

School Improvement Grants

Application for Fiscal years 2015 and 2016 New Awards Competition

**Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left
Behind Act of 2001**

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: MISSOURI



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

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (authorized under section 1003(g) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by No Child Left Behind (ESEA). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by No Child Left Behind (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. The Department published final requirements for the SIG program in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). In 2015, the Department revised the final requirements to implement language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, and the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, that allows LEAs to implement additional interventions, provides flexibility for rural LEAs, and extends the grant period from three to five years. The revisions to the requirements also reflect lessons learned from four years of SIG implementation. Finally, since the final requirements for the SIG program were published in 2010, 44 SEAs received approval to implement ESEA flexibility, pursuant to which they no longer identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. To reflect this change, the revised requirements make an LEA with priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools, and focus schools, which are generally the schools within a State with the largest achievement gaps, eligible to receive SIG funds. The SIG final requirements, published on February 9, 2015, are available at <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, provided approximately \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 provided approximately \$450 million in FY 2016.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas is eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2015 and FY 2016 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2015 and FY 2016 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements. The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2015/2016 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

Each SEA should submit its FY 2015/2016 application to its individual State mailbox address at: [OSS.\[State\]@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.[State]@ed.gov)

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

Paper Submission:

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

Michael Wells, Group Leader
Office of State Support, OESE
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W103
Washington, DC 20202-6132

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due no later than May 27, 2016.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact your OSS State contact or Michael Wells at (202) 453-6689 or by e-mail at Michael.Wells@ed.gov. Additional technical assistance, including webinars for State staff, will be provided in the spring.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)	Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 480 205 Jefferson Street Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480	
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant		
Name:	Craig Rector	Jocelyn Strand
Position and Office:	Coordinator, Grants and Resources	Coordinator, School Improvement
Contact's Mailing Address:	PO Box 480 205 Jefferson Street Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480	
Telephone:	(573)526-1594	(573)751-1014
Fax:	(573)526-6698	(573)751-1179
Email address:	craig.rector@dese.mo.gov	jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Telephone:	
Margaret M. Vandeven, Ph.D.	(573)751-4446	
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:	Date:	
X 	5-27-16	
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.		

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

The directions below indicate information an SEA must provide in its application for a School Improvement Grant. Where relevant, these directions distinguish between the information that must be provided by SEAs that have approved requests for ESEA flexibility and those that do not. For any section that is not applicable to a particular SEA, the SEA should write “Not Applicable.”

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

For SEAs not approved for ESEA Flexibility: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools and Eligible Schools: As part of its FY 2015/2016 application, an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition.

Directions: SEAs that generate new lists should create this table in Excel using the format shown below and attach the list to this application. An example of the table has been provided for guidance.

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2015/2016 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years.

For SEAs approved for ESEA flexibility: Eligible Schools List: Each SEA should provide a link to the page on its Web site or a link to the specific page(s) in its approved ESEA flexibility request that includes a list of its current priority and focus schools. That list should clearly indicate which schools are SIG-eligible (*i.e.*, meet the definition of priority or focus school in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*).

Missouri’s list of SIG eligible buildings can be found at <http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/qs-sig-FFY-2015-2016-SIG-eligible-bldgs.pdf>.

For all SEAs: Awards not renewed, or otherwise terminated: All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2016-2017 school year. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, reason for nonrenewal or termination, the amount of unused remaining funds, and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:					N/A

B. STATE-DETERMINED MODEL (OPTIONAL)

An SEA may submit one State-determined model for the Secretary’s review and approval. Submission of a state-determined model is not required. An SEA that previously submitted, and received approval for, a State-determined model need not re-submit that model. (*Check applicable box below*)

SEA is submitting a State-determined model for review and approval. (Please attach to the application.)

SEA is not submitting a State-determined model.

