

# School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name: Missouri**



U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682  
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

### Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.



# SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

## **Purpose of the Program**

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

## **Availability of Funds**

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

## **State and LEA Allocations**

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

## **Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners**

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

# FY 2010 Submission Information

## **Electronic Submission:**

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: [school.improvement.grants@ed.gov](mailto:school.improvement.grants@ed.gov)

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

## **Paper Submission:**

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist  
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320  
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

## **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

## **For Further Information**

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at [carlas.mccauley@ed.gov](mailto:carlas.mccauley@ed.gov).

# **FY 2010 Application Instructions**

**Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.**

**Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.**

**We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.**

**Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.**

**SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.**

**APPLICATION COVER SHEET**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

Legal Name of Applicant: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 480 205 Jefferson Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480						
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant							
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Name:</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Jocelyn Strand</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Craig Rector</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Position and Office:</td> <td>Coordinator School Improvement Office of Quality Schools</td> <td>Coordinator Grants &amp; Resources Office of Quality Schools</td> </tr> </table>		Name:	Jocelyn Strand	Craig Rector	Position and Office:	Coordinator School Improvement Office of Quality Schools	Coordinator Grants & Resources Office of Quality Schools
Name:	Jocelyn Strand	Craig Rector					
Position and Office:	Coordinator School Improvement Office of Quality Schools	Coordinator Grants & Resources Office of Quality Schools					
Contact's Mailing Address: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education P.O. Box 480 205 Jefferson Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480							
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Telephone: 573-751-1014 (Strand)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">573-526-1594 (Rector)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Fax: 573-526-6698</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Email address: <a href="mailto:jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov">jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov</a></td> <td><a href="mailto:craig.rector@dese.mo.gov">craig.rector@dese.mo.gov</a></td> </tr> </table>		Telephone: 573-751-1014 (Strand)	573-526-1594 (Rector)	Fax: 573-526-6698		Email address: <a href="mailto:jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov">jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov</a>	<a href="mailto:craig.rector@dese.mo.gov">craig.rector@dese.mo.gov</a>
Telephone: 573-751-1014 (Strand)	573-526-1594 (Rector)						
Fax: 573-526-6698							
Email address: <a href="mailto:jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov">jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov</a>	<a href="mailto:craig.rector@dese.mo.gov">craig.rector@dese.mo.gov</a>						
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Chris L. Nicastro, Ph. D.	Telephone: 573-751-4446						
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date:						
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.							

# FY 2010 Application Checklist

**Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.**

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

**Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.**

<b>SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
<b>SECTION C: CAPACITY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
<b>SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION E: ASSURANCES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
<b>SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
<b>SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
<b>SECTION H: WAIVERS</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

**A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:** An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

*For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:*

1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.

*SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)*

2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.

3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

*For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:*

1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.

**Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here:**

<http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/fedprog/instrucimprov/documents/MissouriDefinitionforLowest-AchievingSchools.pdf>

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup>

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

**EXAMPLE:**

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

<sup>1</sup> “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

**EXAMPLE:**

<b>SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS</b>							
<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>LEA NCES ID #</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

**Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.**

**SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.**

**B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

**Part 1:** The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA’s application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it 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 application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

**Part 2:** The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA’s commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:**

**Part 1**

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA/district must take prior to submitting

its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's/district's application with respect to each of the following actions:

### **Part 1**

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA/district must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's/district's application with respect to each of the following actions:

**The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) will provide technical assistance to identified schools as they prepare their application. The Department will conduct a meeting of identified schools to review the key components of the application. Additionally, Area Supervisors of Instruction and Federal Instructional Improvement Supervisors will be available to provide assistance to schools as they conduct their needs assessment and begin development of their plan, including goals, strategies and activities. Further technical assistance will be provided to LEA/districts who voluntarily submit their application for a preliminary application content review. Written feedback will be provided to LEA/districts prior to the final submission of their application.**

**The Department will use the LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Guide and Additional Guidance (LEA/District Application, Appendices A-E) to evaluate all parts of the LEA/District Applications. Department staff, and others who have been involved in school improvement and turnaround initiatives and technical assistance to schools will serve on evaluation teams to review the applications.**

