



**LEA/District School Improvement Grant  
Application**

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

**CFDA Number 84.388A**

**Federal Award Number S388A100026A**

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
P.O. Box 480 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102**

**2011**

## FAST FACTS

### FEDERAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT, TITLE I, SECTION 1003 (G) OF ESEA

**AWARD:** In no instance will an award exceed \$2,000,000 or be less than \$50,000. Pre-implementation grant activities may begin upon grant approval; this is anticipated to be February 29, 2012. All other grant activities will begin July 1, 2012. All grant activities for year one must end as of June 30, 2013.

**DEADLINE:** All applications must be delivered to the Federal Grants and Resources Unit of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education by noon on Friday, December 16, 2011, or must be postmarked on Friday, December 16, 2011. Faxed applications will not be accepted.

**REQUIREMENT:** To be considered, the Department must receive an original and three copies of the entire application package. The applicant will also submit an electronic copy of the application package (including attachments) to [webrepliesig2010@dese.mo.gov](mailto:webrepliesig2010@dese.mo.gov) by 11:59 p.m. Friday, December 16, 2011.

An acceptable application must be submitted in the order listed in the application form. The narrative sections of the proposal must be double-spaced and the font used must not be smaller than 12-point. Other documents such as needs analysis, CSIP (school improvement plan) and other relevant documents may be attached as appendices.

**DELIVER RFP TO:** Federal Grants and Resources Unit  
7th Floor, Jefferson State Office Building  
205 Jefferson Street  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0480

**MAIL RFP TO:** Federal Grants and Resources Unit  
205 Jefferson Street  
P.O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0480

**CAPACITY INTERVIEW:** All LEA/districts who submit applications that are of sufficient quality to be considered for funding by the review team are required to attend a capacity interview with staff from the Department's Office of Quality Schools. This interview will be held in Jefferson City, Missouri on January 31, 2012. 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.

#### **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION QUESTIONS:**

Craig Rector, Coordinator  
Federal Grants and Resources Unit  
Phone: 573-526-1594  
Fax: 573-526-6698  
E-mail: [Craig.Rector@dese.mo.gov](mailto:Craig.Rector@dese.mo.gov)

#### **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM QUESTIONS:**

Jocelyn Strand, Coordinator  
School Improvement Unit  
Phone:(573) 751-1014  
Fax: (573) 522-1759  
E-mail: [Jocelyn.Strand@dese.mo.gov](mailto:Jocelyn.Strand@dese.mo.gov)

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

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

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

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

**Funding is subject to Federal appropriation.**

**DIRECTIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

**LEA/district approval for the Department to provide direct services:** Section 1003 (g) permits SIG funds to be used for the SEA (the Department) to provide and arrange for direct services to the LEAs/districts and the

schools. Examples of these services would include but not be limited to common training, coaching, mentoring and other services and activities that would support preparation of the LEA/District Application and the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the selected interventions and improvement activities in LEAs/districts and selected schools.

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

**Section IV. LEA/DISTRICT YEAR ONE TOTAL BUDGET & SUPPORTING DATA:** The Total Budget is the total of Year One Pre-Implementation, Implementation and Administration budgets for all building and district activities.

The Supporting Data section indicates the positions funded by the LEA, with School Improvement Grants 1003(g) subgrant monies and the required certification (if any) for those positions. All federally-funded positions, whether certified or non-certified, are to be reported. All positions are to be reported according to what the staff person is actually doing. Reported positions should not be different from what would be observed on site during a review or monitoring. For more information on federal programs’ positions coding, please refer to Exhibit 15 of the Core Data manual. This section should reflect the information submitted on screens 18 and 20 of core data. Information on Core Data can be found on DESE’s website at: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/coredata/CDmanual.html>.

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

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

**Section VI.B.i. LEA/District/Building Budget Template**

Use this template to enter the current year’s detailed school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds). Funds listed would include all Federal, state and local revenue sources.

**Section VI.A. - LEA/District/Building Year One Strategies And Activities Template**

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities. Include the Year One Pre-implementation Budget in this grid if applicable.

**Section VI.B. - LEA/District/Building Budget Template**

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school for each year of the three year grant period and any pre-implementation funds the district may request.

**Section VI.C. - LEA/District/Building Year One Budget Itemization**

Use this form to itemize the SIG funded LEA/district/building Year One and Pre-implementation budgets listed in Section VI. B. Also use this form to itemize the SIG funded LEA/district/building Year One and Pre-implementation Administrative Costs budgets listed in Section VI. B. Complete a budget itemization only for year one grant funds the district may request.

**Section VII. – PROJECT NARRATIVE/PLAN**

**Descriptive Information:** The LEA/district will provide information in Section B that details its plans for serving schools in Tiers I, II, and III. The information should be in enough detail for the grant evaluators to determine how the LEA/district has made decisions and how it plans to implement interventions and improvement activities in each school it commits to serve. Provide a project narrative/plan and documentation specifically addressing each item outlined in the following sections in accordance with Title I, Section 1003 (G). All items must be addressed. All narrative/plan and documentation must be organized as listed on the application form. If multiple buildings are included in this application, the narrative/plan must be provided for each building served.

**Timeline for the Cadre II, Year I SIG application process:**

<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

<b>TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12</b>		
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
November 14, 2011	LEAs/Districts preliminary application content review deadline. (optional)	LEAs/Districts
November 17 & 18, 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



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION  
 FEDERAL GRANTS AND RESOURCES  
 PO BOX 480, JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-0480  
**1003(g) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (SIG)**  
**Project Dates: February 29, 2012 to June 30, 2013**  
**CFDA Number 84.388A**  
**Federal Award Number S388A100026A**

**DIRECTIONS**

Mail the completed form postmarked or delivered by Friday, December 16, 2011 to: Federal Grants and Resources, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, PO Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480.