To be approved, a State-determined model must meet the definition of whole-school reform model:

A whole-school reform model is a model that is designed to:

- (a) Improve student academic achievement or attainment;
- (b) Be implemented for all students in a school; and
- (c) Address, at a minimum and in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, each of the following:
 1. School leadership
 2. Teaching and learning in at least one full academic content area (including professional learning for educators).
 3. Student non-academic support.
 4. Family and community engagement.

C. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information below in an LEA's application for a School Improvement Grant.

The actions listed in this section are ones that an LEA must take to receive a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to these criteria.

If applicable, the SEA should attach an LEA application review rubric that it will use to evaluate each of the actions listed below. If a rubric is attached, provide relevant page numbers below and a description if needed. If a rubric is not attached, provide a description of the evaluation criteria to be used.

Check here if an LEA application review rubric is attached.

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school that is designed to meet the specific needs of the school, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the school improvement needs identified by families and the community, and takes into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention for each school.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 19 & 22***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (2) The LEA has designed and will implement interventions consistent with the SIG requirements.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15 & 17***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (3) The LEA has demonstrated it will use the School Improvement Grants funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 7, 9, 17 & 19***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (4) The LEA has demonstrated how it has, or will, recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Page 9***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(5) The LEA has demonstrated how it will align other resources with the selected intervention.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 7, 9 & 17***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(6) The LEA has demonstrated how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Page 9***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(7) The LEA has demonstrated how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school that it proposes to serve, such as by creating an LEA turnaround office.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Page 7***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(8) The LEA has demonstrated how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 13 & 22***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(9) The LEA has described how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 9 & 17***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(10) The LEA has demonstrated how, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), it will implement one or more evidence-based strategies.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number in rubric: **Pages 7, 11, 15, 17 & 19***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(11) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Pages 3, 5, 7, 9 & 17***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(12) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that proposes to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA has described how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Page 17***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(13) An LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a whole school reform model developer, an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in a school, must demonstrate that (a) the evidence supporting the model includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the school to be served; and (b) it has partnered with a whole school reform model developer that meets the definition of "whole school reform model developer" in the SIG requirements.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Page 17***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(14) For an LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA has demonstrated that it will conduct a rigorous review process, as described in the final requirements, of the charter school operator, charter management organization (CMO), or education management organization (EMO) that it has selected to operate or manage the school or schools.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: **Page 9***

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

D. LEA BUDGETS: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section C, the SEA must describe how it will evaluate an LEA's budget and application.

The SEA must describe how it will review each LEA's budget, including a description of the processes the SEA will use to determine if it is appropriate to award an amount different than that requested in the LEA's budget request.

*Please note that an SEA may make a SIG award to an LEA for up to five years for a particular school, of which the LEA may use one school year for planning and other pre-implementation activities and up to two school years for activities related to sustaining reforms following at least three years of full intervention implementation. The LEA budget should address the entire grant period. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding for a particular school.

As part of the LEA application, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) will require the applicant to complete Section X-D – LEA Pre-Implementation and Section XI-C School Level Pre-Implementation for all proposed pre-implementation activities, implementation activities and continuation activities. The reviewer will determine that the applicant has addressed the required components of the 1003(g) SIG Evaluation Criteria form. The reviewer must respond affirmatively to the six indicators before DESE will approve the budget. Activities not clearly designed to assist the LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year will not be approved.

DESE will use four elements of evaluation in order to determine if the LEAs will continue to be funded. At the conclusion of the pre-implementation period and at the end of the first year of implementation, DESE will place a higher level of importance on evaluating the building's fidelity to its plan for implementing improved processes and practices and DESE's additional criteria for evaluation (found in F.1 and F.2). In addition, DESE will also evaluate the progress the building is making toward improving the SIG leading indicators and toward meeting the annual goals for student achievement.

During the second year of implementation and for the remainder of the grant period, DESE will evaluate the categories mentioned above with higher level of importance on evaluating progress in the leading indicators and academic achievement.

E. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

At a minimum, the timeline should include information regarding when the:

- (1) SEA will notify LEAs about the SIG competition;
- (2) LEA applications are due to the SEA;
- (3) SEA will conduct its review of LEA applications;
- (4) LEAs will be notified about their award status; and
- (5) SEA will award FY 2015/2016 SIG funds to LEAs.