**The evaluation team will include representatives from each of the following categories (the list is intended to identify the types and levels of participants and not to limit the evaluation team to these specific members):**

- **Department staff:**
  - **Federal Instructional Improvement Supervisors**
  - **Federal Grants and Resources Staff**
  - **School Improvement Staff**
  - **Coordinator of the Division of Financial and Administrative Services**
  - **Director of Special Education Effective Practices and Supervisors**
  - **Area Supervisors of Instruction**
- **Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) staff**
  - **RPDC Directors**
  - **Missouri Turnaround Program staff,**
    - **Regional Shepherds**
    - **Trained coaches (work directly with turnaround principals)**
- **University staff who have worked in support and evaluation roles for the Missouri**

### **Turnaround Project**

- **Harris-Stowe State University**
- **University of Missouri, Columbia**
- **University of Missouri, Kansas City**
- **Southeast Missouri State University**
- **Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis, University of Missouri, Columbia**
- **LEA/District and school staff representing relatively high performing LEAs/Districts and schools**
  - **Central office administrators**
  - **Principals**
  - **Teachers**

**The Department staff will screen LEA/District Applications before the full team begins the final evaluation process. Applications will be screened to be sure that all required responses have been submitted and those responses are complete. Applications without the required responses will be eliminated from the initial evaluation process. (LEAs/districts will be given the opportunity to provide the required information and documentation.)**

**The full evaluation team will meet to review the LEA Applications. The full team will be divided into teams of no fewer than three readers to evaluate applications submitted by LEAs/districts that have committed to serve Tier I schools. Readers will be trained to use the LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application Scoring Guide. The reading teams will then use the scoring guide to assign points for the application. Applications will be ranked from high to low to determine successful grants. Once the applications have been scored, the scoring groups will present their findings to the full team to determine the final scores and rankings of the applications. If there are funds available, the process will be repeated for applications submitted by LEAs/districts that commit to serve Tier II and III schools.**

(1) The LEA/district has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's/district's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

**The evaluation team will review the needs analysis to determine if it is thorough and includes meaningful 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**

(2) The LEA/district has demonstrated that it 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 selected intervention in each of those schools.

**The evaluation team will review the LEA/District Application to determine the LEA's/district's capacity to fully and effectively implement selected interventions based on the following information:**

- **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**
- **Plan details that explain how the LEA/district will implement the required and permissible activities of the selected intervention(s) in a state approved planning and reporting system**
- **The selected activities are based on the results of the needs analysis**
- **How the LEA/district will support the interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level**
- **The plans for the selected interventions address all of the required activities of the required interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools**

**Capacity Interviews will be conducted with the LEA/districts that have applications that are of sufficient quality and are recommended to be funded by the review teams. The team conducting the Capacity Interviews will be Office of Quality Schools staff, MOSIG Grant Coordinator and MOSIG Resource Specialist. Required participants from each LEA/district include: Superintendent (or equivalent), Building Principal, and Turnaround Officer (if hired). Optional attendees may include: School Board Member, Teacher, and Federal Program Coordinator. This interview will be considered by the Department along with the reviewers ranking to determine funding status.**

- (3) **The LEA's/district's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's/district's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the Department or the LEA/district).**

**The evaluation team will review the LEA/District Application to ensure that:**

- **The LEA/district has submitted a complete budget for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve. The budgets must reflect the strategies in the improvement plans that describe the specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period.**
- **The LEA/district has submitted a budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve.**
- **The LEA/district has submitted a budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.**

## **Part 2**

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA/district may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's/district's commitment to do the following:

**If any component of Part 2, 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 Part cannot be considered met. As directed in the “LEA/District Scoring Guide Outline,” the evaluation team will review:**