Questions, contact Federal Grants and Resources: Phone: (573) 526-3232; Fax: (573) 526-6698; or e-mail to: [webreplysig2010@dese.mo.gov](mailto:webreplysig2010@dese.mo.gov); Visit The Department's website at: [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov)

**THE DEPARTMENT'S APPROVAL - FOR DESE USE ONLY**

The Department AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	DATE	TOTAL APPROVED \$
--	-----------	------	----------------------

**SECTION I. - LEA/DISTRICT AND PROGRAM CONTACT INFORMATION**

LEA/DISTRICT/AGENCY NAME			COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE
NAME OF BOARD-AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	ADDRESS	CITY, STATE, ZIP	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER	
NAME OF GRANT CONTACT	ADDRESS	CITY, STATE, ZIP	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER	
NAME OF LEA TURNAROUND OFFICER (if known)	ADDRESS	CITY, STATE, ZIP	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER	

**SECTION II. - ASSURANCES**

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

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

The LEA/district must assure that it will—

- If selected attend the mandatory Capacity Interview held January 31, 2012 in Jefferson City, MO with the required LEA/district personnel;
- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA/district commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**SECTION III. - WAIVERS**

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

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION IV. - LEA/DISTRICT YEAR ONE TOTAL BUDGET & SUPPORTING DATA**

*This is the total of Year One Pre-Implementation, Implementation and Administration budgets for all building and district activities.*

<b>YEAR ONE SIG FUNDS</b>	<b>6100</b> Certificated Salaries	<b>6150</b> Non- Certificated Salaries	<b>6200</b> Employee Benefits	<b>6300</b> Purchased Services	<b>6400</b> Materials & Supplies	<b>6500</b> Capital Outlay	<b>6600</b> Other	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1100</b> Instruction <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>1200</b> Supplemental Instruction (Title I) <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>2100</b> Non-Instructional Support Services <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>2200</b> Professional Development <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>2600</b> Planning and Evaluation <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>3000</b> Community Services <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>Program Costs Subtotal</b> <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>Indirect Costs</b>								
<b>Administrative Costs</b> <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS SUBTOTAL</b> <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b> <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								



**SECTION VI.A. - LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING YEAR ONE STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES TEMPLATE (COPY AS NEEDED)**

List the strategies from the LEA/district implementation plan and school plans that support the selected interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level and for each school to be served. Relate the strategies and activities from the plans to the budget codes from the budget template and complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school the LEA/district has committed to serve. Include references to the Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps that direct the implementation of the intervention and improvement activities. Include the Year One Pre-implementation Budget in this grid if applicable.

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME		COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE
<b>Budget Codes</b>	<b>Related Strategies and Activities</b>	
<b>1100</b> Instruction		
<b>1100</b> Instruction <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
<b>1200</b> Supplemental Instruction(Title I)		
<b>1200</b> Supplemental Instruction(Title I) <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
<b>2100</b> Non-Instructional Support Services		
<b>2100</b> Non-Instructional Support Services <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
<b>2200</b> Professional Development		
<b>2200</b> Professional Development <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
<b>2600</b> Planning and Evaluation		
<b>2600</b> Planning and Evaluation <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
<b>3000</b> Parent Involvement		
<b>3000</b> Parent Involvement <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
<b>Administrative Costs</b>		
<b>Administrative Costs</b> <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		

**SECTION VI.B. - LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING BUDGET TEMPLATE(COPY AS NEEDED)**

Use this template to enter required school and LEA/district budget totals to be submitted with the LEA/District SIG Application. Complete a budget for the LEA/district and each school for each year of the three year grant period and any pre-implementation funds the district may request.

Check the box below that applies to this budget template.(Check only one box)

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>PRE-IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>YEAR ONE IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>YEAR TWO IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>YEAR THREE IMPLEMENTATION</b>
--	---	---	---

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME					COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE			
Year One 2012-13	6100 Certificated Salaries	6150 Non-Certificated Salaries	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	6600 Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1200 Supplemental Instruction(Title I)								
1200 Supplemental Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG								
2100 Non-Instructional Support Services								
2100 Non-Instructional Support Services 1003 (g) SIG								
2200 Professional Development								
2200 Professional Development 1003 (g) SIG								
2600 Planning and Evaluation								
2600 Planning and Evaluation 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Community Services								
3000 Community Services 1003 (g) SIG								
<b>Administrative Costs</b>								
<b>Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG</b>								
<b>Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG )</b>								
<b>1003 (g) SIG Subtotal</b>								
<b>Grand Total</b>								

**SECTION VI.B.i. - LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING BUDGET TEMPLATE (COPY AS NEEDED)**

Use this template to enter the school year 2011-2012 detailed school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds). Funds listed would include all Federal, state and local revenue sources.

