

**APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Charlotte Hughes</p> <p>Position and Office: Director, Program Monitoring and Support Division</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: MSC # 6351, Raleigh, NC, 2</p> <p>Telephone: 919.807.3957</p> <p>Fax: 919.807.3968</p> <p>Email address: <a href="mailto:chughes@dpi.state.nc.us">chughes@dpi.state.nc.us</a></p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): June S. Atkinson June St. Clair Atkinson</p>	<p>Telephone: 919.807.3957</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p><i>June St. Clair Atkinson</i></p> <p>X</p>	<p>Date: February 16, 2010</p>
<p>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.</p>	

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

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.

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has determined a list of schools for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III in accordance with the final requirements governing the process that a State educational agency (SEA) uses to award school improvement funds authorized under section 1003 (g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Appendix A of this application outlines North Carolina’s definition for “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Under the provisions of the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2010, NC identified newly eligible schools for Tier III. Newly eligible schools included in Tier III are Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II and that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates. For the purpose of schools that have been added to Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools are schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and schools that are Title I participating. The list of schools is attached in Appendix B.

**B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:** An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA’s application for a School Improvement Grant.

### **Part 1**

Each LEA with schools identified for Tier I and Tier II will be notified of eligibility in order to provide an opportunity for submitting a Letter of Intent. Priority for funding will be given to LEAs submitting an LEA Application to serve its Tier I and/or Tier II schools. Applications and budgets for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools will be prioritized for funding as outlined in section D(5) and D(6) of the SEA application.

Each application will be reviewed to determine if the LEA has sufficiently demonstrated an analysis of needs for each school, identified specific interventions for all schools, addressed capacity for supporting interventions, and budgeted to appropriately implement selected interventions within a specific timeline. The SIG Scoring Rubric for Tier I and Tier II schools as well as the SIG Scoring Rubric for Tier III schools is attached in Appendix D.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

For each of the SIG requirements listed in the rubric, the LEA application will be rated as follows:

Leading	Developing	Emerging	Lacking
10 points	6 points	2 points	0 points

LEAs submitting requests for Tier I and/or Tier II schools will be prioritized for funding based on the total number of points received out of a possible 50 points total. LEAs submitting requests for Tier III schools will be prioritized for funding based on the total number of points received out of a possible 40 points total. An LEA Application that receives a rating of 0 for any required component will not be approved.

**Part 2**

In order to effectively assess the LEA’s commitment to implement interventions throughout the period of SIG funding, DPI will utilize the Scoring Rubric (Appendix D) for each of the required components. Exemplars for each component are described as Leading in the rubric. DPI will provide funding to LEAs in priority for applications receiving the highest overall scores based on ratings described in section B(1). Descriptions must clearly demonstrate the following:

- Evidence of a thorough needs assessment clearly aligned to the selected intervention;
- Description of external partner/provider selection, alignment of resources, modification of existing policies or practices, and efforts to sustain the reforms;
- Capacity to support the interventions with adequate resources, monitoring, and evaluation; and
- Proposed budgets sufficient to implement the selected intervention.

In the LEA application, LEAs will have an opportunity to address any interventions that have been implemented prior to the receipt of SIG funds (see attached LEA Application). DPI will monitor the LEAs implementation of the interventions supported with SIG funds throughout the period of fund availability as described in section D(4) of this application to further ensure LEA commitment is sustained.

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

To determine each LEAs capacity to support its schools, DPI annually reviews district capacity based on specific criteria as a part the Statewide System of Support. Capacity is measured by a combined index of the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funding (DSSF) index and the low wealth percentage. Capacity should not be equated to funding levels.

DSSF index combines weighted “community” variables that are correlated to low student performance. It provides information on the student population.

- Percentage of public school students living in a single parent household;
- Percentage of students eligible for federal ESEA Title I; and
- Percentage of public school students who have at least one parent with less than a high school diploma.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

Low Wealth index combines weighted financial variables that are a reflection of the LEAs ability to generate their own funds as compared with the State average. LEAs that fall below the State average are eligible for supplemental state funds.

- Anticipated Total County Revenue
- Tax Base per Square Mile (Density)
- Per Capita Income

Although the initial screening process as described above determines general capacity, the LEA must demonstrate capacity in its application for SIG funds by sufficiently describing how:

- Existing resources are clearly aligned to selected interventions including district and school staff that will be used to implement intervention;
- Additional resources that will be needed to implement the intervention have been identified;
- Specific annual goals and measurable objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools align to the intervention model and the school's identified needs;
- A monitoring plan for ongoing review of interventions will ensure the fidelity of implementation steps; and
- Periodic evaluation measures clearly align to all of the measurable objectives for each school's progress toward achieving its goals with timeline and persons responsible.