- **the elements of the LEA/district implementation plan to ensure a complete and viable plan of action,**
- **if applicable, the plan to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure that all components will lead to a constructive and successful partnership,**
- **the plan to align other resources with the interventions to ensure that a comprehensive set of resources has been selected to support the improvement efforts of the school(s),**
- **the plan to modify policies and practices to ensure full and effective implementation of the chosen intervention(s), and**
- **the plan to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends to ensure a complete and viable plan is in place to support successful interventions and make them portable to other schools in need of improvement.**

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

**The evaluation team will measure components of the LEA/district design based on detailed plan submitted by the LEA/district to implement the intervention(s) including:**

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

**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.**

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

**The evaluation team will review documents and process artifacts designed to recruit, screen, select, and contract external providers to insure they are supported by state guidance, clearly define authority and accountability, and comply with state and federal regulations.**

- **LEA/district application process for external providers**
  - **Request for proposals**
  - **Memorandum of understanding**
  - **Provider contract**
  - **Evaluation procedures**
- **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**

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

**The evaluation team will review the LEA's/district's improvement plans and budget to determine if the LEA/district will align all available resources to meet the goals and objectives of the plan and those decisions are based on the results of the needs analysis.**

- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

**The evaluation team will review the LEA/District Application to determine if the LEA/district has appropriately modified practices and policies to enable it to implement the selected interventions fully and effectively.**

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

- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

**The evaluation team will review the LEA's/district's commitment and capacity to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends based on:**

- **Thorough explanation of how the reforms will be sustained**
  - **LEA/district support**
  - **Community Support**
  - **SEA Support**
- **Long range plans are in place to sustain the interventions and make successful practices portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts**

**B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:** In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period<sup>2</sup> to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? (*For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.*)

<sup>2</sup> "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

**Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:**

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following year?

**As part of the LEA application, the SEA will require the applicant to complete Section VI. A.— LEA/District/Building Year One Strategies and Activities Template and Section VI.C. – LEA/District/Building Year One Budget Itemization for all proposed pre-implementation activities. The reviewer will determine that the applicant has addressed the required components on page 16 of the 1003(g) SIG Evaluation Criteria form. The reviewer must respond affirmatively to the six indicators before the SEA will approve the pre-implementation budget. Activities not clearly designed to assist the LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year will not be approved. No points will be awarded or deducted based upon the applicant's planned use of pre-implementation activities.**

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

**As part of the LEA application, the SEA will require the applicant to complete the following for pre-implementation and year one activities:**

**Section VI. A.— LEA/District/Building Year One Strategies and Activities Template**

**Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity**

**Section VII. C.— LEA/District Actions**

**Section VII. D.— Timeline**

**Section VII. F.— Services and Activities**

**The applicant must address all proposed pre-implementation activities in the sections listed above. The reviewer will determine that the applicant has addressed the required pre-implementation components on page 16 of the 1003(g) SIG Evaluation Criteria form. The reviewer must respond affirmatively to the six indicators before the SEA will approve the pre-implementation activities. Activities not clearly designed to assist the LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year will not be approved. No points will be awarded or deducted based upon the applicant’s planned use of pre-implementation activities.**

**C. CAPACITY:** The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section C Capacity here:**

As the LEAs/districts develop their applications, Department staff and others will collaborate with LEAs/districts to help them fully understand the requirements of each intervention, and the Department and the LEA/district will cooperatively determine the LEA/district capacity to serve the Tier I schools in the LEA/district. 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 Improvement) will review the documentation to determine if the claim is valid. Decisions will be based on the factors listed on the bulleted items listed below. Also, Office of Quality Schools staff 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.

After the LEA/district's application has been evaluated by the review teams, Capacity Interviews will be conducted with the LEA/districts that have applications that are of sufficient quality and are recommended to be funded by the review teams. The team conducting the Capacity Interviews will be Office of Quality Schools staff, MOSIG Grant

**Coordinator and MOSIG Resource Specialist. Required participants from each LEA/district include: Superintendent (or equivalent), Building Principal, and Turnaround Officer (if hired). Optional attendees may include: School Board Member, Teacher, and Federal Program Coordinator. This interview will be considered by the Department along with the reviewers ranking to determine funding status.**