Additionally, the SEA should specify if it is using FY 2015/2016 funds to make two-year awards or multi-year awards, through a waiver of the period of availability of funds, to grantees.

TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2016-17		
Projected Date	Activity	Responsible Party
February 3, 2016	Release the list of Priority and Focus schools to the LEAs.	DESE
March 29, 2016	Release the SEA Application	USED
April 19, 2016	Provide all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive School Improvement Grants with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s)	DESE
April 19, 2016	Post notice of proposed waivers on DESE website	DESE
May 20, 2016	Missouri's Committee of Practitioners reviews the SEA application	DESE
May 27, 2016	Submit SEA Application to USED	DESE
	Pre Application Meeting for LEAs	DESE
	Approval of Missouri's SEA application	USED
	Secure MO500 number for LEA application	DESE
June 27, 2016	Inform LEAs of program requirements and timelines.	DESE
June 27, 2016	The final LEA application will be distributed to the LEAs.	DESE
July 19, 2016	The LEAs will have fifteen business days from the receipt of the final LEA application to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • declare their commitment to serve schools, • submit a projected list of schools it intends to serve, and the intervention or improvement model. 	LEAs
June – August 2016	Conduct a thorough needs analysis of each of the Priority and Focus schools it intends to commit to serve with 1003(g) funds	LEAs
June – August 2016	Collect necessary data, involve stakeholders, and begin developing LEA Applications.	LEAs
TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2016-17		
Projected Date	Activity	Responsible

		Party
June – August 2016	Collaborate with the LEAs to assist in determining capacity and commitment to serve Priority and Focus schools. (Missouri believes that ongoing communication and support during the application planning as LEAs 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.)	DESE
August 26, 2016	Final LEA Application deadline.	LEAs
August 29- September 2, 2016	Screen the applications for completeness and organize the applications in preparation for the evaluation team review.	DESE
September 7-9, 2016	Convene evaluation teams to review the applications.	DESE
September 12-16, 2016	Conduct interviews to verify the capacity of the applicants.	DESE
September 19- October 17, 2016	Notify any applicants of their lack of capacity and begin 14 day appeal process.	DESE
September 12- October 21, 2016	Consult with LEAs to get additional information or amend the grant applications to ensure compliance with regulations.	DESE
October 24, 2016	Final approval of grant awards will occur on or before this date. DESE anticipates awarding approximately eleven to fifteen, five-year awards utilizing FY 2013-16 1003(g) federal funds.	DESE
November 1, 2016	All funded applications will start activities.	LEAs
December 1, 2016	Post all LEA applications (not funded and negotiated and funded) on the DESE website	DESE

Missouri will use FY 2015/2016 funds to make multi-year awards, that must be renewed annually, through a waiver of the period of availability of funds to grantees.

F. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information below.

- (1) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority and focus schools, as applicable, and describe how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools, or one or more priority or focus schools, in an LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

Annual Goals for Student Achievement

The key to Missouri achieving its goal of preparing all students to be college and career ready is in the development and implementation of a focused education reform plan that identifies specific goals and provides specific strategies implemented with precision and fidelity. To ensure the success of all students in the state, Missouri has implemented the Top 10 by 20 Initiative.

This comprehensive reform plan measures whether students are prepared for college and careers. It focuses on

student growth and gain, rather than absolute test scores, and maintains a commitment to disaggregating data to track whether schools are closing the achievement gap. The Top 10 by 20 Initiative is a solid, actionable plan for improving the education provided to all students in the state. The plan provides a road map for raising the bar for academic achievement enabling Missouri to achieve the status as one of the top ten performing states in the country by 2020. The strategic goals included in the plan are supported by specific and measureable objectives that serve as key milestones. Progress toward identified objectives is made available to the public through the Missouri Comprehensive Data System Portal (MCDS), which provides state dashboard data.