The SEA realizes that specific conditions often exist within an LEA that may result in the LEAs lack of capacity to implement the rigorous intervention models with SIG funds. For example, an LEA might be able to demonstrate a lack of capacity if it lacks a sufficient number of school leaders (e.g., principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders) capable of implementing one of the rigorous interventions. Additionally, an LEA might sufficiently describe that it can best impact student achievement by focusing resources heavily in a subset of Tier I schools, attempting to turn around some schools before proceeding to others.

If an LEA does not choose to serve an identified Tier I school, the LEA may describe why it lacks capacity to do so in its application. LEA applications that sufficiently justify a lack of capacity to serve all of its Tier I schools may still receive funds for the remaining Tier I or Tier II schools. If DPI determines that an LEA has more capacity than it claims in its application, DPI will require the LEA to provide additional information and/or data to substantiate its lack of capacity to serve its Tier I schools.

**D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.**

(1) LEA Applications for School Improvement Grant funds will be reviewed by a team of internal and external reviewers with expertise in school reform initiatives such as comprehensive needs assessments, curriculum alignment, school leadership, and teacher evaluation. Each application will be independently reviewed by two (2) members of the review team.

The timeline for SIG funds is as follows:

- March 15, 2010 - Letter of Intent requested for Tier I and Tier II schools
- March 30, 2010 – Letter of Intent due to DPI
- April 30, 2010 – LEA Applications due for Tier I and Tier II schools
- May 15, 2010 – Final Approval of LEA Applications for Tier I and Tier II schools
- June 15, 2010 – LEA Applications for Tier III schools due to DPI
- June 30, 2010 – Final Approval of LEA Applications for Tier III schools

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

Upon approval of the SEAs application for SIG funds, all LEAs will be provided with technical assistance in order to assist with the completion of the local application. Technical assistance will be offered through various venues including, Title I Regional Meetings, Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) meetings, and webinars. Sessions scheduled include the following:

- March 4, 2010 – RESA Meeting, Kenansville, NC.
- March 9, 2010 – Statewide Webinar for Title I Directors
- March 10, 2010 – Statewide Webinar for LEAs with Tier I and Tier II Schools
- March 15, 2010 – RESA Meeting, Pinehurst, NC
- March 16, 2010 – RESA Meeting, Clemmons, NC

If funds remain after DPI determines that sufficient funding is available to support the proposed plans for LEAs committing to serve its Tier I and Tier II schools, then the remaining SIG funds will be made available to LEAs with Tier III schools. Funds for Tier III schools will be prioritized according to criteria outlined in D(6). An LEA requesting to serve its identified Tier III schools will submit an LEA SIG Application for Tier III schools specifically to describe the needs, activities, and budgets for each of the Tier III schools it commits to serve.

Applications for all LEA Tier I and Tier II proposals will be reviewed by a team of DPI staff in order of priority to determine if sufficient funds remain to approve additional LEA applications for Tier III schools. LEA applications and budgets will be reviewed utilizing the criteria outlined in the Scoring Rubric provided in Appendix D of this application to determine if the LEA has sufficiently met the requirements for the use of SIG funds. Final approvals will be made prior to July 1, 2010.

DPI will carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds (depending on the availability of appropriations), and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements.

(2) Each LEA receiving SIG funds for Tier I and Tier II schools must annually report on the progress of meeting its goals. DPI will review required reports on an annual basis to determine if the LEAs School Improvement Grant requires revision.

The LEA must demonstrate progress with appropriate increases (e.g., increased the percentage of students that are proficient on state reading assessments), or appropriate decreases (e.g., decreased the total number of tardies in grade 6) on each measurable objective described in its application. Progress on locally established goals and objectives will be reported to DPI in June of each year of funding. Student outcomes will be reviewed after state assessments are administered on an annual basis.

For LEAs with schools not meeting annual goals as described in the initial application, the LEA must revise the implementation plan outlining specific steps that will be taken to ensure the success of selected interventions. Revisions and budget amendments along with annual progress reports will be reviewed to determine if the LEAs SIG funds will be renewed.