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME					COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE			
Year One 2012-13	6100 Certificated Salaries	6150 Non-Certificated Salaries	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	6600 Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1200 Supplemental Instruction (Title I)								
2100 Non- Instructional Support Services								
2200 Professional Development								
2600 Planning and Evaluation								
3000 Community Services								
Administrative Costs								
Program Costs Subtotal								
Grand Total								

**SECTION VI.C. - LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING YEAR ONE BUDGET ITEMIZATION (COPY AS NEEDED)**

Check the box below that applies to this budget itemization. (Check only one box)

<input type="checkbox"/> PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	<input type="checkbox"/> PRE-IMPLEMENTATION ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	<input type="checkbox"/> YEAR ONE IMPLEMENTATION	<input type="checkbox"/> YEAR ONE IMPLEMENTATION ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
---	---	--	--

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME	COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE
----------------------------	---------------------------------

BUDGET ITEMIZATION	GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED
<b>6100:</b> Certificated Salaries	
<b>6100 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>6150:</b> Non-Certificated Salaries	
<b>6150 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>6200:</b> Employee Benefits <i>(optional categories)</i> FICA Medicare Retirement (Teacher or Non-Teacher) Health, Life, and/or Dental Insurance Other Benefits	
<b>6200 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>6300:</b> Purchased Services	
<b>6300 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>6400:</b> Materials/Supplies	
<b>6400 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>6100-6400 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>Indirect Cost Optional</b> (Restricted Rate: ____% X Subtotal)	<b>\$</b>
<b>6500:</b> Capital Outlay	
<b>6500 Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>

## SECTION VII. – PROJECT NARRATIVE/PLAN

Provide a project narrative/plan and documentation specifically addressing each item outlined in the following sections in accordance with Title I, Section 1003 (G). All items must be addressed. All narrative/plan and documentation must be organized as listed below. If multiple buildings are included in this application, the narrative/plan must be provided for each building served.

### SECTION VII A - NEEDS AND CAPACITY

- (1) Demonstrate analysis of needs and capacity to implement selected interventions
  1. Provide information that explains how your LEA/district has analyzed the needs of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school you intend to serve
    - a. discuss the most significant results of the needs analysis with supporting data
    - b. the methods used to gather the data.
    - c. list the selected intervention for each school
  2. Provide the following information as it applies to LEA/district-level activities and individual school plans and activities (including any pre-implementation activities, if proposed):
    - a. A description of recent school improvement initiatives the LEA/district has implemented in its low-achieving schools and progress of and results from those initiatives
      - i. The school improvement efforts include activities that are required or permissible activities listed in the SIG required interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools
      - ii. There is evidence of LEA/district-level support
      - iii. There is evaluation data available
      - iv. The activities have or have not been successful
    - b. Plan details that explain how the LEA/district will implement the required and selected permissible activities of the selected intervention (s)
      - i. There is a detailed improvement plan for each school to implement the interventions and improvement activities
      - ii. The plan is written in a format consistent with the requirements of Missouri's planning, budget, and reporting system. (See Appendix B for additional information.)
      - iii. The plan is based on improvement activities focused on the significant findings of the needs analysis
      - iv. Procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the strategies
      - v. The plan is based on improvement activities focused on the significant findings of the needs analysis
      - vi. Procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the strategies
      - vii. The plans indicate that the required activities of the selected interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools will be implemented
      - viii. The plans indicate that appropriate permissible activities of the selected interventions will be implemented
    - c. How the LEA/district will support the interventions and improvement activities at the central office level
      - i. Planned LEA/district-level activities are listed
      - ii. Responsible staff are identified
      - iii. Staff responsibilities and expectations are listed

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

### SECTION VII B - NOT SERVING ALL TIER I SCHOOLS

(2) If the LEA/district is not planning to serve all Tier I schools, please list the schools that you do not plan to serve and explain why you have determined that your LEA/district does not have the capacity to serve those schools. (See Appendix C for additional information.)

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

### SECTION VII C - LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS

- (3) For each of the topics listed below, describe what actions the LEA/district will take to:
  1. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements for each Tier I and/or Tier II school the LEA/district commits to serve;
    - a. There is a detailed LEA/district-level plan to implement the intervention(s) including:
    - b. Responsible staff members for each strategy
    - c. Timelines for each strategy and action step
    - d. Identifies any pre-implementation activities the LEA/district proposes
    - e. Funding identified for each strategy
    - f. Implementation progress measures for each strategy
    - g. LEA/district oversight and support

## SECTION VII C - LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS - continued

2. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
    - a. LEA/district application process for external providers
      - i. Request for proposals
      - ii. Memorandum of understanding
      - iii. Provider contract
      - iv. Evaluation procedures
    - b. SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers
      - i. Guidance on related laws and regulations has been provided
      - ii. If applicable, the SEA has cooperated in the planning for the selection process
  3. Align other resources with the interventions;
    - a. The LEA/district has listed other resources that will support the interventions
      - i. Local, State and other Federal funding sources
      - ii. Higher Education partnerships
      - iii. Other educational resources
      - iv. Other community resources
      - v. The resources are selected to align with the findings of the needs analysis
  4. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively
    - a. LEA/district policies and practices that have been or will be modified
    - b. Projected impact of those changes
  5. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
    - a. Thorough explanation of how the reforms will be sustained
      - i. LEA/district support
      - ii. Community Support
      - iii. SEA Support
    - b. Long range plans are in place for sustainable processes and procedures that are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts
- (See Appendix D for additional information.)

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

## SECTION VII D - TIMELINE

- (4) What is the timeline for implementing the planned activities for the selected interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA/district commits to serve?
- a. The LEA/district timeline includes specific dates for implementation of all components of the selected intervention.
  - b. The timeline is reasonable, achievable, and reflects urgency.
  - c. The timeline identifies any pre-implementation activities the LEA/district proposes.
  - d. Implementation and evaluation dates are included in the school improvement plans or attached documents

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

## SECTION VII E - ANNUAL GOALS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

- (5) What are the annual goals for student achievement in communication arts, mathematics, and, if applicable, graduation rate the LEA/district has established for each Tier I and Tier II school receiving School Improvement Grant funds?
- a. The LEA/district has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State's assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.
  - b. Accurate and meaningful baseline data are provided
  - c. Targets will lead to moving out of School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring in a reasonable amount of time
  - d. Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

## SECTION VII F - SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

- (6) What services and activities will be implemented in the Tier III schools receiving School Improvement Grant funds?
- a. The LEA/district has specific strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:
    - i. Responsible staff members for each strategy
    - ii. Timelines for each strategy and action step
    - iii. Funding identified for each strategy
    - iv. Implementation progress measures for each strategy
    - v. Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step
    - vi. LEA/district oversight and support
    - vii. Identifies any pre-implementation activities the LEA/district proposes.

