choice On Grade Level English 9*.
 - Administer formative assessments to students enrolled in *America's Choice On Grade Level English 9*.
- **For implementation of Academic Reading and Writing middle school program:**
 - Acquire student and teacher support materials for Genre Studies.
- **For implementation of Literacy Navigator:**
 - Schedule time for students to participate in the intervention during school and/or after school hours.
 - Acquire the student materials needed to support implementation of the Literacy Navigator program.
 - Administer the pre- and post-tests to students for each module completed.
 - Collect data on student performance.
- **For implementation of the *Ramp-Up Literacy* courses:**
 - Schedule Ramp-Up classrooms as a double period course (90 minute block) with the same teacher who is being trained in the Ramp-Up course.

- Acquire the student materials needed to support implementation of the Ramp-Up to Middle Grades Literacy or Ramp-Up to Advanced Literacy courses.
 - Administer the QRI three times per year.
 - Administer the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test as a pre- and post-test (published by Riverside Publishing and available through America's Choice).
 - Administer, over the course of the year, all Ramp-Up Literacy end-of-unit assessments (3 units) in Reading Comprehension, Vocabulary, Fluency and Writing (blackline masters provided by ACI).
 - Collect data on student performance.
- 5. Acquire and administer EXPLORE to seventh, eighth and ninth-grade students in Year One and the Student Readiness Inventory for sixth, seventh and eighth-grade students.

2 a iv. (*District & Building Plans, Goals 2, Objective 1, Strategy 4*)

Twice during the year, *America's Choice* Project Manager and Cluster Leaders will conduct a formal Quality Review of the school's progress toward implementation of the strategies and programs included in the design using a Diagnostic and Assessment Tool. The Diagnostic and Assessment Tool lists the implementation expectations for the year and provides a rating scale ranging from "not in place" to "fully implemented." The tool is used to rate the progress of the school in implementing key milestones contained in the Implementation Rubric.

Generally, the Quality Reviews are completed midyear and at the end of the year. As part of the protocol for the review, the Project Manager, Cluster Leaders, and the school Leadership Team complete a focus walk of the school to review evidence of implementation. Where there is little or no progress in any areas, the Project Manager and Cluster Leader work with the Leadership Team to create an action plan to address those areas. The results of the Quality Review are shared with the school and with the district. The school Leadership Team continues to work with the Cluster Leader to assess evidence of meeting the expectations for implementation, discuss strengths and weaknesses, troubleshoot, and plan ahead. In this manner, quality control is assured, along with targeted support.

(*District & Building Plans, Goals 2, Objective 1, Strategy 5*)

In the first year, the focus is on implementation—getting the school administrators and teachers committed to changing practice--and data collection for evaluation purposes. At the secondary level, information is gathered from ACT's Student Readiness Inventory, and data is collected from administration of EXPLORE at the 7th, 8th and 9th grades. In addition, there is data from the Navigator pre and post tests and from the Ramp-Up courses in literacy and mathematics for students who have serious deficits in reading and math, as well as attendance data. The school Leadership Team is charged with collecting this data, analyzing it and using it to make resource allocation decisions and to guide instructional targets. Using the Planning for Results system that America's Choice has developed, Leadership Teams learn to use data, construct data walls, and monitor and evaluate progress.

At the end of the year, *America's Choice* and ACT prepare a report that addresses student achievement and changes in practice from prior years. This progress report includes the results of

all of the student assessments and inventories during the year, as well as the assessment of implementation by the teachers and administrators in the school. Because there is a high correlation between positive growth and the fidelity of implementation, it is important to analyze both the student assessment results and what the school has done to change practice and focus on teaching and learning.

- b. SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers
 - i. Guidance on related laws and regulations has been provided
 - ii. If applicable, the SEA has cooperated in the planning for the selection process

SEA provided a workshop in Jefferson City on April 27, 2010 to introduce and provide guidance on related laws and regulations. The SEA has contacted the *America's Choice* representative for KCMSD to invite them to webinars and workshops pertaining to the grant application and regulations.

- 3. Align other resources with the interventions;
 - a. The LEA/district has listed other resources that will support the interventions
 - i. Local, State and other Federal funding sources
 - ii. Higher Education partnerships
 - iii. Other educational resources
 - iv. Other community resources
 - v. The resources are selected to align with the findings of the needs analysis

Within the District Improvement Plan, Goal 1 – Objective 3 refers to working with higher education and other educational resources.

The district will also utilize other educational resources. One of the district's schools, Central High School (*Goal 2, Objective 1, Strategy 6*), will become professional development schools through an eight million dollar grant from UMKC. This partnership between the district and the university will allow student teachers from UMKC to be placed in these schools. In doing so, students from UMKC will gain a competitive advantage over their peers by working in urban schools and learning how to apply best practices in working with students; the district would also benefit from the partnership because of the potential to recruit these students into the teaching pool once they graduate. The district will also engage in partnerships with Penn Valley and Northwest Missouri State University to provide dual enrollment and early college experiences for high school students. These institutions are also committed to provide additional college readiness activities to the district's high school students.

If the social, emotional and mental needs of students are not met, there is a strong likelihood that their academic achievement could suffer. With this premise in mind, the Office of Student Support and Community Service sponsored a breakfast in May, 2010 to gain the support of community agencies to work with the district to provide wraparound services to the district's students. The central theme of this meeting was that of linking services from various agencies to assist the district in addressing the needs to students that often go lacking but could also impede student learning. Approximately 85 community agencies completed *Commitment Cards* that demonstrated their interest in working with the district to provide various means of support to students and families. The overall idea is to provide a one-stop shop to address needs that students may have. This partnership will be strengthened during the 2010-11 school year.

3 a. i

Please see attached District and School Improvement Plans for documentation of use of other Federal funding sources. These plans were completed June 24, 2010 through a three-day workshop with leadership teams.

4. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively:
- a. LEA/district policies and practices that have been or will be modified
 - b. Projected impact of those changes

Bangser (2008) noted that if today’s graduates are to be well-equipped with workplace demands that place great emphasis on literacy, mathematics, science, technology and effective communication, we must change the way we work with students in our secondary schools. Ensuring that KCMSD graduates finish high school with the necessary skills needed to be successful in college or their chosen career is a major focus of the Transformation Plan. The KCMSD secondary schools will be transformed to prepare graduates to become fierce competitors on the economic world stage.

Our high schools will be restructured to include two divisions: A lower division for grades 7-9 and an upper division to focus on grades 10-12. More specifically, grades 7-9 will ensure

- a focus on high school readiness will ensure that all students are provided with the necessary skills to be successful in all classes;**
- an introduction to world languages will help students understand the importance of learning an additional language to be successful;**
- Algebra 1 for all eighth graders has been recognized as the gateway course that often determines student success in high school; and**
- the *Certificate of Mastery* (Coddling, 1999) will include multiple assessments designed to prepare students for upper division coursework.**

The Upper Division that includes grades 10-12 will have

- a focus on college and career readiness includes coursework that addresses both college and career areas;**
- career focused themes at each secondary school allows students to “specialize” in various areas that can lead to certification and/or dual enrollment;**
- Dual/Early college opportunities closely aligned to standards –based instruction that allows students to be concurrently enrolled in high school and college level courses; and**
- a Senior Capstone Project will be required of all seniors that will demonstrate mastery of a particular topic guided by a mentor and research conducted by the student.**

These areas address the use of consistent use of data to inform school leaders and teachers of the progress students are making in their classes. Indicators include assessments that are not limited to the following:

- Emphasis on “On track on time to graduate within four years;”
- End of Course Exams;
- Challenging coursework;
- America’s Choice *Rigor and Readiness*;
- SREB’s *High Schools That Work*;
- Increased credits for graduation; and
- Improved graduation rates for all students.

The District will use the following assessments more strategically to prepare students for success in learning to deep levels of understanding and to assist students and their parents in planning for appropriate transition into college and/or careers:

- EXPLORE - beginning at the seventh grade
- PLAN/PSAT - including all tenth grade students
- ACT/SAT - assessing high school juniors and seniors

To raise the level of expectations for students at the secondary school level, various support systems will be in place to address the diverse needs of students. Pending Board approval, beginning with the Class of 2014, the minimum graduation requirements will include four years or its equivalent in mathematics, science, English and social studies. Students will also be required to complete either an academic or a career concentration accomplished through the accumulation of electives credit.

(District & Building Plans, Goals 1, Objective 3, All Strategies) Research addresses the importance of schools/districts having systems in place that focus on the “whole child.” Our secondary schools will include the following programs and services:

- Single gender classes for grades 7-8 in core subject areas;
- Early college/dual enrollment allows students to take college level courses early or be enrolled in other courses concurrently;
- Advisor-advisee-allows teachers to work with small groups of students in grade level-specific curriculum that addresses students’ personal, social and emotional needs;
- Extra-/Co-Curricular activities-will include various sports as well as course and student-interest clubs and organizations designed to support the classroom;
- Career development and Individual Graduation Plans begins with the eighth grade and prepares students and their parents in mapping out a program for study up to post graduation;
- On- line learning/Credit Recovery-will serve the needs of students who may be out of school for a certain time for various reasons or those students who may need additional support in classes where they have lost credit;
- Distance Learning- will allow our students to take courses with their peers in other schools

within the United States and throughout the world; and

- **Alternative Education will be structured to serve students who may need a different type of environment in which to learn.**

All policies mentioned above are noted within the District and Building Improvement Plans that are attached.

5. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
 - a. Thorough explanation of how the reforms will be sustained
 - i. LEA/district support
 - ii. Community Support
 - iii. SEA Support

A critical goal of the partnership between the school district and *America's Choice* and *ACT* is to build the capacity of the district to sustain the initiative and reforms that have taken place. The partnership addresses this goal in several ways: (a) through the seminars and coaching provided directly to the superintendent and cabinet members, (b) through the development of both district-level and school-based coaches, and (c) through the leadership component of the program.

District Partnership. It is expected that the superintendent and cabinet members will participate in a series of seminars, network meetings and progress meetings each year. The purpose of the seminars is to make certain that (1) the research behind the practices that are being implemented in the schools is understood, (2) the college and career readiness system that is built in the district has coherence and is fully aligned, and (3) through progress monitoring, the superintendent and cabinet gain a deeper understanding of the power of student data in driving decision making about resource allocation.

Coaching. Research tell us (Joyce, Bruce and Showers, *Student Achievement through Staff Development*, 2nd edition, ASCD, 1995) that the transfer of professional development to practice is 80% effective when coaches support teachers in their schools. Without coaching, that transference is only 10% likely to happen. Each of the targeted schools will have school-based coaches who will participate in a series of Coaching Institutes that focus on three strands of instruction coaching: (1) skills (interpersonal), (2) process (needs analysis, planning and evaluation), and (3) organizational culture (professional learning communities). Coaches also attend the leadership and content-area institutes that *America's Choice* and *ACT* deliver. They are build their capacity to support this work because they know it deeply. They will be able to help the district sustain these reforms over the years.

Leadership Institutes. The leadership component of this program strengthens principals and assistant principals in the key areas of instructional leadership, supervisions, systematic monitoring of data, strategic thing and planning, coaching and team leadership, and managing change. The approach includes strengthening instructional leadership by developing effective distributed leadership among the members of the leadership team, creating a standards-based school culture, and aligning supervision with implementation expectations. It also includes supporting the principal's utilization of management systems that closely monitor student progress towards

meeting standards, the effective alignment of academic intervention services with students' needs, and the development of organizational structures to support the school's primary focus on student achievement. Research is clear that second only to the quality of teachers in improving student performance is effective school leadership. To sustain the use of effective, student-focused practices in classrooms, principals must be prepared to recognize good teaching and to establish the conditions in the school that support quality teaching.

Preparing students to succeed is a community responsibility.

The KCMSD through its community developed strategic plan will establish partnerships with parents, business, civic, community partners, and various broad-based social service agencies. The greater Kansas City area has immense philanthropic capacity and resources to close the gap between needs and solutions for children and families. Mobilizing and leveraging these resources in an effective manner becomes critical to student academic achievement and community challenges. By building a partnership infrastructure that is responsive to school and community needs, the KCMSD can effectively address student needs, engage the public in "public education" endeavors and once and for all build a seamless partnership with the community. Most recently, the newly formed Office of Student Support and Community Service held a breakfast meeting where the District solicited and received various commitments of support from well over 85 agencies throughout the city. The OSSCS will work with these agencies to provide ongoing assistance to parents and students that ultimately address student achievement.

- b. Long range plans are in place for sustainable processes and procedures that are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts

The District firmly believes that with the results achieved through the —right sizing of the district|| along with the consolidated efforts of the Transformation Plan and the Strategic Plan will reap many benefits for students in the very near future. Both having the main focus of increasing student achievement at all levels, these two documents are virtually synonymous and will serve to guide all aspects of the district in the future. Perhaps one of the most important areas of these documents focuses on professional development. Adopting the —grow or go|| mentality, KCMSD leaders believe that the only way the district can continue to impact sustained and improved student achievement is through the professional development of all staff members from custodians to central level administrators. As the District moves forward in its efforts to keep up with latest research-driven initiatives that are designed to positively impact student achievement, professional development of all educators will play a major role in sustaining the efforts of such initiatives.

As highlighted as a strategy in the Strategic Plan, the district will also seek community and other partnerships that can provide resources to _advance the success of each student.|| Another area that the district will continue to utilize is that of seeking and writing grants that will supplement the various programs and initiatives already in place to strengthen student achievement. From a financial perspective, the district has already changed the way it funds schools and has moved from an system of equality to one of equity that allows schools that have demonstrated, based on various measures of data, the greatest needs of students. With this system of school funding in place, stakeholders can be assured that efforts to assist those schools will be addressed while a continued focus on accountability for measureable student improvement remains at the forefront.

(4) What is the timeline for implementing the planned activities for the selected interventions in each Tier I and Tier II School the LEA/district commits to serve?

- a. The LEA/district timeline includes specific dates for implementation of all components of the selected intervention.
- b. The timeline is reasonable, achievable, and reflects urgency.
- c. Implementation and evaluation dates are included in the school improvement plans or attached documents

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT			
<i>Getting Started Checklist</i>			
Task	Responsible	Due Date	Comments
Organize visitation team	DMc	5-7-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact team* [Email send 5-7-10] • Contract calls for 3 veteran educators (six were recommended) <p style="text-align: center;">COMPLETE</p>
Schedule visit (2 days): confirm dates with KCMUSD	DMc	5-12-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract currently in their legal department – handed me a copy on site; emailed to Jason Dougal – he will try to have it back to us by Friday, May 21, 2010; Dr. Prince wants this to go to the board May 26 • June 14-15 <p style="text-align: center;">COMPLETE</p>
Visit to KCMUSD; meet with Dr. Prince	DMc	5-18-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule students for RU and Navigator – wait until further notice from Scholastic • Confirm dates for team visit • Meet superintendent; brief on district and expectations from AC • Are they using a transformation model? Yes; on Department of Education on grant • More information they can give us the better • District directory; contact information for assessment director, Title I director, C&I, supervisors (assistant superintendents) for principals, teachers union, PTA (School Advisory Committee- SAC) representative, principals • School calendar (when does school start) - OK • District Assessment Calendar (Dr. Esselman) • District Interventions (check with Dr. Esselman) • District Reading and Math Curriculum (Dr. Esselman) • Demographics for each school (Dr. Prince will get this information for me) • Ensure counselors and others on a need to know are in the loop • What are other district initiatives? • Schedule students <p style="text-align: center;">COMPLETE</p>

Hotel and Team Meeting Accommodations	Suzie Sullivan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send Suzie an Email; prefer Embassy Suites; accommodations close to district office; Dr. Esselman will check on hotels in downtown area COMPLETE
Prepare preliminary report on district for the team	DMc	5-26-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact Larry Molinaro re: report for OK Getting Started (Email sent 5-18-10) Review District strategic plan IN PROGRESS
Assessment Profile	DMc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact Betsy and Claire regarding putting together an assessment profile that has a three year trend for district and each school; include state and other standardized assessments IN PROGRESS
Orientation for Team	DMc	6-1-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone Conference/Webinar Send copies of SoW Prepare a timeline and schedule for team Send College Readiness Framework and other R&R Materials Get CMAC interview protocols
Getting Started Team Visit to KCMUSD	DMc	6-14-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood Tour – Dr. Prince will pull four high school counselors to serve as tour guides Key community contacts (Call Denise Gilmore); DMc to get information
Preparation of Report	SK		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two days for preparation Target June 23 for review of report
Review Report with team	DMc	6-23-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone Conference
Review Report with Superintendent and his Leadership Team	DMc	6-24-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DMc and selected persons come to KC
Secondary Network (3 days)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Leadership Team – July 7: Walt, Bob P., DMc Literacy Team – July 6 Math Team July 7
Projected timeline for contract for Year One	DMc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact Jason Dougal; what work can we do without signed contract?
AC Staffing	DMc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the staffing needs? Develop a plan; work with Marietta

Please see the attached District and Building plans. These plans indicate objectives, strategies, and action steps for the strategies to be put into place at each of the high schools identified for the grant under goals 1 and 2. All objectives and strategies under each goal are reflective of the interventions identified within the grant.

(5) What are the annual goals for student achievement in communication arts, mathematics, and, if applicable, graduation rate the LEA/district has established for each Tier I and Tier II school receiving School Improvement Grant funds?

- a. The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.
- b. Accurate and meaningful baseline data are provided
- c. Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time
- d. Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

Please see the attached District and School Improvement Plan templates. Based on the five goals in the School Improvement Plan template which is aligned to the Missouri Department of Secondary Education school planning process and the needs assessment, the following targets have been set for the 2010-11 school year:

- **All students will show in grades 7-12 will show a 20% increase annually in Communication Arts as measured by district and state assessments;**
- **All students in grades 7-12 will show a 20% increase annually in Mathematics as measured by district and state assessments;**
- **One hundred (100) percent of the high schools within the KCMSD will undergo transformation changes in organization and structure that support effective teaching and learning to levels of deep understanding while raising the graduation rate;**
- **District leadership will support all school level leadership teams in the purchasing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of America's Choice effectiveness in all high schools;**
- **KCMSD will promote and support high quality instructional and organizational leadership at the district and building levels.**

(6) What services and activities will be implemented in the Tier III schools receiving School Improvement Grant funds?

- a. The LEA/district has specific strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:
 - i. Responsible staff members for each strategy
 - ii. Timelines for each strategy and action step
 - iii. Funding identified for each strategy
 - iv. Implementation progress measures for each strategy
 - v. Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step
 - vi. LEA/district oversight and support

The District will hold these schools to the same level of expectations that it will for those schools that are in Tier II. Please see attached District Improvement Plans and School Improvement Plans for Paseo Academy and Southwest High School. Please see attached copies of the SIP plans provided for each of the Tier 3 Schools. Each addresses the needs assessment as well as the individual cultural needs of each building.