(3) Each LEA receiving SIG funds for Tier III schools must annually report on the progress of meeting its goals. DPI will review each school's progress on specific school-level data related to the use of SIG funds and the impact of the specific interventions implemented to determine if the LEAs School Improvement Grant requires revision. The general categories of review are as follows:

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

- Student Achievement Outcomes (average scale scores on State assessments, in the aggregate and disaggregated by subgroup and number of students enrolled in advanced coursework); and
- Progress on the goals and outcomes as listed in the LEA Application for Tier III Schools.

The LEA must demonstrate progress with appropriate increases (e.g., increased the percentage of students that are proficient on state reading assessments), or appropriate decreases (e.g., decreased the total number of tardies in grade 6) on each measurable objective described in its application. Progress on locally established goals and objectives will be reported to DPI in June of each year of funding. Student outcomes will be reviewed after state assessments are administered at the end of each school year.

For LEAs serving Tier III schools not meeting annual goals as described in the initial application, the LEA must commit to implementing interventions in Tier III schools aligned to the SIG models in order to continue receiving SIG funding for its Tier III schools. The LEA must revise the implementation plan outlining specific steps that will be taken to ensure the success of activities supported with SIG funds. Revisions and budget amendments along with annual progress reports will be reviewed to determine if the LEAs SIG funds will be renewed.

(4) The monitoring plan for SIG funds consists of the following elements.

a) Application and Assurances

In order to be eligible to receive funds, each LEA signs and submits to DPI the “Assurances for SIG Funds” which is included in this application. This list includes assurances which address the Recovery Act requirements for expenditures and reporting. Applications are reviewed by a regional consultant with final approval from the Section Chief of Program Monitoring.

b) Allotment

SIG funds are allocated to LEAs in accordance with SB 202, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Funds Appropriated, Section 6.6C. SIG funds are allotted in Program Report Codes (PRC) 117 and 143 to distinguish these funds from all other funds at the LEA. In general, allotments are issued to sub-recipients at the beginning of the school year and through the year as additional federal program budgets are approved or additional funds become available.

c) Budgeting Process

Budgets for federal programs, including SIG funds, are submitted to DPI via the Budget Utilization and Development (BUD) System. In BUD, SIG funds are budgeted according to purpose and object, using a chart of accounts aligned to federal requirements and limitations on the allowable use of funds. The BUD system also captures detail for salary line items, such as number of positions and monthly salary, and detail on equipment items over \$5,000. Federal program budgets are submitted annually through the BUD System, and amended as necessary during the year. DPI Federal program administrators are responsible for approving budgets for their programs. The Program Monitoring Section approves budgets for SIG funds.

d) Onsite and Desk Review Monitoring

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

Federal program consultants monitor federal grant sub-recipients on an annual basis. For LEAs receiving SIG funds, federal program staff will conduct on-site and desk reviews to determine the quality of interventions being implemented at each school identified in the LEAs initial application for funding. All LEAs receiving SIG funds will be monitored through on-site and desk reviews once per year beginning with the 2010-11 monitoring cycle. On-site and desk reviews will be conducted for all schools in the LEA receiving SIG funds or participating in LEA-level activities provided with SIG funds. During on-site visits, DPI conducts documentation review, observation of interventions, and interviews with appropriate staff. Desk reviews will include documentation review, a comparison of the budget versus the expenditures aligned to the approved plan, and virtual interviews (e.g., phone conference, webinars, etc.) as appropriate.

In addition, monitoring will be conducted as a component of the North Carolina Statewide System of Support and in coordination with its pending Race to the Top grant plan. Some LEAs identified as having the least capacity and lowest performing schools, are encouraged to enter into a three-year agreement with DPI to provide intense resources and support. DPI staff members are assigned to assist the LEA on-site throughout each of three (3) years with ongoing need assessments, budget analysis, resource allocation, plan implementation, and program evaluation. For these LEAs, DPI coordinates monitoring efforts through a three-prong roundtable structure that provides for cross-agency collaboration and coordination of both monitoring and support.

Regional Roundtables consisting of appropriate DPI and Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) staff meet on a monthly basis to coordinate monitoring and support for districts and schools. For those districts serving schools with SIG funds, a function of the Regional Roundtable will be to ensure that interventions with SIG funds are implemented fully and effectively for the Tier I and Tier II schools as identified in the LEA application.

e) Monitoring of Expenditures

DPI monitoring of expenditures involves the use of several established systems and reports within DPI. These systems and reports are described below:

**UERS:** The acronym for the Uniform Education Reporting System. It is the legislated required accounting system specifications and processes designed to help ensure standard, accurate, reporting of accounting activity by the school systems in order to maintain uniform reporting of the use of various funds to the state.