DESE will utilize the process outlined in the [ESEA Flexibility Waiver](#) and described below to ensure that the LEA's annual goals for student achievement are rigorous, relevant and attainable.

Missouri's standards and related assessments are considered to be among the most rigorous in the nation. (See National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) Brief, January 12, 2012, no. 5.) The credibility of Missouri's state standards also has been validated through NAEP outcomes. Due to the rigor of Missouri's achievement level standards, a 25 percent increase in student proficiency levels on Missouri's state assessments and a reduction in achievement gaps are ambitious goals, supported by the State Board and constituents from across the state. Missouri believes its AMOs must be ambitious to ensure that the system reflects our highest aspirations for all students to graduate college- and career-ready. Yet, they must also be attainable so that schools and LEAs find them to be meaningful and useful goals that guide improvement efforts.

DESE staff will review the applications to ensure that the goals outlined by the LEA and school are sufficient to show progress toward meeting the AMO's outlined in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Each year, members of the Regional School Improvement Team and DESE staff will evaluate the goals based on the most recent academic achievement data available to ensure that the LEA/school are making progress toward achieving the goals.

Renewal Determination

DESE will use four elements of evaluation in order to determine if the LEAs will continue to be funded. During and at the end of the first year of full implementation of the selected interventions and improvement activities, fidelity to implementation will be weighted more heavily in the evaluation.

- The first will be an evaluation of fidelity to the plans for implementation of improved processes and practices in the selected schools.
- The second will measure progress on the SIG leading indicators:
 1. Providing increased number of minutes within the school year;
 2. Student participation rates on state assessments in English language arts and mathematics for the group of total and the super subgroup;
 3. Dropout rate
 4. Student Attendance Rate
 5. Number and Percentage of students completing advanced coursework
 6. Discipline incidents;
 7. Chronic absenteeism rates;
 8. Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation and support system; and
 9. Teacher attendance rate
- The third will be progress toward meeting the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) established in cooperation with DESE.
- The fourth will be progress toward meeting DESE's additional criteria for renewal.

DESE staff and/or a regional school improvement team will meet monthly with LEA level staff and school principals responsible for the intervention and improvement activities. The LEA will provide documentation of implementation measures and leading indicator measures for each school served. DESE staff and/or the regional school improvement team will make not less than one school visit each month to monitor implementation. The school visits will include classroom observations, and building and LEA interviews.

DESE's School Improvement Unit will receive quarterly reports from the LEAs and a report from the regional school improvement team. These reports will document the schools and the LEAs progress toward implementation of the selected interventions and improvement activities. Data from quarterly measures of the required and LEA-identified leading indicators along with formative student assessment data will be reported as well. DESE staff will evaluate these formative reports to determine if the LEAs and schools have demonstrated fidelity to plan implementation, progress toward improving performance on the leading indicators and to inform the work of the regional school improvement teams. Missouri believes that ongoing collaboration and support, frequent communication, observation, and reporting with timely constructive feedback will help ensure fidelity to implementation and permit timely changes in plans and activities in need of improvement.

At the end of the first year of implementation, DESE will base its decision on whether to renew an LEA's SIG grant for one or more priority and/or focus schools on the DESE's evaluation of implementation progress and fidelity to the implementation plan. DESE will consider the following additional criteria for renewal:

- Implementation of the intervention model and plan on the first day of school
- Implementation of the plan's strategies
- Adherence to timelines
- LEA supports and technical assistance provided to identified schools
- Implementation of data driven decision making
- Approval of policies and implementation of practices modified to allow the school to implement the selected intervention model
- Implementation of professional development activities that address key finding of the needs assessment

Additionally, DESE will consider measures of leading indicators and annual student achievement results in making determinations about the grants renewal status. During and at the end of the first year of implementation of the selected interventions and improvement activities, fidelity to implementation and additional criteria for renewal will be weighted more heavily in the evaluation. If it is determined that the LEA has not substantially demonstrated its commitment to and progress on the implementation plan in one or more of its schools, SIG funding will not be renewed for the priority and/or focus school.