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

## SECTION VII G - ANNUAL GOALS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

## SECTION VII H - CONSULTATION WITH AND INVOLVEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

## SECTION VII I – COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES

1. **Implement one plan.** LEAs should demonstrate that policies, processes and procedures support (and do not contradict) the implementation of the buildings turnaround plan.
2. **Set ambitious targets for improvement.** LEAs should create improvement targets rigorous enough to demonstrate significant growth in student achievement over the three-year grant period, as agreed to by the Department.
3. **Design an innovative plan for recruiting, evaluating, and retaining the best teachers and leaders – and removing those who are ineffective.** To include: (1) annual evaluations of teachers using multiple measures, including student-growth data as one significant factor; (2) strategies for removing staff found to be ineffective in improving student outcomes; (3) incentives to attract teachers to high need areas.
4. **Identify high-risk students and create opportunities to succeed.** Strong proposals will feature early warning systems that use a combination of common formative assessment results and attendance measures to identify students at risk of failure. Such proposals also will provide supports designed to ensure that high-need students, including low income students, English-language learners, and special-needs students are achieving at grade level and are being prepared for success in college or a career.
5. **Be bold and innovative.** To receive these new SIG funds districts must demonstrate that they provide their schools with consistent support, freedom to innovate, and autonomy to make personnel decisions. True reform requires structural changes in the school day and year. Bold proposals will lengthen the school day and add weekend or summer programs for all students. Districts that request SIG dollars must pledge to change personnel policies that lead to turnover among school leaders and staff. Districts must ensure that schools can select their staff, remove ineffective employees, avoid an imbalance of novice teachers (unless part of an intentional staffing strategy), and retain high-performing staff members. In addition, LEAs must ensure that SIG dollars supplement, not supplant, the existing state, local, and federal funding that schools receive.
6. **Demonstrate teacher commitment.** Individual teachers have the largest single school effect on student performance. Strong proposals will demonstrate that at least 80% of the teachers agree to implement the plans included in the School Improvement Grant application.

# Appendix A

## FAQs

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

The following is from: ***Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965***, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, February 23, 2011. Access the complete document at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf>.

#### **H. LEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

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

##### **H-3. Must an LEA that wishes to receive FY 2010 SIG funds submit a new application?**

Yes. An LEA that wishes to receive FY 2010 SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition to support interventions in schools that are not being served with FY 2009 SIG funds must submit a new application. The LEA should bear in mind that, if it also received FY 2009 SIG funds, renewal of its SIG grant for the schools being funded with FY 2009 SIG funds will be made out of the FY 2009 SIG funds that were reserved by the SEA when it conducted its competition for FY 2009 funds. Funds from the FY 2010 competition, however, could be used by the LEA to support implementation of a school intervention model in additional schools, which may include schools that had not been identified as eligible to receive SIG funds for purposes of the FY 2009 competition but are eligible to receive SIG funds for purposes of the FY 2010 competition as well as schools that the LEA did not previously have the capacity to serve. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

- (1) Identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve;
- (2) Identify the school intervention model the LEA will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- (3) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, demonstrate that the LEA--
  - Has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school.
  - Has the capacity to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
- (4) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school;
- (5) Describe actions it has taken, or will take, to:
  - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
  - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
  - Align other resources with the interventions;
  - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively;and
  - Sustain thereforms after the funding period ends;
- (6) Include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application;
- (7) Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds;

- (8) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement;
- (9) Describe the goals the LEA has established to hold accountable the Tier III schools it serves with SIG funds;
- (10) Include a budget indicating the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use to--
  - a. Implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
  - b. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
  - c. Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application;
- (11) Consult with relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools;
- (12) Include the required assurances; and
- (13) Indicate any waivers that the LEA will implement with respect to its SIG funds.

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

Note that, even in a State that does not request a waiver to extend the period of availability of its FY 2010 SIG funds, the timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention ((6) above), the required annual goals ((7) and (9) above), and the budget ((10) above) should cover all three years over which the school intervention model will be implemented. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

**H-4a. Should families and other members of the community be included among the relevant stakeholders with whom an LEA consults regarding its application for SIG funds and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools?**

Yes. Family and community engagement is a critical component of a successful intervention in a Tier I or Tier II school. Accordingly, the Department strongly encourages LEAs to engage these stakeholders in the decision-making process regarding an LEA's SIG application. For example, an LEA might hold community meetings to discuss the school intervention model it is considering implementing and the reasons it believes that the model is appropriate; survey families and the community to gauge their needs; or provide updates to families and the community about the application process and status of the LEA's application. Given the importance of family and community engagement to the success of an intervention, the open dialogue and engagement with these stakeholders should not end when an LEA's application is approved, but should continue through the pre-implementation stage and throughout the implementation of the intervention model. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