**Uniform Chart of Accounts:** All LEAs are required to use the Uniform Chart of Accounts. This chart is administered and controlled at the State level. When a new grant or program is funded by the State or federal government, the initial chart is created, conferring with the program staff to ensure that only allowable expenditures are included in the chart. LEAs may request additions to the chart after the initial set up. These requests are made in writing and are only added at the approval of the DPI financial and program staff.

**Financial Data Collection:** On a monthly basis, each LEA is required to submit all financial data in a required file layout. The financial data include all expenditures from state, federal and local account, detail of all checks written and all payroll records by social security. All the LEAs financial data are run through a series of UERS edits to determine if the data are in compliance with accounting specifications. After the data

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

have passed the UERS edits, they are validated against our Uniform Chart of Accounts to determine which expenditures, if any, have been coded to account codes that are unallowable or invalid. A monitoring letter is provided electronically to the LEAs listing all the invalid codes. LEAs are required to correct all errors.

Salary Audit: A large percentage of education funds are expended on certified personnel (principals, teachers and instructional support). In order to ensure that personnel expenditures are appropriate, DPI audits expenditures coded to certified personnel. All monthly payroll detail is loaded in to a Salary/Licensure database at DPI. This system audits combines the salary paid, the license of individuals and the chart of accounts. The audit process ensures the following:

- The person coded from the grant is certified in the appropriate license area;
- The salary paid from the fund is allowable according to State law; and
- Only persons with specific license areas can be paid from certain budget codes.

All LEAs have access to the audit exception list via a web application. DPI has two salary audit personnel to consult with LEAs and monitor the exceptions. All audit exceptions must be cleared.

Communication and Reports Back to the LEAs: A monitoring letter is provided electronically to the LEAs listing all the invalid codes. LEAs are required to correct all errors.

The following monthly reports are made available to the LEAs:

- Budget Balance Report (JHA305EG): This is the primary report used to reconcile expenditures which have been posted for the Federal Funds (by grant) for each LEA. The report shows the most recent total budget amount for the year, current month expenditures, current month adjustments and refunds, year-to-date expenditures, and remaining budget balance. If the expenditures do not have a corresponding budget, then the LEA will need to complete a budget amendment through the BUD system and the Program section to correct this.
- Cash Balance Report (JHA314EG): This is the primary report used to reconcile the cash certifications which have posted for the Federal Funds. It is in two parts; year-to-date figures (R01), and monthly figures (R03). This report shows the beginning of the fiscal year cash balance, the certifications recorded, the cash expenditures recorded, and the ending calculated cash balance. It also shows the amount of dollars still available (Authority to Draw) to be requested for the PRC.
- Federal Cash Zero-out Report (JHA903EG): This report is used to notify the LEA of the amount of the monthly cash zero-out for the Federal funds, by program. It is a summary report by PRC.
- Monthly Financial Reports:
  - DBS/MFR Match Report (JHA899EG): This report shows the comparison month-to-date and year-to-date between the DBS/MSA data (datafile) and the MFR data (LEA general ledger). Any differences on this report should be reconciled monthly.
  - MFR Error Messages Issued Report (PGA10RP4-E): This report provides all errors that must be corrected (in all funds).
  - MFR Verification Messages Issued Report (PGA10RP4-V): This report notifies the LEA of unusual transactions/conditions. Items on this report do not have to be corrected if they are valid transactions. If they are not valid transactions, then the

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

LEA only needs to correct its general ledger. It is not necessary to notify DPI of these corrections.

MFR Revenue & Expenditure Summary Report (PGA10RP5): This report is grouped by PRC. It shows all revenue and expenditure codes categorized by Fund: State, Federal, and Local. Each fund shows Total Revenues, Total Expenditures, and any Difference. Revenues and Expenditures should equal for State and Federal funds.

f) Monthly Zero-Out Process

DPI utilizes a zero-out process to prevent subrecipients from keeping cash on hand above the amount of reported expenditures. Each month the LEAs' federal fund balances are compared against expenditures reported. If there is excess cash above expenditures, the cash balance is returned to DPI. If more expenditures have been reported than cash requested, the LEA receives cash to cover the expenditures up to the periods authorized funding limit. In this way, cash balances are kept to a minimum.