**By February 7, 2012, LEA/districts will be notified, in writing, if the applicant did not demonstrate sufficient capacity to implement the school improvement activities and their application is subsequently denied. In the Department's notice, it will state the reasons for the denial.**

**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 about an LEA's capacity will be based on the following factors:**

- **Staff has been identified with the credentials and capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.**

**Model(s):All**

- **The ability of the Local Education Agency (LEA) to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.**

**Model(s):All**

- **A commitment to support the selected intervention model has been indicated by:**
  - **The teachers' union/teachers**
  - **The school board**
  - **Parents**

**Model(s):All**

- **A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year has been provided.**

**Model(s):All**

- **A strategic planning process has already taken place that successfully supported the selection and implementation of the intervention model.**

**Model(s):All**

- **The history of the LEA/district ability to recruit new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the model has been described.**

**Model(s):Turnaround, Transformation**

- **The ability of the LEA to control the turnover of teachers and administrators, particularly in the post-award contract period providing for stability in the implementation of the school's plan for improvement.**

**Model(s): All**

- **The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.**

**Model(s): Turnaround, Restart, Transformation**

- **Plans to provide at least an hour of additional instructional time per day, or provide a school-year calendar that exceeds 1044 hours of instruction for each identified Tier I and Tier II school to be served. If summer school time is proposed to meet this factor, it must be additional to any other summer school activities the district plans to implement.**

**Model(s): Turnaround, Restart, Transformation**

- **A governance structure is described that includes an LEA-based Turnaround Officer(s) or Turnaround Office that will be responsible for taking an active role in the day-to-day management implementing intervention model requirements of turnaround efforts at the school level and for coordinating with the Department.**

**Model(s): Turnaround, Restart, Transformation**

- **The availability of Charter School Management Organizations (CMOs) and Education Management Organizations (EMOs) appropriate to the needs of the school to be served that could be enlisted has been described.**

**Model(s): Restart**

- **Access to and geographic proximity of higher achieving schools, including but not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.**

**Model(s): School Closure**

**D (PART 1). TIMELINE:** An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

<b>TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12</b>		
<b>Projected Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
September, 2011	Receipt of approval for the waiver to carryover fiscal year (FY) 2010 SIG funds.	USDE
October, 2011	Release the list of Tier I, II, and III schools to the LEAs/districts.	Department
October, 2011	Inform LEAs/districts of program requirements and timelines.	Department
October, 2011	The final LEA application will be distributed to the LEAs/districts.	Department
October, 2011	The LEAs/districts will have fifteen days from the receipt of the final LEA application to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• declare their commitment to serve schools,</li> <li>• submit a projected list of schools it intends to serve, and the intervention model or improvement.</li> </ul>	LEAs/Districts
October, 2011 – November , 2011	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
October, 2011 – November , 2011	Collect necessary data, involve stakeholders, and begin developing LEA/District Applications based on the draft LEA/District Application.	LEAs/Districts
October, 2011 – November , 2011	Collaborate with the LEAs/districts to assist in determining capacity and commitment to serve Tier I and Tier II schools. (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.)	Department

<b>TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12</b>		
November 9, 2011	LEAs/Districts preliminary application content review deadline. (optional)	LEAs/Districts
November 14 & 15, 2011	Convene evaluation teams to preliminarily review the application content.	Department
December 16, 2011	Final LEA/District Application deadline.	LEAs/Districts
December, 2011	Screen the applications for completeness and organize the applications in preparation for the evaluation team review.	Department
January 17-18, 2012	Convene evaluation teams to review the applications.	Department
January 31, 2012	Conduct interviews to verify the capacity of the applicants.	Department
February 7, 2012	Notify any applicants of their lack of capacity and begin 14 day appeal process.	Department
January, 2012 – February, 2012	Consult with LEAs/districts to get additional information or amend the grant applications to ensure compliance with regulations.	Department
February 29, 2012	Final approval of grant awards will occur on or before this date.	Department
March, 2012	Pre - implementation funds available to approved LEAs/districts no later than March 7, 2011 or five days after final approval of the LEA/District Application.	Department
July 1, 2012	All funded applications will start activities if not already engaged in pre- implementation activities.	LEAs/Districts

**D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA’s approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information here:**

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s/district’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s/district’s School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA/district are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III

of the final requirements.