An LEA that applies for a SIG grant must serve each of its Tier I schools—including both Tier I schools that are among the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and Tier I schools that are newly eligible to receive SIG funds that the SEA has identified as Tier I schools—using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. See section II.A.3 of the final requirements. An LEA that is serving some of its schools with FY 2009 SIG funds is not obligated to apply for FY 2010 SIG funds to serve additional schools, but if it chooses to do so, it must meet this requirement to serve each of its Tier I schools unless it lacks sufficient capacity to do so, particularly if the LEA wishes to serve any Tier III schools. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

An LEA might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools by documenting efforts such as its unsuccessful attempts to recruit a sufficient number of new principals to implement the turnaround or transformation model; the unavailability of CMOs or EMOs willing to restart schools in the LEA; or its intent to serve Tier II schools instead of all its Tier I schools (see H-9). An LEA may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I schools based on its intent to serve Tier III schools or the fact that it is currently serving Tier III schools with FY 2009 SIG funds. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**H-12a. May an LEA continue to serve as a Tier III school a school that was previously identified as a Tier III school and is being served in 2010–2011 with FY 2009 SIG funds but is identified as a Tier I or Tier II school for the FY 2010 SIG competition?**

In general, no; if it is to be served, the school must be served as a Tier I or Tier II school and must implement one of the SIG intervention models. If a school that was previously identified as a Tier III school and is being served in 2010–2011 with FY 2009 SIG funds is identified as a Tier I or Tier II school for purposes of the FY 2010 competition for SIG funds, that school may not continue to receive SIG funds as a Tier III school beyond the 2010–2011 school year. (See section II.A.3 of the SIG final requirements, providing that an LEA —may not serve with [SIG] funds ... a Tier I or Tier II school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions ... .||) If the LEA in which such a school is located wishes to continue receiving SIG funds for that school, it must apply for SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition to serve the school as a Tier I or Tier II school, as appropriate. The exception to this rule is that a Tier III school that is using SIG funds to implement one of the school intervention models beginning in the 2010–2011 school year may continue to receive FY 2009 SIG funds over the full three years of its grant to support that implementation. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**H-12b. May an LEA receive FY 2010 or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds for a Tier III school that also is receiving FY 2009 SIG funds as a result of the FY 2009 competition?**

No. Through the waiver to extend the period of availability, a Tier III school that is receiving SIG funds as a result of the FY 2009 competition will continue to receive FY 2009 SIG funds in the 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 school years, assuming it meets the requirements for having its grant renewed. Therefore, if a school that was previously identified as a Tier III school and is being served with FY 2009 SIG funds is again identified as a Tier III school for purposes of the FY 2010 competition, it may not continue to receive FY 2009 SIG funds and receive, in addition, FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. In other words, the school may not —double dip|| to receive SIG funds from both competitions. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

The following chart summarizes how the requirements and limitations described in H-6 through H-12 work together to guide an LEA's determination of which schools it must commit to serve with SIG funds if it wishes to receive FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 SIG carryover funds:

If an LEA has one or more . . .	In order to get FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds, the LEA must commit to serve . . .
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school†
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school <sup>1</sup>
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

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

(Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**H-18. How can an LEA demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four school intervention models?**

An LEA can demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve by addressing a number of matters. For example, the LEA might emphasize the credentials of staff who have the capability to implement one of the school intervention models. The LEA might also indicate its ability to recruit new principals to implement the turnaround and transformation models or the availability of CMOs and EMOs it could enlist to implement the restart model. The LEA might also indicate the support of its teachers' union with respect to the staffing and teacher evaluation requirements in the turnaround and transformation models, the commitment of its school board to eliminate any barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models, and the support of staff and parents in schools to be served. In addition, the LEA should indicate through the timeline required in its application that it has the ability to begin implementing the school intervention model it selects fully and effectively by the beginning of the 2011–2012 school year. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

#### **H-19. How can an LEA use —external providers|| to turn around its persistently lowest-achieving schools?**

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

#### **H-19a. How should an LEA select external providers to assist it in turning around its persistently lowest-achieving schools?**

As discussed above in Section C of the guidance (see, in particular, C-5), if an LEA wishes to contract with a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO to implement the restart model, it must select that charter school operator, CMO, or EMO through a —rigorous review process.|| All other external providers must also be screened for their quality. (See section I.A.4(iii) of the final requirements, providing that, in its application for SIG funds, an LEA must describe, among other things, the actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure their quality.) The purpose of such screening is similar to the purpose of the —rigorous review process,|| in that both processes permit an LEA to examine a prospective provider's reform plans and strategies. Screening an external provider helps prevent an LEA from contracting with a provider without ensuring that the provider has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the targeted school. In screening a potential external provider, an LEA might, for example, require the provider to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based and that it has the capacity to implement the strategies it is proposing. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, including both schools that are being served with FY 2009 SIG funds and schools that are eligible to receive FY 2010 SIG funds, may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools. See section II.A.2(b) of the final requirements. Given that the cap only applies to an LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, an LEA with, for example, four Tier I schools and four Tier II schools, for a total of eight Tier I and Tier II schools, would not be covered by the cap. However, an LEA with, for example, seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools, for a total of nine Tier I and Tier II schools, would be covered by the cap. Thus, continuing the prior example, the LEA with seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools would be able to implement the transformation model in no more than four of those schools. This limitation applies irrespective of whether the Tier I or Tier II schools in a given LEA are among the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or whether they are newly eligible schools identified as Tier I or Tier II schools at the State's option.