(7) What are the annual goals for student achievement in communication arts, mathematics, and, if applicable, graduation rate the LEA/district has established for each Tier III school receiving School Improvement Grant funds?

- a. The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.
- b. Accurate baseline data is provided
- c. Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time
- d. The LEA/district has collaborated with the SEA while setting the annual targets for student achievement

Please see the attached District and School Improvement Plan templates. This data has been configured within our needs assessment, including base line data covering 3-5 years. The targets have been set as:

- **All students in grades 7-12 will show a 20% increase annually in Communication Arts as measured by district and state assessments;**
- **All students in grades 7-12 will show a 20% increase annually in Mathematics as measured by district and state assessments;**
- **The graduation rate for each high school will show a 20% increase annually each year as measured by district and state assessments.**

(8) Provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools. The stakeholder group represents:

- a. Students
- b. Staff
 - i. School Building
 - ii. LEA/district
- c. Parents
- d. Teacher organizations and/or unions
- e. Colleges and universities
- f. Community representatives
 - i. Local government and other public sector representatives
 - ii. Business community
 - iii. Other organizations

g. Other relevant stakeholders

Meeting with Stakeholders regarding school closings occurred during community forums held throughout the district in December 10, 12, 14, 15, and 17, 2009. Late winter meetings were also held February 16-19, 2010. Each member of Senior Cabinet presented his/her area of expertise in regards to the transformation plan. During the School Improvement Planning workshop, stakeholders such as parents will be invited to review and discuss plans with school leadership teams. The dates for this workshop are June 22-24, 2010. Sign in sheets were collected each day to show each school building had a community member, parent, and/or student in attendance during the workshop.

C. BUDGET: An LEA/district must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA/district will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA/district must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA/district will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA/district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's/district's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA/district level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's/district's application.

Note: An LEA's/district's budget must cover the period of availability, including any

	<p>extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA/district commits to serve.</p> <p>An LEA's/district's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.</p>	
--	---	--

C. BUDGET: LEA/District Response

Use the LEA/District Budget Templates found in Appendix D to provide budgets that indicate the amount of school improvement funds and other resources the LEA/district will use each year that funding is available to—

1. Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
 - a. Current year's school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds)
 - b. Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability
2. Conduct LEA/district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's/district's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
3. Support school improvement activities, at the school and/or LEA/district level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's/district's application.

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA/district must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Check the boxes in this table to include the assurances in this application.

The LEA/district must assure that it will—

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA/district commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish

goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;

If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and

Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: Missouri has requested waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's/district's School Improvement Grant, an LEA/district must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA/district must check each waiver that the LEA/district will implement. If the LEA/district does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, in an attached document, the LEA/district must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: Missouri has requested a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs/districts in the State.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

LEA/district approval for The Department to provide direct services:

- The LEA/district approves The Department’s use of grant funds to provide improvement services directly to the LEAs/districts and schools.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SCANNED FORM FOR SIGNATURES

[p.37 Signature Page.pdf](#)

SIGNATURE OF BOARD-AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	DATE
SIGNATURE OF SUPERINTENDENT (If other than Authorized Representative)	DATE

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, or age in its programs and activities. Inquiries related to Department programs and to the location of services, activities, and facilities that are accessible by persons with disabilities may be directed to the Jefferson State Office Building, Civil Rights Compliance (Title VI/Title IX/504/ADA/Age Act), 5th Floor, 205 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480; telephone number 573-526-4757 or Relay Missouri 800-735-2966.

Appendix A

LEA/District Application Scoring Guide Outline

LEA/District Application Scoring Guide Outline

The application evaluation team and the Department will use this scoring guide to determine the merits of the LEA/district application. The applications will be evaluated based on the elements listed in the bordered tables in this document. A Scoring Form is also found in this document. The evaluation of the applications, “greatest need” calculations, and the availability of funds will all help determine the final allocations to LEAs/districts. LEAs/districts should use this document to inform the planning for and development of the LEA/District Application.

A. List of Schools to be Served: (The Department will create a list of schools eligible and the LEA/district will mark the schools to be served and the selected interventions.)

B. Descriptive Information

(1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA/district commits to serve, the LEA/district must demonstrate that—

1. The LEA/district has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school.

The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of:

- Student Performance
- Curriculum Development and Learning Management
- Professional Development
- Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Information Technology and Data Management
- Human Resources
- Leadership and Governance
- Fiscal and Budget

The LEA/district has identified the most significant results of the needs analysis and the data submitted supports those decisions.

The LEA/district used appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.

The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis

2. The LEA/district has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s/district’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected and improvement activities in each Tier III school identified.

The LEA’s/district has provided the following information:

- A description of recent school improvement initiatives the LEA’s/district has implemented in its low-achieving schools and progress of and results from those initiatives
 - The school improvement efforts include activities that are required or permissible activities listed in the SIG required interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools

- There is evidence of LEA/district-level support
- There is evaluation data available
- The activities have or have not been successful
- Plan details that explain how the LEA/district will implement the required and permissible activities of the selected intervention(s)
 - There is a detailed improvement plan for each school to implement the interventions and improvement activities
 - The plan is written in a format consistent with the requirements of Missouri’s planning, budget, and reporting system. (See Appendix C for additional information.)
 - The Department’s identified planning goals and, if applicable, LEA/district defined goal(s)
 - **Goal 1—Student Performance:** Develop and enhance quality educational/instructional programs to improve student performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic, and career goals.
 - **Goal 2—Highly Qualified Staff:** Recruit, attract, develop, and retain highly effective staff to carry out the LEA (local educational agency)/District mission, goals, and objectives.
 - **Goal 3—Facilities, Support, and Instructional Resources:** Provide and maintain appropriate instructional resources, support services, and functional and safe facilities.
 - **Goal 4—Parent and Community Involvement:** Promote, facilitate, and enhance parent, student, and community involvement in LEA/District educational programs.
 - **Goal 5—Governance and Leadership:** Govern the LEA/District in an efficient and effective manner providing leadership and representation to benefit the students, staff, and patrons of the district.
 - Measurable Objectives
 - Progress measures identified each year for the next three-five years
 - Measures used to evaluate annual progress
 - Strategies
 - Responsible staff
 - Implementation timeline
 - Funding sources
 - Related plans and resources
 - Action steps
 - Responsible staff
 - Implementation timeline
 - The plan is based on improvement activities focused on the significant findings of the needs analysis
 - Procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the strategies
 - The plans indicate that the required activities of the selected interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools will be implemented
 - The plans indicate that appropriate permissible activities of the selected interventions will be implemented
- How the LEA/district will support the interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level
 - Responsible staff are identified
 - Staff responsibilities and expectations are listed
 - Planned LEA/district-level activities are listed

--

- (2) If the LEA/district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA/district must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

The LEA/district has listed each Tier I school that it **will not** serve and has explained why it lacks the capacity to serve the school (s):

(This section will be completed and evaluated in collaboration with the Department. The Department will evaluate the LEA's/district's lack of capacity based on documentation and consultation with the LEA/district. The guidance below will be used to determine if the LEA's/district's claim is valid.

During the application process, these LEAs/districts will declare their commitment to serve schools and submit a projected list of schools it may commit to serve, and the intervention model or improvement activities and, if feasible, an estimate of the SIG funds that will be budgeted for each school. If the LEA/district does not commit to serve each identified Tier I school, it will also submit documents to support the decision not to serve each Tier I school. Department staff (Federal Instructional Improvement, Federal Financial Management, School Finance, and School Accountability and Accreditation Sections) will review the documentation to determine if the claim is valid. Decisions will be based on the factors listed in the SEA SIG Application. Also, the Federal Instructional Improvement Section will provide and/or arrange for ongoing communication, support and technical assistance during the application period. Missouri believes that this collaboration will help determine each LEA's/district's capacity to serve Tier I schools as the LEA/District Application is prepared.

If the LEA/district does not provide adequate documentation during the application preparation period or the Department determines that the LEA/district has more capacity, the LEA/district will be required to submit additional information to support the claim. If the claim of lack of capacity cannot be supported by the LEA/district documentation or the Department decides that the claim is not valid, the LEA/District Application will be denied. The LEA/district will have fourteen days after the decision is made to provide additional information and amend the application. The Department will make the final decision within fourteen days of receiving the additional information and amended application.)

The decisions will be based on:

- Available funding
 - SIG funds
 - Federal, state, and local funds
 - Other funds
- Human resources capacity
 - Availability of trained principals
 - Availability of trained and highly-effective teachers
 - Availability of support staff
 - Availability of LEA/district-level staff to support the interventions
- Outside resources

- Funding sources
- Professional development
- Other services as determined by the needs analysis
- Parent and community support
- Direct services provided by the SEA and others

An LEA/district might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools by documenting efforts such as its unsuccessful attempts to recruit a sufficient number of new principals to implement the turnaround or transformation model; the unavailability of CMOs or EMOs willing to restart schools in the LEA/district; or its intent to serve Tier II schools instead of all its Tier I schools. An LEA/district may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools based on its intent to serve Tier III schools.

- (3) The LEA/district must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This section evaluates the LEA/district implementation plan and actions.