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

- (2) Describe the SEA's process for renewing the SIG award of an LEA that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities for a school, including the SEA's process for reviewing the performance of the school against the LEA's approved application to determine whether the LEA will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention for the school beginning the first day of the following school year.

DESE's process for renewing the SIG award for an LEA that elects to either conduct a year of planning and/or other pre-implementation activities will be evaluated on the following:

- Provision of professional development for all staff on the requirements of the selected intervention model
- Development of an approved schedule for providing increased learning time for both students and staff for year one of implementation
- Demonstration of compliance with the requirement to replace the principal (unless LEA elects to utilize the flexibility granted for LEAs in rural districts) for year one of implementation
- Demonstration of the replacement of 50% of the staff for those schools that elect to implement the turnaround model
- Demonstration that the district has not, and will not, transfer teachers and administrators from low

performing schools into the identified school

- Demonstration of active participation in the monthly support meetings with the regional school improvement team
- Development of a plan that rewards teachers (incentives, etc.) for teachers who are successful in improving academic outcomes for students

(3) Describe how the SEA will monitor, including the frequency and type of monitoring (*e.g.*, on-site, desk, self-reported) each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools, or priority and focus schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

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

Monitoring will include evaluation of:

- The LEA and school fidelity to the implementation of the planned interventions and improvement activities
- Implementation measures and timelines
- Leading indicators as required by the SIG Regulations and those identified by the LEA and school
- DESE's Federal Financial Management staff will monitor the budgetary aspects of the grant implementation including:
 - Obligation of funds
 - Accounting requirements
 - Staff paid with federal funds
 - Supplement, not supplant
 - Annual evaluation process
 - Parent involvement
 - Budgets and expenditure reports
- Annually, DESE staff will monitor LEAs that are receiving 1003(g) SIG funds using selected parts of the DESE's 1003(g) Self-Monitoring Checklist that will be updated to reflect new grant requirements.

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

Missouri acknowledges that it has insufficient funds to serve all eligible priority and focus schools. Missouri's current award and future awards will allow DESE to serve less than 10% of the schools that have been identified for priority or focus school status.

Missouri will utilize the criteria indicated below to prioritize school improvement grants to LEAs:

- Each school level grant application will receive a reader score based on the evaluation rubric (attached)
- 40 Competitive points will be assigned to each building's total reader score that is a priority school
- 35 Competitive points will be assigned to each building's total reader score that selects to start with a pre-implementation year
- 15 Competitive points will be awarded to each building's total reader score that has a school enrollment above 180 for the 2015-16 school year
- DESE will conduct a capacity interview to determine the school and LEA's ability to implement the plan outlined in the grant application.

(5) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

Missouri has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

(6) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

Missouri has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

G. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

By submitting this application for new awards, the SEA assures that it will do or has done the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Consult with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in this application.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority or focus school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Award each School Improvement Grant to an LEA based on an individual review of each application and a case-by-case determination of the amount needed to plan for implementation, as applicable, to fully implement a model, and sustain the model, as applicable, rather than make grant awards based on a formula.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers, including charter school operators and CMOs, to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or CMO accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of each LEA's grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority and focus school, as applicable. An SEA must post all LEA applications, including those of applicants that did not receive awards,

as well as applications to serve Tier III schools. Additionally, if an LEA amends an application, the SEA will post the amended application.

Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, seek and obtain approval from the LEA to have the SEA provide the services directly prior to providing services.

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

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

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance (*e.g.* funding staff positions, supporting statewide support, etc.) that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grants allocation.