**The Department will use three elements of evaluation in order to determine if the LEAs/districts will continue to be funded. 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.**

- **The first will be an evaluation of fidelity to the plans for implementation of improved processes and practices in the selected schools.**
- **The second will measure progress on the SIG leading indicators.**
- **The third will be progress toward meeting the AYP targets established in cooperation with the Department.**

**Department staff and/or designated support team staff will meet monthly 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 School Improvement and Grants & Resources 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.

- (3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA/district establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's/district's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA/district are not meeting those goals.

**The Department will use three elements of evaluation in order to determine if the LEAs/districts will continue to be funded. Process and practice implementation measures will be weighted more heavily during the first year's evaluation period, and measures of leading indicators and assessment results will be weighted more heavily during years two and three.**

**Measures:**

- **The first will be an evaluation of fidelity to the plans for implementation of improved processes and practices in the selected schools.**
- **The second will measure progress on leading indicators designed to measure improvement activities.**
- **The third will be progress toward meeting the AYP targets established in cooperation with the Department.**

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 III 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 annual student achievement results will be evaluated. During and at the end of the first year of implementation of the selected 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 Tier III schools, SIG funding will not be renewed for the school(s).**

**At the end of the second year, if a school or schools 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. The results of the evaluation will be used along with the achievement data to determine if the SIG grant will be renewed.**

- (4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA/district that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA/district is approved to serve.

**Department staff and /or designated support team staff will meet monthly 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.**

**Monitoring will include evaluation of:**

- **The LEA/district and school fidelity to the implementation of the planned interventions and improvement activities**
- **Implementation measures and timelines**
- **Leading indicators as required by the SIG Regulations and those identified by the LEA/district and school**
- **The Department's Federal Financial Management staff will monitor the budgetary aspects of the grant implementation quarterly**
- **Annually the Department's Federal Financial Management and Federal Instructional Improvement staff will monitor LEAs that are receiving SIG funds using selected parts of the Department's Self-Monitoring Checklist which can be found at: <http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/fedprog/documents/MO5002336.pdf>.**

**Areas monitored will include but not be limited to:**

- **LEA/district and school improvement plans**
- **Obligation of funds**
- **Accounting requirements**
- **Staff paid with federal funds**
- **Supplement, not supplant**
- **Annual evaluation process**
- **Parent involvement**

○ **Budgets and expenditure reports**

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs/districts if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA/district applies.

**The Department will collaborate with each LEA/district that intends to serve Tier I and Tier II schools during the LEA/district Application planning process. Decisions will be based on:**

- **Available funds**
- **The overall merits of the LEA/District Application**
- **The capacity of the LEA/district to serve the identified schools**
- **LEAs/districts will be ranked to determine greatest need by:**
  - **LEAs/Districts with Tier I and Tier II Schools**
    1. **Ranked by the number to 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**
  - **LEAs/Districts with Tier III schools only**
    1. **Ranked by the number of Tier III schools in LEA/district**
    2. **Ranked by the number of Tier III schools in the lowest-achieving decile in the State**
    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.**

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

**The Department will collaborate with each LEA/district that intends to serve Tier III schools during LEA/District Application planning process. Decisions will be based on:**

- **Priority will be given to LEAs/districts that commit to serve schools eliminated from the Tier I and Tier II lists due to the “minimum n” of less than 30 waiver provisions.**
- **Priority will be given to LEAs/districts that commit to serve schools ranking in the lowest decile then the lowest quintile of achievement.**
- **Available funds**
- **The overall merits of the LEA/District Application**
- **The capacity of the LEA/district to serve the identified schools**

- **The number of students affected by interventions and improvement activities**

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

**The Department does not currently plan to take over schools.**

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's/district's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