If any component of Section (3) LEA/District Implementation Plan and Actions (implementation plan, selecting external providers (if applicable), align other resources, modify policies and practices, and sustain reforms after the funding period) is not determined to be adequate, the standard for this section cannot be considered met.

The LEA/district has designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a detailed plan to implement the intervention(s) including: (The evaluation team will consider how this plan is aligned with all parts of the LEA/District Application (e.g. Needs Analysis, Timelines, Annual Goals, Budgets). If clear alignment cannot be determined, the plan will not meet the standard.)
 - Responsible staff members for each strategy
 - Implementation
 - Evaluation
 - Timelines for each strategy and action step
 - Timelines are reasonable and specific
 - Timelines reflect urgency
 - Funding identified for each strategy
 - Written budgets support each strategy
 - Funding is adequate to support implementation
 - Implementation progress measures for each strategy
 - A review schedule is in place to measure implementation of each strategy
 - Reviewer identified
 - Review periods identified (weekly, monthly, quarterly, etc.) and

- reasonable
 - Review metrics are identified and appropriate for the strategy
 - LEA/district oversight and support
 - The LEA/district governance structure will include a Turnaround Officer
 - Reports directly to the Superintendent
 - Oversees and/or coordinates all strategies of the LEA/District Implementation Plan
 - Served schools report directly to the Turnaround Officer
 - The LEA/district has system capable of collecting and reporting formative and summative data
 - The LEA/district will permit autonomies as possible (e.g. personnel decisions, compensation and incentive systems, budget authority, program design, professional development, calendar and daily schedule)

If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers

- LEA/district application process for external providers
 - Request for proposals (RFP)
 - Application process and timeline
 - Description of performance contract
 - Progress and outcome measures
 - Evaluation methods
 - Reporting procedures
 - Length of partnership
 - Assignment of responsibility for operational services (e.g., capital expenditures, IT infrastructure, maintenance, food services, transportation)
 - Define needs
 - State/LEA Turnaround strategy
 - Schools to be served
 - Achievement and demographic data for the LEA and schools
 - Vision of intervention during the funding period and beyond
 - Attract a pool of providers
 - Applicant criteria
 - Provider turnaround capacity, experience, and successes
 - Role of provider defined
 - Role of LEA defined
 - Provider authorities and accountability
 - Funding strategy
 - Evaluate and select providers
 - Evaluation rubric
 - Evaluation and decision timeline
 - Criteria for agreement termination by the LEA or provider
 - Memorandum of understanding (MOU)
 - Final performance contract
 - Specific roles and responsibilities
 - Legal issues
 - Provider contract
 - Evaluation procedures (as described in the RFP and/or MOU)
- SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers

- Guidance on related laws and regulations has been provided
- If applicable, the SEA has cooperated in the planning for the selection process

Align other resources with the interventions

- The LEA/district has listed other resources that will support the interventions
 - Local, State and other Federal funding sources
 - Higher Education partnerships
 - Other educational resources
 - Other community resources
- The resources are selected to align with the findings of the needs analysis

Modify LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively

- LEA/district policies and practices that have been or will be modified
- Projected impact of those changes

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

- Thorough explanation of how the reforms will be sustained
 - LEA/district support
 - Community Support
 - SEA Support
- Long range plans are in place for sustainable processes and procedures that are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts

- (4) The LEA/district must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's/district's application.

The LEA/district timeline includes specific dates for implementation of all components of the selected intervention.

- The timeline is reasonable, achievable, and reflects urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation dates are included in the school improvement plans or attached documents

- (5) The LEA/district must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.

The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.

- Accurate and meaningful baseline data are provided
- Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time
- Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA/district commits to serve, the LEA/district must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

The LEA/district has specific strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:

- Responsible staff members for each strategy
- Timelines for each strategy and action step
- Funding identified for each strategy
- Implementation progress measures for each strategy
- Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step
- LEA/district oversight and support

The Department's Federal Instructional Improvement (FII) Staff and Federal Grants Management (FGM) Staff currently use the Department's planning and grants online application to gather, review, and approve required LEA/District and School Improvement Plans and budgets. FII and FGM Staff will use the current approval process to review and approve the goals for Tier III schools.

- (7) The LEA/district must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.

- Accurate baseline data is provided
- Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time
- The LEA/district has collaborated with the SEA while setting the annual targets for student achievement

- (8) As appropriate, the LEA/district must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's/district's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

The LEA/district has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools

- Students
- Staff
 - Building
 - LEA/district
- Parents
- Teacher organizations and/or unions
- Colleges and universities

- Community representatives
 - Local government and other public sector representatives
 - Business community
 - Other organizations
- Other relevant stakeholders

C. Budget

The LEA/district must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA/district will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA/district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's/district's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA/district level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's/district's application.

The LEA/district has submitted:

- complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period.
 - Current year's detailed school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds)
 - Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability
- a budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve.
- a budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities

D. Assurances checked?

Comments:

E. Waivers checked or explanation of why waivers will not be implemented in each school the district intends to serve. (SEA will apply for waivers)

Comments:

LEA/district approval for the Department to provide direct services?

Comments:

Signature (s) and dates?

Comments:

Appendix B

FAQs

Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,

The following is from: *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, January 20, 2010 Access the complete document at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/faq.html>.

H. LEA/DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS

H-1. Which LEAs may apply for a SIG grant?

An LEA that receives Title I, Part A funds and that has one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools may apply for a SIG grant. See section II.A.1 of the final requirements. Note that an LEA that is in improvement but that does not have any Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools is not eligible to receive SIG funds.

H-2. May an educational service agency apply for a SIG grant on behalf of one or more LEAs?

Only LEAs are eligible to apply to an SEA for a SIG grant. An educational service agency (ESA) may apply for a SIG grant on behalf of one or more LEAs if the ESA is itself an LEA under the definition in section 9101(26) of the ESEA and each LEA for whom the ESA is applying receives Title I, Part A funds and has at least one Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school. Moreover, the ESA must have the authority and capability to implement the whole-school intervention models required in the final requirements in Tier I and Tier II schools in the LEAs for which it applies to serve.

H-3. Must an LEA that previously submitted an approved SIG application that is eligible for renewal submit a new application for FY 2009 funds?

Yes. Any LEA seeking SIG funds appropriated for FY 2009 or any subsequent year must submit a new application that meets the final requirements. Accordingly, the timeline for renewal will start anew with the approval of an LEA's application for FY 2009 funds (*i.e.*, the 2010–2011 school year will be the first year of the grant, which may be renewed for the 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 school years).

H-4. What must an LEA include in its application to the SEA for SIG funds?

In addition to any other information that the SEA may require, the LEA must:

- (1) Identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve;
- (2) Identify the school intervention model the LEA will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- (3) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, demonstrate that the LEA--
 - a. Has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school.

- b. Has the capacity to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
- (4) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school;
- (5) Describe actions it has taken, or will take, to:
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends;
- (6) Include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application;
- (7) Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds;
- (8) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement;
- (9) Describe the goals the LEA has established to hold accountable the Tier III schools it serves with SIG funds;
- (10) Include a budget indicating the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use to--
 - a. Implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
 - b. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
 - c. Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application;
- (11) Consult with relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools;
- (12) Include the required assurances; and
- (13) Indicate any waivers that the LEA will implement with respect to its SIG funds.

See generally sections II.A.2, II.A.4, and II.A.5 of the final requirements.

H-5. Must an LEA identify every Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school located within the LEA in its application for SIG funds?

No, an LEA need not identify every Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school located within the LEA in its application; the LEA need only identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that it commits to serve with SIG funds.

H-6. Must an LEA commit to serve every Tier I school located within the LEA?

An LEA that applies for a SIG grant must serve each of its Tier I schools—including both Tier I schools that are among the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools and Tier I schools that are newly eligible to receive SIG funds that the SEA has identified as Tier I schools—using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. See section II.A.3 of the final requirements.

H-7. How might an LEA demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools?

An LEA might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools by documenting efforts such as its unsuccessful attempts to recruit a sufficient number of new principals to implement the turnaround or transformation model; the unavailability of CMOs or EMOs willing to restart schools in the LEA; or its intent to serve Tier II schools instead of all its Tier I schools (see H-9). An LEA may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools based on its intent to serve Tier III schools.

H-8. Is an LEA obligated to serve its Tier II schools?

No. Each LEA retains the discretion to determine whether it will serve any or all of its Tier II schools. Moreover, although an LEA must serve all of its Tier I schools unless it lacks sufficient capacity to do so, an LEA has the choice to serve only a portion of its Tier II schools.

H-9. May an LEA take into account whether it will serve one or more of its Tier II schools in determining its capacity to serve its Tier I schools?

Yes. An LEA must serve all of its Tier I schools if it has the capacity to do so. However, an LEA may take into consideration, in determining its capacity, whether it also plans to serve one or more Tier II schools. In other words, an LEA with capacity to serve only a portion of its Tier I and Tier II schools may serve some of each set of schools; it does not necessarily have to expend its capacity to serve all of its Tier I schools before serving any Tier II schools. See section II.A.3 of the final requirements.

H-10. May an LEA commit to serving only its Tier II schools?

Yes. Even an LEA that has one or more Tier I schools may commit to serving only its Tier II schools. In particular, an LEA that has one or more Tier I schools may commit to serving only its Tier II schools if serving those schools will result in a lack of capacity to serve any Tier I schools (see H-9).

H-11. May an LEA commit to serving only its Tier III schools?