Note that, for purposes of the FY 2010 SIG competition, the number of Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA has is based on the number of Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA served through the FY 2009 competition and the number of additional Tier I and Tier II schools in the LEA that are identified as such on the State's FY 2010 Tier I and Tier II lists. For example, for FY 2009, LEA 1 had seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools, so it was covered by the cap. Using FY 2009 SIG funds, it implemented the transformation model in four of those schools. For FY 2010, one of the schools in LEA 1 that had been identified as a Tier II school for FY 2009 is not identified as either a Tier I or Tier II school for FY 2010, but the

SEA has identified two additional Tier I schools and two additional Tier II schools in LEA 1, so the LEA now has a total of 12 Tier I and Tier II schools (the four schools currently being served + the four schools that were identified in FY 2009 and that remain on the FY 2010 list + the four additional schools identified for FY 2010), which means it may implement the transformation model in a total of six schools, or two schools in addition to those that are being served with FY 2009 funds. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance; Revised February 16, 2011)

**H-21a. If an LEA that was not subject to the nine-school cap for FY 2009 is subject to the cap for FY 2010 because it now has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools and is already exceeding the cap based on the number of schools in which it is implementing the transformation model in 2010–2011, must it change the model being implemented in some of those schools in order to comply with the cap?**

No. An LEA in this situation need not change the models it is implementing in the schools already being served with SIG funds but, if it is already exceeding the cap, it may not implement the transformation model in any additional schools. For example, for FY 2009, LEA 2 had four Tier I schools and four Tier II schools, so it was not affected by the cap (because it only had eight Tier I and Tier II schools). Using FY 2009 SIG funds, it implemented the transformation model in all four Tier I schools and two Tier II schools. For FY 2010, LEA 2 has three additional schools identified as Tier I, so it now has a total of 11 Tier I and Tier II schools, which means the cap would apply. As a result, it may implement the transformation model in only five of its schools. Under these circumstances, LEA 2 would not be required to stop implementing the transformation model in one of its schools, but it would not be permitted to implement the transformation model in any additional Tier I or Tier II schools that it seeks to serve. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**H-21b. Is the nine-school cap for implementing the transformation model based on the number of Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA has or the number of Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA serves?**

The nine-school cap is based on the number of Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA has, not the number of Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA serves through the SIG program. Thus, the cap applies to any LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, even if the LEA applies to serve, and is approved to serve, only a portion of those schools. For example, the cap would apply to an LEA that has 10 Tier I and Tier II schools, even if the LEA applies to serve, and is approved to serve, only six of those schools. In this example, the LEA would be able to implement the transformation model in no more than 50 percent, or five, of its 10 Tier I and Tier II schools; the LEA would have to implement one of the other models in any additional school that it serves. (Added February 16, 2011)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

have met the LEA's annual goals for student achievement and must also comply with its obligations for making accountability determinations under section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

Further, note that the LEA should establish annual goals to cover all three years of implementation of the school intervention model, even if the second and third years will be funded out of continuation grants. (Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

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

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

See section III.A of the final requirements.

**H-28. Is there a limit on the amount of SIG funds an LEA may carry over?**

No. The provision in section 1127(a) of the ESEA that limits the amount of Title I, Part A funds an LEA may carry over to the subsequent fiscal year does not apply to SIG funds.

**H-29. May an LEA use SIG funds to pay for the costs of minor remodeling necessary to support technology that will be used as part of the implementation of a school intervention model?**

Yes, an LEA may use SIG funds to pay for the costs of minor remodeling that is necessary to support technology if the costs are directly attributable to the implementation of a school intervention model and are reasonable and necessary.

The overall goal of the SIG program is to improve student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools through the implementation of one of four school intervention models. If an LEA determines, with an eye toward the ultimate goal of improving student achievement, that the use of new technology is essential for the full and effective implementation of one of the models, it may deem the costs associated with that new technology a reasonable and necessary use of SIG funds. For example, if an LEA chooses to accelerate learning by implementing Web-based interim assessments and aligned on-line instructional materials for students and that implementation requires computers placed in classrooms rather than in a computer lab and wireless connectivity, it may use SIG funds to carry out minor remodeling needed to accommodate the computers in the classrooms and the wireless connectivity.

Please note that, under 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c), "minor remodeling" means "minor alterations in a previously completed building," and also includes the "extension of utility lines, such as water and electricity, from points beyond the confines of the space in which the minor remodeling is undertaken but within the confines of the previously completed building." "Minor remodeling" specifically "does *not* include building construction, structural alterations to buildings, building maintenance, or repairs." (34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (emphasis added).)

Any costs for minor remodeling that an LEA wishes to support with SIG funds must be included in the LEA's proposed SIG budget and reviewed and approved by the SEA. In addition, the LEA must keep records to demonstrate that such costs are directly attributable to its implementation of a school intervention model as well as reasonable and necessary.

## **J. PRE-IMPLEMENTATION\***

(\*Section J from the FY 2009 Guidance, —SIG, Race to the Top, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund,|| has been removed and replaced with this new Section J for FY 2010.)

### **J-1. May an LEA use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds for —pre-implementation||?**

Yes. Carrying out SIG-related activities during a —pre-implementation|| period 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. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

### **J-1a. What criteria should an SEA use in evaluating an LEA’s proposed uses of SIG funds for pre-implementation?**

In evaluating an LEA’s proposed uses of SIG funds for pre-implementation, an SEA should apply the same criteria that it uses to evaluate all other proposed uses of SIG funds, including activities proposed to be carried out during full implementation. In particular, and as discussed more fully in I-30, an SEA should consider whether the activities proposed to be carried out during pre-implementation:

- Are directly related to the selected model;
- Are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;
- Are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA’s needs assessment;
- Represent a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years;
- Are research-based; and
- Represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.