g) Independent Audit and Single Audit Review

A single audit is required annually by the various federal and state agencies. This requires an outside, independent auditor to come into the school system to audit their books and records in accordance with the requirements of the program. The audit compliance supplement directs this audit. A State Compliance Supplement is prepared for programs funded by state or federal funds. Auditors utilize the Federal compliance supplements in OMB Circular A-133, as well as the State compliance supplements. In the State supplements, DPI can direct auditors to review certain areas for compliance with state or federal requirements. The auditor informs the user of the audit if the entity audited is using funds according to the grant specifications. If the auditor finds problems referred to as deficiency or a material finding, the issues are explained in the audit.

The Single Audit accountant at DPI reviews the single audits from all LEAs. When the independent auditor reports a material audit finding, DPI requests an action plan. When a Significant Deficiency or a Material Finding is reported on a Federal Program in the audit, the Single Audit Accountant makes a copy of the finding for the Federal Program involved. DPI may ask the auditor for the working papers on these for further review. In addition the school system may be provided with technical assistance to review and help correct the problem. In some cases, DPI will ask the school system to repay the money they received because they used the funds improperly.

All questioned costs (subject to a threshold that varies with the program) are presented to the appropriate DPI program administrator for review. The DPI program administrator has 30 days to review the cost and report back to the Monitoring & Compliance Section. The Monitoring & Compliance Section follows the recommendation of the DPI program administrator. If recommended, the questioned cost is recovered from the proper party. The Single Audit Accountant updates a tracking table at each step in the process, to provide for follow up.

(5) School Improvement grants will be allotted to districts committing to serve its Tier I and Tier II schools. If after funding all Tier I and Tier II schools DPI determines that sufficient funds remain to approve additional LEA applications, funds will be made available to LEAs for Tier III schools. LEAs with Tier I schools, but have not committed to serving those schools may not apply for SIG funds for Tier III schools only.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

LEA Applications will be reviewed and rated as described in Part 1 of section B in this application. LEAs that receive the highest rating as determined by the identified criteria in the Scoring Rubric will receive priority for funds. An LEA Application that receives a rating of 0 for any required component in accordance with SIG final rules will not be approved.

The SEA may determine that SIG funds allocated to an LEA may be less than what the LEA budget indicates is requested if the SEA determines that a lesser amount is needed to implement the proposed intervention(s) or if the SEA determines the LEA does not have the capacity to implement the proposed intervention(s). Final funding will be determined in consideration of the overall distribution of funds relative to geographical regions of the state.

(6) In order to serve Tier III schools demonstrating the greatest need, the SEA will allocate funds for Tier III schools in following order of priority:

- First - Title I eligible non-secondary schools that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates
- Second - Title I eligible secondary schools that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates
- Third - Title I schools in Restructuring
- Fourth - Title I schools in Corrective Action
- Fifth - Title I schools in School Improvement

(7) DPI does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

(8) In coordination with the North Carolina Statewide System of Support, DPI will provide direct services to LEAs for which the following apply:

- The SEA has determined the LEA does not have sufficient capacity for implementing the interventions identified for its schools; and
- The LEA enters into an agreement with DPI to allow the SEA to provide direct services.

While the SEA will not assume responsibility for implementing the intervention models, SEA services will provide support for the implementation of the models including data analysis, budget review, identifying resources for sustainability, and facilitation of professional development needs for staff.

Beginning June, 2010, DPI will develop and facilitate a statewide Title I teacher leadership program as described in section F of this application.

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

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following:

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities;
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application that the SEA has determined the LEA has the capacity to serve;
- Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability;

- Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds (depending on the availability of appropriations), and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State);
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements;
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds;
- 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 to the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA;
- 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 the 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; and
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final notice.