Only an LEA that has no Tier I schools may commit to serving only Tier III schools. See section II.A.7 of the final requirements. This means that an LEA that has Tier II schools, but no Tier I schools, may commit to serve only its Tier III schools. Note, however, that in awarding SIG funds, an SEA must give priority to an LEA that commits to serve Tier I or Tier II schools over an LEA that commits to serve only Tier III schools (see I-7).

H-12. May an LEA commit to serving only a portion of its Tier III schools?

Yes. Just as an LEA has discretion with respect to whether it will serve any Tier II schools and, if so, which ones, an LEA retains discretion with respect to whether it will serve its Tier III schools and, if so, whether it will serve all, only a portion, or any of those schools. Although the final requirements do not impose any restrictions with respect to which Tier III schools an LEA may choose to serve, an SEA may impose requirements that distinguish among Tier III schools (see I-11). An LEA should review its SEA’s requirements carefully before determining which, if any, Tier III schools it will commit to serve in its application.

H-13. How do the requirements and limitations described in H-6 through H-12 work together to guide an LEA’s determination of which schools it must commit to serve with SIG funds?

The following chart summarizes how the requirements and limitations described in H-6 through H-12 work together to guide an LEA’s determination of which schools it must commit to serve with SIG funds:

If an LEA has one or more . . .	In order to get SIG funds, the LEA <u>must</u> commit to serve . . .
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school OR at least one Tier II school ¹
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school OR at least one Tier II school ¹
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve

¹ The number of Tier I schools an LEA has capacity to serve may be zero if, and only if, the LEA is using all of the capacity it would otherwise use to serve its Tier I schools in order to serve Tier II schools.

Tier II schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

H-14. If an LEA wishes to serve a Tier III school, must it provide SIG funds directly to the school?

No. An LEA may “serve” a Tier III school by providing services that provide a direct benefit to the school. Accordingly, a Tier III school that an LEA commits to serve must receive some tangible benefit from the LEA’s use of SIG funds, the value of which can be determined by the LEA, but the school need not actually receive SIG funds. For example, an LEA might use a portion of its SIG funds at the district level to hire an outside expert to help Tier III schools examine their achievement data and determine what school improvement activities to provide based on that data analysis. Similarly, an LEA might provide professional development at the district level to all or a subset of its Tier III schools.

H-15. Are there any particular school improvement strategies that an LEA must implement in its Tier III schools?

No. An LEA has flexibility to choose the strategies it will implement in the Tier III schools it commits to serve. Of course, the strategies the LEA selects should be research-based and designed to address the particular needs of the Tier III schools.

H-16. May an LEA use SIG funds to continue to implement school improvement strategies that do not meet the requirements of one of the four models but that have helped improve achievement in the LEA?

Yes. An LEA may use SIG funds for these activities in Tier III schools or may add them to the school intervention models in Tier I or Tier II schools, to the extent they are consistent with the requirements of those models. The LEA may also use other sources of funds, such as school improvement funds it receives under section 1003(a) of the ESEA or under Title I, Part A, for these other strategies.

H-17. May an LEA implement several of the school intervention models among the Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve?

Generally, yes. An LEA may use whatever mix of school intervention models it determines is appropriate. However, if an LEA has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools (see H-21).

H-18. How can an LEA demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits

to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four school intervention models?

An LEA can demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve by addressing a number of matters. For example, the LEA might emphasize the credentials of staff who have the capability to implement one of the school intervention models. The LEA might also indicate its ability to recruit new principals to implement the turnaround and transformation models or the availability of CMOs and EMOs it could enlist to implement the restart model. The LEA might also indicate the support of its teachers' union with respect to the staffing and teacher evaluation requirements in the turnaround and transformation models, the commitment of its school board to eliminate any barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models, and the support of staff and parents in schools to be served. In addition, the LEA should indicate through the timeline required in its application that it has the ability to get the basic elements of its selected models up and running by the beginning of the 2010–2011 school year.

H-19. How can an LEA use “external providers” to turn around its persistently lowest-achieving schools?

The most specific way an LEA can use “external providers” is to contract with a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO to implement the restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school. The LEA might also contract with a turnaround organization to assist it in implementing the turnaround model. The LEA might also use external providers to provide technical expertise in implementing a variety of components of the school intervention models, such as helping a school evaluate its data and determine what changes are needed based on those data; providing job-embedded professional development; designing an equitable teacher and principal evaluation system that relies on student achievement; and creating safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs.

H-20. What are examples of “other resources” an LEA might align with the interventions it commits to implement using SIG funds?

An LEA might use a number of other resources, in addition to its SIG funds, to implement the school intervention models in the final requirements. For example, an LEA might use school improvement funds it receives under section 1003(a) of the ESEA or Title I, Part A funds it received under the ARRA. The LEA might also use its general Title I, Part A funds as well as funds it receives under other ESEA authorities, such as Title II, Part A, which it could use for recruiting high-quality teachers, or Title III, Part A, which it could use to improve the English proficiency of LEP students.

H-21. What is the cap on the number of schools in which an LEA may implement the transformation model and to which LEAs does it apply?

An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools. See section II.A.2(b) of the final requirements. Given that the cap only applies to an LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, an LEA with, for example, four Tier I schools and four Tier II schools, for a total of eight Tier I and Tier II schools, would not be impacted by the cap. However, an LEA with, for example, seven Tier I schools and

two Tier II schools, for a total of nine Tier I and Tier II schools, would be impacted by the cap. Thus, continuing the prior example, the LEA with seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools would be able to implement the transformation model in no more than four of those schools. This limitation applies irrespective of whether the Tier I or Tier II schools an LEA applies to serve are among the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or whether they are newly eligible schools identified as Tier I or Tier II schools at the State's option.

H-22. If an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the four interventions in all of its Tier I schools, may it apply for SIG funds to provide other services to some of its Tier I schools?

No. The only services an LEA may provide to a Tier I school using SIG funds are services entailed in the implementation of one of the four interventions described in the final requirements (*i.e.*, turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model). If an LEA lacks capacity to implement one of those models in some or all of its Tier I schools, the LEA may not use any SIG funds in those schools. See section II.A.3 of the final requirements.

H-23. May an LEA use SIG funds to serve a school that feeds into a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school, but is not itself a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school?

No. Only a school that is a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school may be served with SIG funds. See section II.A.1 of the final requirements.

H-24. What criteria must an LEA use to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds?

An LEA must monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds to determine whether the school:

- (1) Is meeting annual goals established by the LEA for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and
- (2) Is making progress on the leading indicators described in the final requirements.

See section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

H-25. What are examples of the annual goals for student achievement that an LEA must establish for its Tier I and Tier II schools?

An LEA must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it will use to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds. See section II.A.8 of the final requirements. Annual goals that an LEA could set might include making at least one year's progress in reading/language arts and mathematics; reducing the percentage of students who are non-proficient on the State's reading/language arts and mathematics assessments by 10 percent or more from the prior year; or meeting the goals the State establishes in its Race to the Top application.

Note that the determination of whether a school meets the goals for student achievement established by the LEA is in addition to the determination of whether the school makes AYP as required by section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA. In other words, each LEA receiving SIG funds must

monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools it is serving to determine whether they have met the LEA's annual goals for student achievement and must also comply with its obligations for making accountability determinations under section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

H-26. What are examples of the goals an LEA must establish to hold accountable the Tier III schools it serves with SIG funds?

An LEA must establish, and the SEA must approve, goals to hold accountable the Tier III schools it serves with SIG funds (see section II.C(a) of the final requirements), although the LEA has discretion in establishing those goals. For example, the LEA might establish for its Tier III schools the same student achievement goals that it establishes for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or it might establish for its Tier III schools goals that align with the already existing AYP requirements, such as meeting the State's annual measurable objectives or making AYP through safe harbor. Note that the goals that the LEA establishes must be approved by the SEA.

H-27. What are the leading indicators that will be used to hold schools receiving SIG funds accountable?

The following metrics constitute the leading indicators for the SIG program:

- (1) Number of minutes within the school year;
- (2) Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- (3) Dropout rate;
- (4) Student attendance rate;
- (5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
- (6) Discipline incidents;
- (7) Truants;
- (8) Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
- (9) Teacher attendance rate.

See section III.A of the final requirements.

Appendix C

MISSOURI PLANNING, BUDGET, AND REPORTING SYSTEM

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES, and ACTION STEPS

MISSOURI PLANNING, BUDGET, AND REPORTING SYSTEM

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES, and ACTION STEPS

The Plans and Grants System was developed to enable school officials to directly connect funding streams with required plans and specific school improvement objectives. It will be a consistent, consolidated system for districts to submit required plans and grant applications. The following definitions will help LEAs/districts and the Department staff achieve consistency as the application is designed and implemented.

GOALS: For planning purposes, five overarching goals have been developed. These goals are statements of the key functions of school districts that organize the plan into areas of responsibility and emphasis. These areas are common to many Comprehensive School Improvement Plans currently in place in districts around the state.

Student Performance

Develop and enhance quality educational/instructional programs to improve performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic and career goals.

Highly Qualified Staff

Recruit, attract, develop, and retain highly qualified staff to carry out the LEA (local educational agency)/ District mission, goals, and objectives.

Facilities, Support, and Instructional Resources

Provide and maintain appropriate instructional resources, support services, and functional and safe facilities.

Parent and Community Involvement

Promote, facilitate, and enhance parent, student, and community involvement in LEA/District educational programs.