**With the permission of the participating LEAs/districts, the SEA will provide and arrange common training and ongoing support for the implementation of interventions and improvement efforts related to the requirements of the grant program. Support team staff, Department staff, LEA/district and school staff will participate in training specifically focused on school turnaround. These groups will collaboratively design and implement sustainable and portable processes and practices to assure a focused effort to improve the schools in most need.**

**The LEA/District Application provides the opportunity for LEAs/districts to approve direct services to be arranged for and/or provided by the State.**

**The Department will seek outside partners and/or build capacity within the Department to provide support to LEAs/Districts during the planning, application process, implementation, and evaluation of SIG activities. Scope of work for the Department and its partner(s) may include but not be limited to:**

- **Advising/consulting with the Department on selecting data to provide meaningful feedback to LEAs and schools**
- **Performing a needs analysis of the district and school to assist in**
  - **coordinating with all involved stakeholders on the development of an intervention plan and its implementation; and**
  - **implementing a coherent, whole-school intervention model in partnership**
- **Developing a fair and consistent method to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing principal and determine whether the principal can serve as the instructional leader for the intervention.**
- **Providing frequent progress assessments and demonstrating an adaptability to changing program needs**
- **Demonstrating ongoing, significant progress while building district capacity to implement and sustain activities aligned with improving student outcomes**
- **Providing formative and ongoing reports on program effectiveness to include, but not limited to, student achievement, parental involvement, student attendance, and student discipline**
- **Employing research-based strategies that provide an immediate and dramatic turnaround in student achievement**
- **Working with the LEA to recruit and recommend teachers and a leader(s) who have**

**a proven record of success of increasing student achievement and assistance in implementing intensive induction and mentoring support for teachers**

- **Promoting parental capacity to support student engagement, motivation, and learning within school, at home and in the community**
- **Working with the LEA to expand community support to garner human resources needed for reform**
- **Evaluating teacher and leader performance and outcomes and make staffing recommendations accordingly**
- **Recommending changes to the school calendar according to student and program needs, for example, year-round schools or extending the length of the school day and working with the school division to obtain a commitment from teachers to allow for additional time for instruction and professional development.**
- **Providing comprehensive, coherent, manageable and integrated instructional and support programs.**
- **Recommending which existing programs are to be continued and which programs are to be eliminated.**
- **Recommending alignment of curriculum, instruction, classroom formative assessment and sustained professional development to build rigor, foster student-teacher relationships, and provide relevant instruction that engages and motivates students.**
- **Identifying and recommending supporting partners to address social, emotional and behavioral issues to provide a braided system of support... wrap-around services for low-income students so educators can focus on teaching and learning while ensuring students' social, emotional, and physical needs are met.**
- **Building capacity within the local school board to oversee and implement Missouri's Turnaround Model**
- **Building the capacity of district superintendents, assistant superintendents, human resource directors, and/or fiscal officers to oversee and implement Missouri's Turnaround Model**
- **Using data to identify and implement comprehensive, research-based, instructional programs that include:**
  - **development and use of frequent formative assessments permitting rapid-time analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction;**
  - **other data-driven instructional systems and strategies.**

## E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

**F. SEA RESERVATION:** The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

**Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:**

**The Department will use the SEA reservations to fund:**

- collaborative Department/LEA/district planning activities,
- Department support for LEAs/districts as they develop their applications, and
- Department support for LEAs/districts as they implement the selected interventions and improvement activities
- Department monitoring and evaluation of LEA/district SIG activities
- Department administrative activities related to the SIG program

**In addition the Department will seek outside partners and/or build capacity within the Department to provide support to LEAs/Districts during the planning, application process, implementation, and evaluation of SIG activities. Scope of work for the Department and its partner(s) may include but not be limited to:**