In J-2, the Department has provided a number of examples of SIG-related activities that may be carried out during the pre-implementation period. Note that, given the foregoing considerations, not all of these activities are necessarily appropriate for all LEAs or schools. Rather, they represent activities that might be appropriate if the activities are aligned with the criteria set forth above. An SEA is not exempt from considering the above criteria simply because an LEA proposes activities to be carried out during pre-implementation that are consistent with the examples in J-2. (Added February 16, 2011)

### **J-2. What are examples of SIG-related activities that may be carried out in the 2010–2011 school year in preparation for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year?**

This section of the guidance identifies possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation. The activities noted should not be seen as exhaustive or as required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities, depending on the needs of particular SIG schools:

- Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model (see H-19a).
- Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as

examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

- Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.

- Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

As discussed in F-4, in general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**J-3. When may an LEA begin using FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds to prepare for full implementation of an intervention model in the 2011–2012 school year?**

An LEA may begin using FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds after the SEA has awarded the LEA a SIG grant based on the LEA's having met all requirements for having a fully approvable SIG application, including conducting a needs assessment and identifying the model that will be implemented in each school the LEA will serve with SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**J-4. Is there a limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during the pre-implementation period that begins when it receives FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds?**

There is no specific limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during pre-implementation. However, funds for activities that are designed to prepare for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year come from the LEA's first-year SIG grant, which may be no more than \$2 million per school being served with SIG funds. Therefore, the LEA needs to be thoughtful and deliberate when developing its budget and should consider, at a minimum, the following:

- SIG funds awarded for the first year must cover full and effective implementation through the duration of the 2011–2012 school year, in addition to preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period.
- All activities funded with SIG funds must be reasonable and necessary, directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, address the needs identified by the LEA, and advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools (see also I-30). (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**Staffing**

**J-5. May SIG funds be used to recruit and hire the incoming principal and leadership team, who will begin planning for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year?**

Yes. Once it receives FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds, an LEA may use those funds to recruit and hire the incoming principal and leadership team so that they may begin planning for full and effective implementation of one of the four intervention models at the beginning of the 2011–2012 school year. However, an LEA that will be bringing on a new principal should be sure to consider and address the following issues with respect to State and local laws and requirements:

- the authority of the incoming principal in relation to the current year principal; and
- the timeframe within which the incoming principal may make human resource decisions regarding current and newly recruited school staff. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**J-6. May SIG funds be used to continue paying unassigned teachers who have been removed from the classroom?**

No, SIG funds may not be used to continue paying unassigned teachers who have been removed from the classroom and are not participating in activities to prepare their school for full implementation of a school intervention model. According to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87, *Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments* (2004) (OMB Circular A-87), Attachment A, C.3.a, —a cost may only be charged to a Federal program *in accordance with relative benefits received* (emphasis added). Continuing to pay unassigned teachers who have been removed from the classroom would not provide any benefits to improve the academic achievement of students through SIG funds. Thus, SIG funds may not be allocated for this purpose. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**J-7. May an LEA use SIG funds to buy out the remainder of the current principal's contract?**

No, an LEA may not use SIG funds to buy out the remainder of the current principal's contract. As noted above (see J-6), in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, Attachment A, C.3.a, —a cost may only be charged to a Federal program in

accordance with relative benefits received. Although a principal may need to be replaced in order to fully implement a SIG intervention model, buying out the remainder of the current principal's contract would not provide any benefits to improve the academic achievement of students and, therefore, SIG funds may not be allocated for this purpose. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

### **Development of External Partnerships**

#### **J-8. For a school implementing the restart model, may an LEA use SIG funds to conduct the rigorous review process required to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO?**

Yes, an LEA may use SIG funds to conduct the required rigorous review process for selecting a charter school operator, CMO, or EMO to implement the restart model, and to contract with the selected entity. Conducting the rigorous review process during pre-implementation should enable the LEA to ensure that the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO it selects to implement the restart model will be ready to begin full implementation by the start of the 2011–2012 school year. (See C-5.)

#### **J-9. May an LEA use SIG funds to hire external providers to assist in planning for and carrying out activities necessary for full implementation of a school intervention model in the following year?**

Yes, an LEA may use SIG funds to hire external providers to assist in planning for and carrying out activities necessary for full implementation of a school intervention model in the following year. However, the LEA should bear in mind that the SIG funds it is awarded for the first year of implementation must fund both activities carried out during pre-implementation and full and effective implementation for the duration of the following school year. Therefore, the LEA should be careful in using its SIG funds for activities such as hiring external providers for planning purposes to ensure that it has sufficient funds to fully implement its intervention models.

Additionally, an LEA should be sure that all external providers with which it contracts are screened to ensure their quality. Like the rigorous review process for charter school operators, CMOs, and EMOs, screening other external providers enables an LEA to ensure that a provider with which it contracts is qualified to assist the LEA in making meaningful changes and implementing comprehensive reform in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA serves with SIG funds (see H-19a; I-24a). (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

### **Instructional Programs**

#### **J-10. May an LEA use SIG funds prior to full implementation to provide supplemental remediation or enrichment to students in schools that will begin full implementation of a SIG model at the beginning of the 2011–2012 school year?**

Yes, an LEA may use SIG funds to provide supplemental remediation or enrichment services to students enrolled in a school that will begin full implementation of a SIG model at the beginning of the 2011–2012 school year. Within those schools, an LEA may use SIG funds, for example, for supplemental activities, including summer school for rising ninth-graders, designed to prepare low-achieving students to participate successfully in advanced coursework, such as AP or IB courses, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment in postsecondary credit-bearing courses; or to provide after-school tutoring for low-achieving students. Note that, to be supplemental, the remediation or enrichment supported with SIG funds must be in addition to what would otherwise be offered to students in the school (e.g., SIG funds may not be used to support a program that would supplant a regular summer school program offered to all students). (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