Governance and Leadership

Govern the LEA/District in an efficient and effective manner providing leadership and representation to benefit the students, staff, and patrons of the district.

OBJECTIVES: Objectives are specific targets that are identified and measured by quantifiable information. Objectives are tied directly to the goals of the organization. Long range objectives include specific performance measures to report annual progress toward achieving each objective.

STRATEGIES: Strategies explain how the objectives will be accomplished. Strategies identify programs and practices to be implemented, responsible persons, resources committed to the strategy, and timelines for implementation.

ACTION STEPS: Action steps divide the strategies into more specific responsibilities and activities necessary to implement the programs and practices described in the strategies. Action plans will also indicate responsible persons, resources, and timelines.

Appendix D
Budget Templates

LEA/District and School Budget Templates

LEA/District: Kansas City Missouri Public Schools School: _____

County/District Code: 048078 School Code: _____

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The chart below is a suggested format. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities.

Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities
1100 Instruction	
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1 – Hire (6) Literacy Coaches Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1 – Hire (6) Math Coach es
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)	
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Hire 3 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within communication arts classrooms Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 2 – Hire 3 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within mathematics classrooms Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4 – Purchase assessment materials for SRI, EXPLORE, EOC, PLAN, PSAT and SAT Purchase all student materials for Ramp-Up Literacy, Ramp-Up Algebra, Literacy Navigator, and Mathematics Navigator.
2100 Support Services - Pupils	Goal 2, Objective 3, Strategy 1 – UMKC Project Cause (paid through Title II) - Central HS Only
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG	
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2, Strategies 5 & 6 – align curriculum, uses of data warehouse, use of formal and informal assessments Goal 2 & 5, Objective 2, Strategies 1 & 2 – Continue work with UMKC RPDC and attend monthly PLC meetings and PBS trainings (4 times a year) – Paid through Title II Funds
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2 – Strategies 2 and 3 – Professional Development for Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, Ramp to Middle Grades Literacy, and Ramp-Up to Algebra and pay teacher stipends
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	

Services	
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG	
3000 Parent Involvement	
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG	
Other (Use Missouri Accounting manual codes)	
Administrative Costs	
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3 & 5 – Project Manager and District Coach from America’s Choice

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school.

BUDGET								
Budget Year—2010	6100 Certificated Salares	<u>6150</u> <u>Noncertificated</u> <u>Salaries</u>	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	712,284		220,416		333,000			1,265,700
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG				1,155,000				1,155,000
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG								
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								2,420,700
Grand Total								2,420,700

LEA/District and School Budget Templates

LEA/District: Kansas City Missouri Public Schools **School:** Central High School

County/District Code: 048078

School Code: 1200

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The chart below is a suggested format. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities.

Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities
1100 Instruction	
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1 – Hire Literacy Coach Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1 – Hire Math Coach
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)	
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within communication arts classrooms Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within mathematics classrooms Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4 – Purchase assessment materials for SRI, EXPLORE, EOC, PLAN, PSAT and SAT Purchase all student materials for Ramp-Up Literacy, Ramp-Up Algebra, Literacy Navigator, and Mathematics Navigator.
2100 Support Services - Pupils	Goal 2, Objective 3, Strategy 1 – UMKC Project Cause (paid through Title II)
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG	
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2, Strategies 5 & 6 – align curriculum, uses of data warehouse, use of formal and informal assessments Goal 2 & 5, Objective 2, Strategies 1 & 2 – Continue work with UMKC RPDC and attend monthly PLC meetings and PBS trainings (4 times a year) – Paid through Title II Funds
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2 – Strategies 2 and 3 – Professional Development for Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, Ramp to Middle Grades Literacy, and Ramp-Up to Algebra and pay teacher stipends
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services	
2620 Planning, Research,	

Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG	
3000 Parent Involvement	
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG	
Other (Use Missouri Accounting manual codes)	
Administrative Costs	
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3 & 5 – Project Manager and District Coach from America’s Choice

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school.

BUDGET								
Budget Year—2010	6100 Certificated Salares	6150 <u>Noncertificated</u> <u>Salaries</u>	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	237,428		73,472		111,000.00			421,900
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG				310,000				310,000
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG				75,000				75,000
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								806,900
Grand Total								806,900

LEA/District and School Budget Templates

LEA/District: Kansas City Missouri Public Schools **School:** East High School

County/District Code: 048078

School Code: 1580

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The chart below is a suggested format. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities.

Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities
1100 Instruction	
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1 – Hire Literacy Coach Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1 – Hire Math Coach
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)	
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within communication arts classrooms Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within mathematics classrooms Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4 – Purchase assessment materials for SRI, EXPLORE, EOC, PLAN, PSAT and SAT Purchase all student materials for Ramp-Up Literacy, Ramp-Up Algebra, Literacy Navigator, and Mathematics Navigator.
2100 Support Services - Pupils	
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG	
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2, Strategies 5 & 6 – align curriculum, uses of data warehouse, use of formal and informal assessments Goal 2 & 5, Objective 2, Strategies 1 & 2 – Continue work with UMKC RPDC and attend monthly PLC meetings and PBS trainings (4 times a year) – Paid through Title II Funds
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2 – Strategies 2 and 3 – Professional Development for Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, Ramp to Middle Grades Literacy, and Ramp-Up to Algebra and pay teacher stipends
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services	
2620 Planning, Research,	

Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG	
3000 Parent Involvement	
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG	
Other (Use Missouri Accounting manual codes)	
Administrative Costs	
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3 & 5 – Project Manager and District Coach from America’s Choice

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school.

BUDGET								
Budget Year—2010	6100 Certificated Salares	6150 <u>Noncertificated</u> <u>Salaries</u>	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	237,428		73,472		111,000.00			421,900
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG				310,000				310,000
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG				75,000				75,000
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								806,900
Grand Total								806,900

LEA/District and School Budget Templates

LEA/District: Kansas City Missouri Public Schools **School:** Northeast High School

County/District Code: 048078

School Code: 1340

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The chart below is a suggested format. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities.

Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities
1100 Instruction	
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1 – Hire Literacy Coach Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1 – Hire Math Coach
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)	
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within communication arts classrooms Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within mathematics classrooms Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4 – Purchase assessment materials for SRI, EXPLORE, EOC, PLAN, PSAT and SAT Purchase all student materials for Ramp-Up Literacy, Ramp-Up Algebra, Literacy Navigator, and Mathematics Navigator.
2100 Support Services - Pupils	
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG	
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2, Strategies 5 & 6 – align curriculum, uses of data warehouse, use of formal and informal assessments Goal 2 & 5, Objective 2, Strategies 1 & 2 – Continue work with UMKC RPDC and attend monthly PLC meetings and PBS trainings (4 times a year) – Paid through Title II Funds
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2 – Strategies 2 and 3 – Professional Development for Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, Ramp to Middle Grades Literacy, and Ramp-Up to Algebra and pay teacher stipends
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services	

2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG	
3000 Parent Involvement	
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG	
Other (Use Missouri Accounting manual codes)	
Administrative Costs	
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3 & 5 – Project Manager and District Coach from America’s Choice

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school.

BUDGET								
Budget Year—2010	6100 Certificated Salares	<u>6150</u> <u>Noncertificated</u> <u>Salaries</u>	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	237,428		73,472		111,000.00			421,900
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG				310,000				310,000
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG				75,000				75,000
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								806,900
Grand Total								806,900

LEA/District and School Budget Templates

LEA/District: Kansas City Missouri Public Schools **School:** Paseo Academy

County/District Code: 048078

School Code: 1400

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The chart below is a suggested format. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities.

Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities
1100 Instruction	
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1 – Hire Literacy Coach Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1 – Hire Math Coach
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)	
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within communication arts classrooms Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within mathematics classrooms Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4 – Purchase assessment materials for SRI, EXPLORE, EOC, PLAN, PSAT and SAT Purchase all student materials for Ramp-Up Literacy, Ramp-Up Algebra, Literacy Navigator, and Mathematics Navigator.
2100 Support Services - Pupils	
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG	
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2, Strategies 5 & 6 – align curriculum, uses of data warehouse, use of formal and informal assessments Goal 2 & 5, Objective 2, Strategies 1 & 2 – Continue work with UMKC RPDC and attend monthly PLC meetings and PBS trainings (4 times a year) – Paid through Title II Funds
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2 – Strategies 2 and 3 – Professional Development for Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, Ramp to Middle Grades Literacy, and Ramp-Up to Algebra and pay teacher stipends
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services	

2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG	
3000 Parent Involvement	
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG	
Other (Use Missouri Accounting manual codes)	
Administrative Costs	
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3 & 5 – Project Manager and District Coach from America’s Choice

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school.

BUDGET								
Budget Year—2010	6100 Certificated Salares	6150 <u>Noncertificated</u> <u>Salaries</u>	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	237,428		73,472		111,000.00			421,900
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG				310,000				310,000
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG				75,000				75,000
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								806,900
Grand Total								806,900

LEA/District and School Budget Templates

LEA/District: Kansas City Missouri Public Schools **School:** Southwest High School

County/District Code: 048078

School Code: 3180

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The chart below is a suggested format. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities.

Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities
1100 Instruction	
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 1 – Hire Literacy Coach Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 1 – Hire Math Coach
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)	
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within communication arts classrooms Goal 1, Objective 2, Strategy 2 – Hire 1 additional HQT teacher to provide additional support and co-teaching within mathematics classrooms Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 4 – Purchase assessment materials for SRI, EXPLORE, EOC, PLAN, PSAT and SAT Purchase all student materials for Ramp-Up Literacy, Ramp-Up Algebra, Literacy Navigator, and Mathematics Navigator.
2100 Support Services - Pupils	
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG	
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2, Strategies 5 & 6 – align curriculum, uses of data warehouse, use of formal and informal assessments Goal 2 & 5, Objective 2, Strategies 1 & 2 – Continue work with UMKC RPDC and attend monthly PLC meetings and PBS trainings (4 times a year) – Paid through Title II Funds
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2 – Strategies 2 and 3 – Professional Development for Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, Ramp to Middle Grades Literacy, and Ramp-Up to Algebra and pay teacher stipends
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services	
2620 Planning, Research,	

Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG	
3000 Parent Involvement	
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG	
Other (Use Missouri Accounting manual codes)	
Administrative Costs	
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG	Goal 3, Objective 1, Strategy 3 & 5 – Project Manager and District Coach from America’s Choice

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school.

BUDGET								
Budget Year—2010	6100 Certificated Salares	6150 <u>Noncertificated</u> <u>Salaries</u>	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG	237,428		73,472		111,000.00			421,900
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG				310,000				310,000
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG				75,000				75,000
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								806,900
Grand Total								806,900

**ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY
KANSAS CITY MISSOURI PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

[Superintendent's Letter for Grant Application.pdf](#)

[SIG KCMSD DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN.docx](#)

[SIG Southwest HS PLAN.docx](#)

[SIG Paseo HS PLAN.docx](#)

[SIG Northeast HS PLAN.docx](#)

[SIG Central HS PLAN.docx](#)

[SIG East HS PLAN.docx](#)

[p.37 Signature Page.pdf](#)

Appendix E

Application Scoring Form

Missouri Title I, Section 1003 (g) SIG Scoring Form

Enter the total number of points awarded for each section of the application at the bottom of each page and transfer to this page.

Department Screening

The LEA/district has submitted all required information and documentation, and the information and documentation meets the application requirements. (Applications missing required information and documentation will not be evaluated.) (yes/no) _____

Section A—Schools to be Served

1. The LEA/district has Tier I schools and has committed to serving at least one of those schools. (yes/no) _____
2. The LEA/district has only Tier III schools and has committed to serve at least one of those schools. (yes/no) _____

Section B—Descriptive Information

- (1) 1 Needs Analysis of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (10 points possible) _____
- (1) 2 Capacity to serve Tier I and Tier II Schools (40 points possible) _____
- (2) LEA/district lack of capacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools (Valid claim-yes/no) _____
- (3) LEA/District implementation plan and actions for Tier I and Tier II schools (20 points possible) _____
- (4) Tier I and/or II timeline (10 points possible) _____
- (5) Tier I and/or Tier II annual goals (10 points possible) _____
- (6) Tier III improvement activities (20 points possible) _____
- (7) Tier III annual goals (10 points possible) _____
- (8) Stakeholder involvement in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (10 points possible) _____

Section C—Budget (10 points possible) _____

Section D—Assurances (yes/no) _____

Section E—Waivers
LEA/district intends to implement all applicable waivers (yes/no) _____

If no, LEA/district has listed the schools in which waivers will be implemented (yes/no) _____

SEA Direct Services Approved (yes/no) _____

Signatures (yes/no) _____

Additional points for committing to serve Tier III schools eliminated from Tier I or Tier II list due to “minimum n” of less than 30 _____ /10

LEAs/districts with Tier I and/or II, and III Schools, Total points Received _____/140

LEAs/districts with only Tier I and Tier II Schools, Total points Received _____/110

LEAs/districts with Tier III Schools only, Total points Received _____ /60

Determining “greatest need:”

LEAs/Districts with Tier I and Tier II Schools

1. Ranked by the number of Tier I schools in the LEA/district (This ranking is weighted by a factor of 1.5.),
2. Ranked by the number of Tier II schools in the LEA/district,
3. Ranked by the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA/district commits to serve,
4. Ranked by the percent of the LEA’s/district’s students enrolled in Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools,
5. The number of Tier III schools in the lowest-achieving decile of achievement in the state,
6. The ranks will be combined to determine greatest need.

Combined Rank _____

LEAs/Districts with Tier III schools only

1. Ranked by the number of Tier III schools in the lowest-achieving decile in the State,
2. Ranked by the number of Tier III schools in LEA/district,
3. Ranked by the number of Tier III schools the LEA/district commits to serve,
4. Ranked by the percent of students enrolled in Tier III schools,
5. The ranks will be combined to determine greatest need among LEAs/districts with Tier III schools only.

Combined Rank _____

SECTION A –BUILDINGS TO BE SERVED

SECTION A. – Scoring Guide

Yes or No

The LEA/district has selected Tier I and/or Tier II schools to serve.

___ Yes ___ No ___ N/A

The LEA/district has selected Tier III schools to serve.

___ Yes ___ No ___ N/A

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Tier I and/or Tier II schools ___ Yes ___ No ___ N/A

Tier III schools ___ Yes ___ No ___ N/A

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

B (1) 1.—NEEDS ANALYSIS

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-4 points

This section determines if the LEA’s/district’s needs analysis for each school it commits to serve meets the criteria.

The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of:

- Student Performance
- Curriculum Development and Learning Management
- Professional Development
- Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Information Technology and Data Management
- Human Resources
- Leadership and Governance
- Fiscal and Budget

The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of **student performance** and a **majority** of:

- Student Performance
- Curriculum Development and Learning Management
- Professional Development
- Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Information Technology and Data Management
- Human Resources
- Leadership and Governance
- Fiscal and Budget

The needs analysis is **not** thorough and/or **does not** include evaluation of a majority of:

- Student Performance
- Curriculum Development and Learning Management
- Professional Development
- Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Information Technology and Data Management
- Human Resources
- Leadership and Governance
- Fiscal and Budget

The LEA/district has identified the most significant results of the needs analysis and the data submitted support those decisions.

The LEA/district has identified the most significant results of the needs analysis and the data submitted supports those decisions.

There is **not** adequate data, or the data does not adequately support the decisions made.

The LEA/district used a variety of appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.

The LEA/district used appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.

The LEA/district did **not** use appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.

The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis

The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis

The selected intervention does not reflect the findings of the needs analysis

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

B.(1) 2.—CAPACITY TO SERVE TIER I AND TIER II SCHOOLS

40 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—32-40 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—20-31 points

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-19 points

Refer to B (1)2 in the Scoring Guide Outline for detailed expectations for the measures below.

This section evaluates Tier I and Tier II school plans.

Each component in the columns below have separate point values that should be considered as the total score is determined.

The LEA/district has successfully implemented turnaround initiatives in low-achieving schools and the school(s) made significant improvement. Those initiatives included activities required by SIG intervention models for Tier I and Tier II schools. (4-5 points)

There is a written plan for each selected Tier I and Tier II school to implement one of the four required intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The plan has all of the required components listed in the Scoring Guide Outline. The plan is detailed, objectives are clearly measurable, strategies are specific and detailed, and the plan, if fully implemented, will drive change. (12-15 points)

Each plan is directly aligned with the findings of the needs analysis and progress measures reflect the findings of that analysis. (4-5 points)

Written procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the plan and progress toward meeting the measurable objectives of the plan. (4-5 points)

The plan explains in detail how all of the required and appropriate permissible activities of the selected intervention model will be implemented. (4-5 points)

There is a plan for LEA-/district-level support for Tier I and Tier II schools that reflects the LEA's/district's strong commitment to lead improvement efforts. (4-5 points)

The LEA/district has implemented turnaround initiatives in low-achieving schools. Those initiatives included activities required by SIG intervention models for Tier I and Tier II schools. (2-3 points)

There is a written plan for each selected Tier I and Tier II school to implement one of the four required intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA/district has committed to serve. The plan has all of the required components listed in the Scoring Guide Outline. (8-12 points)

Each plan is aligned with the findings of the needs analysis. (2-3 points)

Written procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation and progress toward the measurable objectives of the plan. (2-3 points)

The plan explains in detail how all of the required and appropriate permissible activities of intervention model will be implemented. (2-3 points)

There is a plan for LEA-/district-level support for Tier I and Tier II schools that reflect only a moderate commitment to lead improvement efforts. (2-3 points)

The LEA/district has not implemented turnaround initiatives in low-achieving schools.
or
The LEA/district implemented turnaround initiatives that did not include activities listed in the SIG regulations.
and/or
The LEA/district has little or no evidence that improvement initiatives have led to improved student achievement. (0-3 points)

Written plans for each selected Tier I and Tier II school lack detail and are missing some or all of the required components listed in the Scoring Guide Outline. (0-7 points)

There is little or no alignment with the findings of the needs analysis. (0-3 points)

The written procedures are not adequate to measure the implementation of the plan and progress toward the measurable objectives of the plan. (0-3 points)

The plan does not detail how the required and appropriate permissible activities of intervention model will be implemented. (0-3 points)

A plan for LEA-/district-level support for Tier I and Tier II schools is not detailed and does not reflect the responsibility of the LEA/district to lead improvement efforts. (0-3 points)

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS (B (1) 2)

Score _____/40 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

B. (2)—LEA/DISTRICT LACK OF CAPACITY TO SERVE TIER I AND/OR TIER II SCHOOLS

YES/NO

The LEA/District Application will not be evaluated until the Department has determined that the claim of lack of capacity is valid.