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

DPI will reserve five (5) percent of the School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and monitoring of its SIG funded implementations. Funds will be used as follows:

- Provide technical assistance to LEAs to assist with the plan development. Technical assistance will be offered through various venues including, Title I Regional Meetings,
- Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) meetings, and webinars. Sessions scheduled include the following:
  - March 4, 2010 – RESA Meeting, Kenansville, NC.
  - March 9, 2010 – Statewide Webinar for Title I Directors
  - March 10, 2010 – Statewide Webinar for LEAs with Tier I and Tier II Schools
  - March 15, 2010 – RESA Meeting, Pinehurst, NC
  - March 16, 2010 – RESA Meeting, Clemmons, NC
- Increase resources to support the application review process and monitoring requirements which may include contracting with outside experts to review applications and monitoring the SIG funded schools;
- Enhance the Consolidated Federal Data Collection system to include required SIG data reporting elements;
- Complete the evaluation process on an annual basis for each LEA receiving SIG funds which may include contracting with outside experts; and
- Increase support services for LEAs determined to have low capacity for implementing interventions. DPI will develop and facilitate a Title I teacher leadership program in order to:

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

- Provide priority for training to (1) districts with low-capacity and receiving SIG funds; (2) districts receiving SIG funds, and (3) other districts within each region;
- Facilitate training in collaboration with Cambridge Education;
- Develop technology delivery plan (e.g., Skype lessons being taught to other classrooms in the LEA, region, etc.);
- Coordinate and calibrate the efforts of teacher leaders throughout the period of implementation with specific fidelity checks to ensure availability of high quality professional development statewide through periodic meetings and professional development as indicated and to ensure appropriate support is provided in the implementation of the SIG intervention models for those schools;
- Develop and implement a program evaluation for the services provided annually; and
- Coordinate support for districts and schools with the District and School Transformation division through Regional Roundtables, the Educator Recruitment and Development division, and Title I Consultants.

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

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, DPI consulted with its Committee of Practitioners on December 15, 2009, as established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including superintendents, principals, Title I directors, RESA directors, and parent representatives.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**H. WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must list in its application those requirements for which it is seeking a waiver.**

The link to the public notice is <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/newsroom/news/2009-10/20100126-03>. The emailed comments from LEAs are attached in Appendix C.

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

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

- Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- 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.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

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

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

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, 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, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

**Appendix A**

**Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools**

**Descriptor (d)(1).** Provide the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in this notice) that the State uses to identify such schools;

**Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools**

***Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools:***

Lowest 5% of Title 1 schools as determined by “proficiency score-R/M”, with “proficiency score-R/M” below 50% in the previous and one of the two prior years

+

Title 1 schools with graduation rates lower than 60% in previous and one of the two prior years

+

Lowest 5% of Title 1 eligible, but not receiving, secondary schools, with “proficiency score-R/M” below 50% in the previous and one of the two prior years

+

Title 1 eligible, but not receiving, secondary schools with graduation rates lower than 60% in previous and one of the two prior years

**Notes and Definitions**

**A. Lack of Progress:**

NC is defining lack of progress as a school who 1) had a proficiency score-R/M below 50% in the previous year, AND who 2) had a proficiency score-R/M below 50% in one of the two prior years. (e.g. Less than 50% in 2008-09 and less than 50% in either 07-08 or 06-07)

And/Or

A school who 1) had a graduation rate of less than 60% in the previous year AND who had a graduation rate less than 60% in one of the prior two years. (e.g., Less than 60% in 2008-09 and less than 60% in either 07-08 or 06-07. )

Using this metric of ‘lack of progress’ will allow us to look at current school performance and their performance trend over the prior two years.

**B. Secondary Schools:**

A secondary schools is any school that:

- graduates students

or

- has any of the following grades: 9-13

**C. Number of Years**

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

When determining whether a school has made progress or increased its proficiency score-R/M and/or graduation rate over a number of years, NC considers the last three years of data for a school. To be identified as making lack of progress, schools must fall under necessary criteria for the previous year, and one of the two prior years.

**D. Proficiency Score – R/M**

For the definition of “persistently lowest performing schools”, North Carolina created a composite of English/language arts and mathematics assessments, to be known as the Proficiency Score – R/M.

**E. Included Schools**

In the analysis to determine the persistently lowest performing schools, all schools in North Carolina were considered, if they were eligible or receiving Title I funds. This includes charter schools, alternative, and special schools.

**F. Included Assessments**

The assessments used determining each school’s Proficiency Score – R/M include the State’s assessments in English/language arts and mathematics, and they include the State’s general assessments, alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, and alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards in those subjects.

Specific assessments used include:

- End-of-Grade Reading, Grades 3-8
- End-of-Grade Math, Grades 3-8
- Grade 10 Math\*
- Grade 10 English\*

\*For Grade 10 Math and English, banked students scores were used during the calculation. For mathematics in grade 10, we use the Algebra I scores of current 10<sup>th</sup> graders, including the scores of those 10<sup>th</sup> graders who took Algebra I prior to 10<sup>th</sup> grade (these are the "banked" scores). For reading in grade 10, we base it on students who are proficient on both English I and Grade 10 writing. We use the English I scores of current 10<sup>th</sup> graders, including the "banked" English I scores of those 10<sup>th</sup> graders who took English I prior to 10<sup>th</sup> grade.