DESE will use the SEA reservations to fund:

- DESE support for LEAs as they implement the selected interventions and improvement activities
- DESE monitoring and evaluation of LEA level SIG activities
- DESE administrative activities related to the SIG program

In addition DESE will seek to utilize outside partners and/or build capacity within the agency to provide technical assistance and support to LEAs during the implementation and evaluation of SIG activities. The scope of work for DESE and its partner(s) may include but not be limited to:

- Advising/consulting with DESE on selecting data to provide meaningful feedback to LEAs and schools
- Providing frequent progress assessments and demonstrating an adaptability to changing program needs
- Demonstrating ongoing, significant progress while building LEA level capacity to implement and sustain activities aligned with improving student outcomes
- Providing formative and ongoing reports on program effectiveness to include, but not limited to, student achievement, parental involvement, student attendance, and student discipline
- Employing research-based strategies that provide improvement in student achievement
- Promoting parental capacity to support student engagement, motivation, and learning within school, at home and in the community
- Working with the LEA to expand community support to garner human resources needed for reform
- Evaluating teacher and leader performance and outcomes
- Recommending changes to the school calendar according to student and program needs, for example, year-round schools or extending the length of the school day and working with the school division to obtain a commitment from teachers to allow for additional time for instruction and professional development.
- Providing comprehensive, coherent, manageable and integrated instructional and support programs.

- Recommending alignment of curriculum, instruction, classroom formative assessment and sustained professional development to build rigor, foster student-teacher relationships, and provide relevant instruction that engages and motivates students.
- Identifying and recommending supporting partners to address social, emotional and behavioral issues to provide wrap-around services for low-income students so educators can focus on teaching and learning while ensuring students’ social, emotional, and physical needs are met.
- Building the capacity of LEA superintendents, assistant superintendents, human resource directors, and/or fiscal officers to oversee and implement the requirements of the 1003(g) SIG Grant.
- Using data to identify and implement comprehensive, research-based, instructional programs that include:
 - development and use of frequent formative assessments permitting rapid-time analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction;
 - other data-driven instructional systems and strategies.

DESE staff will continue to seek feedback from identified LEAs, schools and other stakeholders related to the services that are being provided with the SEA level reservation.

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

Missouri requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. The SEA believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools or in its priority and focus schools, as applicable, or will allow any LEA in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

Part 1: Waivers Available to All States

Waiver 1: Period of availability of FY 2015 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2015 funds for the purpose of making three- to five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2017, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2015 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2021.

Waiver 2: Period of availability of FY 2016 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2016 funds for the purpose of making three- to five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2018, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2015 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2021.

Part 2: Waivers Available Only to States Not Approved for ESEA Flexibility

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2015/2016 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3

of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2015/2016 competition, waive the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the "all students" group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2014 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2015/2016 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a SIG model in the 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016 school years cannot request this waiver to "start over" their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I or Tier II title I participating schools that will fully implement a SIG model beginning in the 2016–2017 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement a SIG model beginning in the 2016–2017 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I and Tier II schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

Waiver 4: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2014 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2015/2016 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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

Assurances

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

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of School Improvement Grant funds to eligible LEAs. SEAs should attach their LEA application.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses 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.

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

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school, or each priority and focus school, as applicable, the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school, or in each priority and focus school, as applicable.

The models the LEA may include are: (1) turnaround; (2) restart; (3) closure; (4) transformation; (5) state-determined model, if approved; (6) evidence-based whole school reform model; and (7) early learning model.

Example (LEAs in an SEA approved for ESEA flexibility):

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY	FOCUS (if applicable) ²	INTERVENTION
Priority School ES #1	xxxxx	X		turnaround
Priority School HS #1	xxxxx	X		state-determined model
Priority School MS #1	xxxxx	X		transformation
Priority School ES #2	xxxxx	X		turnaround

Example (LEAs in an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility):

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II only)
Tier I ES #1	xxxxx	X			turnaround
Tier I ES #2	xxxxx		X		early learning model
Tier I MS #1	xxxxx	X			transformation
Tier II HS #1	xxxxx	X			state-determined model

²An LEA in which one or more priority schools are located must serve all of these schools before it may serve one or more focus schools.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section VIII in the LEA application.

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, based on a needs analysis that, among other

things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-A, X-B, X-D, X-F, XI-A, XI-C & XI-F in the LEA application.

- (2) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-F & XI-F in the LEA application.

- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, early learning model, or state-determined model.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section X-C & XI-B in the LEA application.

- (4) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-A, X-B & XI-B in the LEA application.

- (5) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section X-C in the LEA application.

- (6) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-A, X-C & XI-B in the LEA application.

- (7) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-C & XI-B in the LEA application.

- (8) The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve (for example, by creating an LEA turnaround office).

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-A & X-C in the LEA application.

- (9) The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-F & XI-F in the LEA application.

- (10) The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-C & XI-B in the LEA application.

- (11) The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-A, X-C, & XI-B in the LEA application.

- (12) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus

school, that receives school improvement funds including by

- a. Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
- b. Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-C & XI-E in the LEA application.

- (13) An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section X-C in the LEA application.

- (14) For an LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-D & XI-C in the LEA application.

- (15) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section XI-B in the LEA application.

- (16) For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will

- a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and
- b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section XI-B in the LEA application.

- (17) For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section X-C in the LEA application.

- (18) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA’s application.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections X-E & XI-D in the LEA application.

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

Missouri has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver and does not identify Tier III schools.

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

Missouri has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver and does not identify Tier III schools.

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

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use in each school it proposes to serve and the funds it will use to —

- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools, or priority and focus schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application (SEAs without ESEA flexibility only).

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover all of the years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I, Tier II, priority, or focus school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s budget plan. Additionally, an LEA’s budget may include up to one full academic year for planning activities and up to two years to support sustainability activities. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding to serve a single school.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, or the number of priority and focus schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

Example: LEA Proposing a Planning Year for One or More Schools

LEA XX BUDGET						
	Year 1 Budget (Planning)	Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five- Year Total
Priority ES #1	\$150,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,100,000	\$750,000	\$4,356,000
Priority ES #2	\$119,250	\$890,500	\$795,000	\$750,000	\$500,750	\$3,055,500
Priority HS #1	\$300,000	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$650,000	\$5,245,750
Focus MS #1	\$410,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,775,000	\$1,550,400	\$550,000	\$5,755,400
LEA-level Activities			\$150,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$400,000
Total Budget	\$879,250	\$4,812,250	\$5,520,000	\$4,950, 400	\$2,550,750	\$18,812,650

Example: LEA Proposing to Implement a Model in One or More Schools on the First Day of the Upcoming School Year

LEA XX BUDGET							
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 3 Budget (Full implementation)	Year 4 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities)	Five-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 (Full Implementation)					
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$650,000	\$450,000	\$5,038,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$2,907,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$5,550,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$800,000	\$550,000	\$7,085,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$1,000,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$2,200,000	\$1,500,000	\$21,580,500

Note: An LEA may fill out both charts if it is applying for a planning year for some, but not all, of the schools it proposes to serve.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Sections IV, V, VI, IX-A & IX-B in the LEA application.

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (3) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- (4) Ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

This requirement is addressed by the LEAs in Section II in the LEA application.

E. WAIVERS: If an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. **NOTE:** Only LEAs in SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility may request the following waivers.

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

Missouri has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Continuation Awards Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/2016 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2015 and/or FY 2016 SIG funds. If no continuation awards will be made with FY 2015 and/or FY 2016 funds, indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	YEAR SCHOOL BEGAN SIG IMPLEMENTATION	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 15/FY 16 ALLOCATION
NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 15/FY16:			

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, description of reason for nonrenewal or termination, amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocating those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction). If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:					

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2015/2016 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2015/2016 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards³ to its LEAs unless the SEA has an approved new awards application.
- Use the renewal process described in Section II(C) of the final requirements to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- If the SEA approves any amendments to an LEA application, post the LEA's amended application on the SEA website.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

For states planning to use FY 2015 and FY 2016 SIG funds for continuation awards only: By submitting the assurances and information above, the SEA agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a FY 2015/2016 SIG application for new awards; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the application for new awards (page 3).

³ A "new award" is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2016–2017 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2015 or FY 2016 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.