The LEA/district has listed each Tier I school that it **will not** serve and has explained why it lacks the capacity to serve the school (s):

(This section will be completed and evaluated in collaboration with the Department. The Department will evaluate the LEA's/district's lack of capacity based on documentation and consultation with the LEA/district. The guidance below will be used to determine if the LEA's/district's claim is valid. During the application process, these LEAs/districts will declare their commitment to serve schools and submit a projected list of schools it may commit to serve, and the intervention model or improvement activities and, if feasible, an estimate of the SIG funds that will be budgeted for each school. If the LEA/district does not commit to serve each identified Tier I school, it will also submit documents to support the decision not to serve each Tier I school. Department staff (Federal Instructional Improvement, Federal Financial Management, School Finance, and School Accountability and Accreditation Sections) will review the documentation to determine if the claim is valid. Decisions will be based on the factors listed in the SEA SIG Application. Also, the Federal Instructional Improvement Section will provide and/or arrange for ongoing communication, support and technical assistance during the application period. Missouri believes that this collaboration will help determine each LEA's/district's capacity to serve Tier I schools as the LEA/District Application is prepared.

If the LEA/district does not provide adequate documentation during the application preparation period or the Department determines that the LEA/district has more capacity, the LEA/district will be required to submit additional information to support the claim. If the claim of lack of capacity cannot be supported by the LEA/district documentation or the Department decides that the claim is not valid, the LEA/District Application will be denied. The LEA/district will have fourteen days after the decision is made to provide additional information and amend the application. The Department will make the final decision within fourteen days of receiving the additional information and amended application.)

The decisions will be based on:

- Available funding
 - SIG funds
 - Federal, state, and local funds
 - Other funds
- Human resources capacity
 - Availability of trained principals
 - Availability of trained and highly-effective teachers
 - Availability of support staff
 - Availability of LEA/district-level staff to support the interventions
- Outside resources
 - Funding sources
 - Professional development
 - Other services as determined by the needs analysis
- Parent and community support
- Direct services provided by the SEA and others)

- An LEA/district might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools by

documenting efforts such as its unsuccessful attempts to recruit a sufficient number of new principals to implement the turnaround or transformation model; the unavailability of CMOs or EMOs willing to restart schools in the LEA/district; or its intent to serve Tier II schools instead of all its Tier I schools. An LEA/district may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools based on its intent to serve Tier III schools.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Claim is valid ____ **Yes** ____ **No**

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

B (3)—LEA/DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND ACTIONS

20 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—16-20 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—10-15 points

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-9 points

Refer to B (3) in the Scoring Guide Outline for detailed expectations for the measures below.
This section scores the evaluation of the LEA/district-level plan.

The LEA/district has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a detailed plan to implement the intervention(s). The evaluation team will also consider how this plan is aligned with all parts of the LEA/District Application (e.g. Needs Analysis, Timelines, Annual Goals, Budgets). If clear alignment cannot be determined, the plan will not meet the standard.

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The LEA/district has listed a **wide variety of additional** resources that will support the interventions.
- The resources directly align with the findings of the needs analysis and support the planned interventions and improvement activities.

Modified LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

- LEA/district policies and practices have been modified
- LEA/district has projected impact of those changes

Thorough explanation of how the reforms will be sustained after the funding period

- LEA/district support
- Community Support
- SEA Support

Long range plans are in place for sustainable processes and procedures that are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts

External provider selection:

If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model

- LEA/district application process for external providers is in place that includes the suggested components.
- SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers.

The LEA/district has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a plan to implement the intervention(s). The evaluation team will also consider how this plan is aligned with all parts of the LEA/District Application (e.g. Needs Analysis, Timelines, Annual Goals, Budgets). If clear alignment cannot be determined, the plan will not meet the standard.

Aligned other resources with the interventions

- The LEA/district has listed resources that will support the interventions.
- The resources loosely align with the findings of the needs analysis and support the planned interventions and improvement activities.

Modified LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively

- LEA/district policies will be modified
- LEA/district has projected impact of those changes

Thorough explanation of how the reforms will be sustained after the funding period

- LEA/district support
- Community Support
- SEA Support

Long range plans are in place for sustainable processes and procedures that are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts

External provider selection:

If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model

- LEA/district application process for external providers is in place and it includes a majority of the suggested components and can produce a legally binding agreement.

(If any one or more of the descriptors below are chosen, the LEA/District Implementation Plan and Actions Standard is not met.)

The LEA/district has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- The plan **lacks necessary detail** to direct the implementation of the intervention(s). The evaluation team will also consider how this plan is aligned with all parts of the LEA/District Application (e.g. Needs Analysis, Timelines, Annual Goals, Budgets). If clear alignment cannot be determined, the plan will not meet the standard.

Aligned other resources with the interventions

- The LEA/district has listed **insufficient** resources to support the interventions;
and/or
- The LEA/district has listed sufficient resources but **these resources do not align with the findings of the needs analysis nor support the planned interventions and improvement activities.**

Modified LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively

- There are **no plans or minimal plans in place** to modify LEA/district policies and practices

Long range plans for sustainable processes and procedures after the funding period **are not in place or lack necessary detail.**

External provider selection:

If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model

- LEA/district **does not have** an application process for external providers **or the plan is missing essential components and cannot lead to an acceptable agreement.**

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS FOR B (3)

Score _____/20 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**B (4) TIMELINE****10 POINTS POSSIBLE****Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points**

The LEA/district timeline includes specific dates for implementation of each component of the selected interventions.

- The timelines are detailed, reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Specific implementation and evaluation dates are included in the school and LEA/district plans or attached documents.

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

The LEA/district timeline identifies time periods for implementation of all components of the selected interventions.

- The timelines are reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation periods are included in the school and LEA/district plans or attached documents.

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0 points

The LEA/district timelines are not specific and/or do not include specific dates for implementation of all components of the selected interventions.

- The timelines are **not** reasonable or achievable, and/or do **not** reflect urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation dates are **not** included in the school and LEA/district plans or attached documents.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

B (5). TIER I AND TIER II ANNUAL GOALS

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points	Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points	Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-4 points
<p>The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and precise baseline data are provided • Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time <p>Targets have been set in consultation with the Department</p>	<p>The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaningful baseline data are provided • Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time <p>Targets have been set in consultation with the Department</p>	<p>The LEA/district has not set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline data are not precise or meaningful • Targets will not lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time <p>There is little or no evidence that targets have been set in consultation with the Department</p>

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**B (6). TIER III IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES****20 POINTS POSSIBLE****Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points****Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points****Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-4 points**

The LEA's/district's plan is written in precise detail to clearly describe how the activities will be implemented, funded, and evaluated. The plan has specific strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:

- Responsible staff members for each strategy
- Timelines for each strategy and action step
- Funding identified for each strategy
- Implementation progress measures for each strategy
- Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step
- LEA/district oversight and support

The LEA'S/district's plan is written in adequate detail to describe how the improvement activities will be implemented, funded, and evaluated. Additional detail would improve the plan. The plan has strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:

- Responsible staff members for each strategy
- Timelines for each strategy and action step
- Funding identified for each strategy
- Implementation progress measures for each strategy
- Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step
- LEA/district oversight and support

The LEA/district has strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:

- Responsible staff members for each strategy
- Timelines for each strategy and action step
- Funding identified for each strategy
- Implementation progress measures for each strategy
- Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step
- LEA/district oversight and support

However, the plan(s) lacks the detail necessary to determine how the activities will be implemented, funded, and/or evaluated.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/20 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**B (7)—TIER III ANNUAL GOALS****10 POINTS POSSIBLE****Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points**

The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.

- Complete and precise baseline data are provided
- Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time

Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.

- Baseline data are provided
- Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time

Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-4 points

The LEA/district has **not** set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.

- Baseline data are **not** precise or meaningful
- Targets will **not** lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time

There is little or no evidence that targets have been set in consultation with the Department

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

SECTION B—DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

B (8)—STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-4 points

The LEA/district has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools

- Students
- Staff
 - Building
 - LEA/district
- Parents
- Teacher organizations and/or unions
- Colleges and universities
- Community representatives
 - Local government and other public sector representatives
 - Business community
 - Other organizations
- Other stakeholders

There is considerable evidence that the LEA/district has involved or has planned to involve representatives of all groups on the list in a meaningful way.

The LEA/district has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools

- Students
- Staff
 - Building
 - LEA/district
- Parents
- Teacher organizations and/or unions
- Colleges and universities
- Community representatives
 - Local government and other public sector representatives
 - Business community
 - Other organizations
- Other stakeholders

There is evidence that the LEA/district has involved or has planned to involve representatives of most of the groups on the list in a meaningful way.

The LEA/district has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools

- Students
- Staff
 - Building
 - LEA/district
- Parents
- Teacher organizations and/or unions
- Colleges and universities
- Community representatives
 - Local government and other public sector representatives
 - Business community
 - Other organizations
- Other stakeholders

*There is **little or no** evidence that the LEA/district has involved or has planned to involve representatives of most of the groups on the list in a meaningful way.*

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

SECTION C—BUDGETS

C—BUDGETS

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—12-15 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—9-11 points

Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-8 points

The LEA/district has submitted:

- Complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period.
 - Current year’s school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds)
 - Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability
- A budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve.
- A budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities

The LEA/district has submitted:

- Complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period.
 - Current year’s school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds)
 - Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability
- A budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve.
- A budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities

The LEA/district has submitted:

- Complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period.
 - Current year’s school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds)
 - Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability
- A budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve.
- A budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