**G. Lowest 5%**

Any time where the definition calls for identifying the lowest 5% of schools, NC selected the lowest 5% of schools or the lowest 5 schools, whichever number was highest. (i.e., if 5% of schools identified only 3 schools, then NC selected the lowest 5 schools.)

**Steps for Determining the Persistently Lowest  
Achieving Schools in North Carolina**

**A. Calculate the Proficiency Score-R/M**

Step 1: Calculate the total number of proficient students in the “all students” group in **English/language arts** by adding the number of proficient students in each grade tested in a

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION**  
**2009-2010**

school. Calculate the total number of proficient students in the “all students” group in **mathematics** by adding the number of proficient students in each grade tested in the school<sup>1</sup>.

Step 2: Add the total number of proficient students in English/language arts and mathematics. **This is the Numerator.**

Step 3: Calculate the total number of students in the “all students” group in the school who took the State’s English/language arts assessment and the total number of students in the “all students” group who took the State’s mathematics assessment.

Step 4: Add the total number of students in the “all students” group in the school who took the State’s English/language arts assessment and the total number of students in the “all students” group who took the State’s mathematics assessment. **This is the Denominator.**

Step 5: Divide the numerator (step 2) by the denominator (step 4) and multiply by 100 to determine the percent proficient in English/language arts and mathematics in the school. This is called the proficiency score-R/M for a school. Calculate this for all schools<sup>2</sup>.

**B. Determine the Lowest 5% of Title I Schools In Improvement, Corrective Action, Or Restructuring**

Step 6: Select all schools that are Title I schools and are either in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Step 7: Rank the list of schools from Step 6 from highest to lowest using the proficiency score-R/M for the most recent year<sup>3</sup>.

Step 8: Select the schools from Step 7 who have demonstrated a “lack of progress” in performance (i.e. those that have a proficiency score-R/M of less than 50% for the previous year and at least one of the two prior years).

Step 9: From the schools selected in Step 8, choose those schools with the lowest 5% proficiency score-R/M in the most recent year<sup>4</sup>. (This is 5% of the schools listed in Step 6).

**C. Determine the Title I Schools In Improvement, Corrective Action, Or Restructuring With Graduation Rates Less than 60%**

Step 10: Using the schools selected in Step 6, identify all Title I high schools with a graduation rate less than 60% for the most recent year, and less than 60% at least one of the two previous years. (For example, in 2008-2009, X school had a graduation rate of 50%. In 2007-2008, the graduation rate was 65%, and in 2006-2007, the graduation rate was 59%. This school would be included in the definition of persistently lowest achieving schools.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: In counting the total number of students who are proficient and the total number of students assessed, include the number of proficient students with disabilities who took an alternate assessment (based on alternate academic achievement standards or modified academic achievement standards) and the total number of students with disabilities who took an alternate assessment.

<sup>2</sup> For this calculation, NC included all schools, including alternative, charter and special schools.

<sup>3</sup> For the SFSF Phase II application, NC is data from the 2008-2009 school year.

<sup>4</sup> Note, if the lowest 5% identifies less than five schools, then NC will identify the lowest 5 schools.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**D. Determine the Lowest 5% Of Any Secondary School Eligible For But Not Receiving Title I Funds**

Step 11: From the schools identified in Step 5, identify all secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I funds.

Step 12: Rank the list of schools from Step 11 from highest to lowest using the proficiency score-R/M for the most recent year<sup>5</sup>.

Step 13: Select the schools from Step 12 who have demonstrated a “lack of progress” in performance (i.e. those that have a proficiency score-R/M of less than 50% for the previous year and at least one of the two prior years).

Step 14: From the schools selected in Step 13, choose those schools with the lowest 5% proficiency score-R/M in the most recent year<sup>6</sup>. (This is 5% of the schools listed in Step 11).

**E. Determine the Secondary Schools Eligible For, But Not Receiving, Title I Funds, With Graduation Rates Less than 60%**

Step 15: Using the schools selected in Step 11, identify all secondary schools that are eligible for, but not receiving, Title I funds with a graduation rate less than 60% for the most recent year, and less than 60% at least one of the two previous years. (For example, in 2008-2009, X school had a graduation rate of 50%. In 2007-2008, the graduation rate was 65%, and in 2006-2007, the graduation rate was 59%. This school would be included in the definition of persistently lowest achieving schools.)