### **Professional Development and Support**

#### **J-11. May an LEA use SIG funds to pilot an evaluation system for teachers and principals at schools receiving SIG funds to implement a transformation model?**

Yes, an LEA may use SIG funds to pilot the rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that are required in schools implementing the transformation model. To meet the requirements of the transformation model, the pilot evaluation system must take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance, on-going collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement, and high school graduation rates. The pilot evaluation system must also be designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. Although an LEA might want to establish and implement a teacher and principal evaluation system that includes all teachers and principals within the LEA, SIG funds may not be used for district-wide activities. However, prior to launching a district-wide teacher and principal evaluation system, an LEA may use SIG funds to pilot the system for teachers and principals only at schools that are being served with SIG funds to ensure that the system is a useful tool that operates as intended.

Similarly, an LEA may use SIG funds to support the salaries of evaluators who, as part of the LEA's preparation to fully implement an intervention model, observe and evaluate teachers in schools that are receiving SIG funds to begin implementing an intervention model at the beginning of the 2011–2012 school year. An LEA might also consider using SIG funds to provide additional training to the individuals who will be observing and evaluating teachers in schools receiving SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

### **Preparation for Accountability Measures**

#### **J-12. May an LEA use SIG funds to pay for a needs assessment in order to select appropriate school intervention models for inclusion in the LEA's SIG application?**

No, an LEA may not use SIG funds to pay for a needs assessment in order to determine which model to implement in particular schools prior to submitting its SIG application. As specified in J-2, an LEA may use SIG funds only after the LEA has received a grant award of FY 2010 or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds based on the LEA's fully approvable SIG application.

An SEA may use its section 1003(a) funds or part of the SIG funds it may reserve for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses to support a needs assessment in its LEAs. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

### **Other**

#### **J-13. May an LEA use SIG funds during pre-implementation in a targeted assistance school that will fully implement a school intervention model through a schoolwide waiver beginning in the 2011–2012 school year?**

Yes. As discussed in F-1, the Secretary is inviting requests for waivers to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school operating a targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program so that it can implement a school intervention model. A targeted assistance school that receives FY 2010 or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds to implement a model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year would need to become a schoolwide school, through the schoolwide waiver, beginning in the 2011–2012 school year. Although the school would remain a targeted assistance school throughout the 2010–2011 school year, the Department will construe the schoolwide waiver to apply to SIG-related activities carried out in the 2010–2011 school year using SIG funds if those activities are designed to prepare the LEA to implement an intervention model fully and effectively in the 2011–2012 school year. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

#### **J-14. May an LEA use SIG funds for minor remodeling of school facilities to enable the use of technology?**

Yes, an LEA may use SIG funds during pre-implementation to pay for the costs of minor remodeling that is necessary to support technology if the costs are directly attributable to the implementation of a school intervention model and are reasonable and necessary.

The overall goal of the SIG program is to improve student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools through the implementation of one of four school intervention models. If an LEA determines, with an eye toward the ultimate goal of improving student achievement, that the use of new technology is essential for the full and effective implementation of one of the models, it may deem the costs associated with that new technology a reasonable and necessary use of SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

## Appendix B

### MISSOURI PLANNING, BUDGET, AND REPORTING SYSTEM

#### ***GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES, and ACTION STEPS***

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

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

##### **Student Performance**

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

##### **Highly Qualified Staff**

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

##### **Facilities, Support, and Instructional Resources**

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

##### **Parent and Community Involvement**

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

##### **Governance and Leadership**

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

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

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

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

## Appendix C

### DETERMINING LEA/DISTRICT CAPACITY

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

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

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

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

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

The decisions will be based on:

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

- Direct services provided by the SEA and others

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

All LEA/districts who submit applications that are of sufficient quality to be considered for funding by the review team are required to attend a capacity interview with staff from the Department's Office of Quality Schools. This interview will be held in Jefferson City, Missouri on January 31, 2012. 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.

## Appendix D

### LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS

The LEA/district must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

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

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

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

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

- There is a detailed plan to implement the intervention(s) including: (The evaluation team will consider how this plan is aligned with all parts of the LEA/District Application (e.g. Needs Analysis, Timelines, Annual Goals, Budgets). If clear alignment cannot be determined, the plan will not meet the standard.)
  - Responsible staff members for each strategy
    - Implementation
    - Evaluation
  - Timelines for each strategy and action step
    - Timelines are reasonable and specific
    - Timelines reflect urgency
  - Funding identified for each strategy
    - Written budgets support each strategy
    - Funding is adequate to support implementation
  - Implementation progress measures for each strategy
    - A review schedule is in place to measure implementation of each strategy
      - Reviewer identified
      - Review periods identified (weekly, monthly, quarterly, etc.) and reasonable
      - Review metrics are identified and appropriate for the strategy
  - LEA/district oversight and support
    - The LEA/district governance structure will include a Turnaround Officer
      - Reports directly to the Superintendent
      - Oversees and/or coordinates all strategies of the LEA/District Implementation Plan
      - Served schools report directly to the Turnaround Officer
    - The LEA/district has system capable of collecting and reporting formative and summative data
    - The LEA/district will permit autonomies as possible (e.g. personnel decisions, compensation and incentive systems, budget authority, program design, professional development, calendar and daily schedule)

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

- LEA/district application process for external providers
  - Request for proposals (RFP)
    - Application process and timeline
    - Description of performance contract
      - Progress and outcome measures
      - Evaluation methods

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

#### Align other resources with the interventions

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

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

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

#### Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

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