- Advising/consulting with the Department on selecting data to provide meaningful feedback to LEAs and schools
- Performing a needs analysis of the district and school to assist in
  - coordinating with all involved stakeholders on the development of an intervention plan and its implementation; and
  - implementing a coherent, whole-school intervention model in partnership
- Developing a fair and consistent method to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing principal and determine whether the principal can serve as the instructional leader for the intervention.
- Providing frequent progress assessments and demonstrating an adaptability to changing program needs
- Demonstrating ongoing, significant progress while building district capacity to implement and sustain activities aligned with improving student outcomes
- Providing formative and ongoing reports on program effectiveness to include, but not limited to, student achievement, parental involvement, student attendance, and student discipline
- Employing research-based strategies that provide an immediate and dramatic turnaround in student achievement
- Working with the LEA to recruit and recommend teachers and a leader(s) who have a proven record of success of increasing student achievement and assistance in implementing intensive induction and mentoring support for teachers
- Promoting parental capacity to support student engagement, motivation, and learning within school, at home and in the community
- Working with the LEA to expand community support to garner human resources

**needed for reform**

- **Evaluating teacher and leader performance and outcomes and make staffing recommendations accordingly**
- **Recommending changes to the school calendar according to student and program needs, for example, year-round schools or extending the length of the school day and working with the school division to obtain a commitment from teachers to allow for additional time for instruction and professional development.**
- **Providing comprehensive, coherent, manageable and integrated instructional and support programs.**
- **Recommending which existing programs are to be continued and which programs are to be eliminated.**
- **Recommending alignment of curriculum, instruction, classroom formative assessment and sustained professional development to build rigor, foster student-teacher relationships, and provide relevant instruction that engages and motivates students.**
- **Identifying and recommending supporting partners to address social, emotional and behavioral issues to provide a braided system of support... wrap-around services for low-income students so educators can focus on teaching and learning while ensuring students' social, emotional, and physical needs are met.**
- **Building capacity within the local school board to oversee and implement Missouri's Turnaround Model**
- **Building the capacity of district superintendents, assistant superintendents, human resource directors, and/or fiscal officers to oversee and implement Missouri's Turnaround Model**
- **Using data to identify and implement comprehensive, research-based, instructional programs that include:**
  - **development and use of frequent formative assessments permitting rapid-time analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction;**
  - **other data-driven instructional systems and strategies.**

**G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS:** The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including LEA Staff in the Kansas City and St. Louis Public School Districts

**H. WAIVERS:** SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

### WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Missouri requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 1: Tier II waiver**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier**

**III schools.**

**Waiver 2: n-size waiver**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** 30.

Assurance

The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.**

**Waiver 3: New list waiver**

Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

**WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS**

**Enter State Name Here** Missouri requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver**

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.**

**Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver**

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER**

**Enter State Name Here** Missouri requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver**

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

**Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS**

**(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)**

The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

**PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS**

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. 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.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

**The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.**

**LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

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

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA 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

Note: An LEA 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.

**B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA 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 commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
  - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
  - The LEA 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 application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA 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 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 application.
- (5) The LEA 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 commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA 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 must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- 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
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s three-year budget plan.

An LEA’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 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

**Example:**

<b>LEA XX BUDGET</b>					
	<b>Year 1 Budget</b>		<b>Year 2 Budget</b>	<b>Year 3 Budget</b>	<b>Three-Year Total</b>
	<b>Pre-implementation</b>	<b>Year 1 - Full Implementation</b>			
<b>Tier I ES #1</b>	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
<b>Tier I ES #2</b>	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
<b>Tier I MS #1</b>	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
<b>Tier II HS #1</b>	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
<b>LEA-level Activities</b>	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$6,279,000</b>		<b>\$5,981,500</b>	<b>\$5,620,000</b>	<b>\$17,880,500</b>

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) 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;
- (3) 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
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.**

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

- “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.

## APPENDIX A

### SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

#### **Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010**

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

## **Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations**

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

## **Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap**

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (*e.g.*, a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

### **LEA Budgets**

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

## **SEA Allocations to LEAs**

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

## APPENDIX B

	<b>Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier</b>	<b>Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier</b>
<b>Tier I</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” <sup>‡</sup>	Title I eligible <sup>§</sup> elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier II</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier III</b>	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. <sup>**</sup>	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two years.</li> </ul>

<sup>‡</sup> “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

<sup>§</sup> For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

<sup>\*\*</sup> Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.