**F. Compile the List of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools**

Step 16: Create an unduplicated list of the schools identified in steps 9, 10, 14, and 15. These are the **Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools** in NC for 2008-2009.

---

<sup>5</sup> For the SFSF Phase II application, NC is data from the 2008-2009 school year.

<sup>6</sup> Note, if the lowest 5% identifies less than five schools, then NC will identify the lowest 5 schools.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**Appendix B**

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	GRAD RATE	Newly Eligible
Broadview Middle	370003000196			X		
Eastlawn Elementary	370003000197			X		
Graham High	370003000009				61.8	X
Harvey R Newlin Elementary	370003000200			X		
Haw River Elementary	370003000011			X		
Hillcrest Elementary	370003000201			X		
Hugh M Cummings High	370003000202				60.2	X
R Homer Andrews Elementary	370003000204			X		
South Graham Elementary	370003000014			X		
Taylorsville Elementary	370009000030			X		
Sparta Elementary	370012000040			X		
Alpha Academy	370010302511			X		
Anson Challenge Academy	370018002367		X		42.9	
Anson High School	370018002054				65.6	X
Anson Middle	370018002056					X
Lilesville Elementary	370018000049			X		
Morven Elementary	370018000046			X		
Wadesboro Elementary	370018000050			X		
Wadesboro Primary	370018000044			X		
Blue Ridge Elementary	370021000971			X		
Mountain View Elementary	370021002284			X		
Balfour Elementary	370024000064			X		
Charles W McCrary Elementary	370024000065			X		
Donna L Loflin Elementary	370024000066			X		
North Asheboro Middle	370024000069					X
Claxton Elementary	370027000072			X		
Hall Fletcher Elementary	370027000071					X
Ira B Jones Elementary	370027000076			X		
Isaac Dickson Elementary	370027002202			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Randolph Learning Center	370027000045				0.0	X
Newland Elementary	370030000088			X		
Bath Elementary	370033000091			X		
John Small Elementary	370033001924			X		
Northeast Elementary	370033002568			X		
Northside High	370033002224				72.8	X
S W Snowden Elementary	370033000098			X		
Washington High	370033001926				66.0	X
Bertie High	370036000101				67.9	X
Bertie Middle	370036002818					X
Colerain Elementary	370036000107			X		
West Bertie Elementary	370036000106					X
Windsor Elementary	370036002285			X		
Elizabethtown Middle	370039002618			X		
Elizabethtown Primary	370039000118			X		
Plain View Primary	370039000119			X		
Tar Heel Middle	370039002619			X		
West Bladen High	370039002620				64.4	X
Brunswick County Academy	370042000980		X		29.4	
Jessie Mae Monroe Elementary	370042002621			X		
Lincoln Elementary	370042000124			X		
Supply Elementary	370042000053			X		
Waccamaw	370042000131			X		
Buncombe Community-East	370045002203		X		47.2	
Clyde A Erwin High	370045000143				66.1	X
Sand Hill-Venable Elem	370045000626			X		
Burke Alternative School-West	370048001005		X		54.8	
Glen Alpine Elementary	370048000179			X		
North Liberty	370048001006				0.0	X
Oak Hill Elementary	370048000188			X		
C G Woodson Sch of Challenge	370002702112	X			42.1	
Coltrane-Webb Elementary	370053000376			X		
R B McAllister Elementary	370053000379			X		
Rocky River Elementary	370053002076			X		
Royal Oaks Elementary	370053000217			X		
W M Irvin Elementary	370053002434			X		
Weddington Hills Elementary	370053001818			X		
Wincoff Elementary	370053000219			X		
Wolf Meadow Elementary	370053000220			X		
Gamewell Middle	370058000227			X		
Horizons Elementary	370058002571			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Hudson Middle	370058000233			X		
Oak Hill School	370058000236			X		
West Lenoir Sch. of Technology	370058000242			X		
East Carteret High	370063000253				77.6	X
Morehead Elem at Camp Glenn	370063001042			X		
Newport Elementary	370063000257			X		
Bartlett Yancey High	370066000264				66.3	X
N L Dillard Middle	370066000268			X		
North Elementary	370066000117			X		
Stoney Creek Elementary	370066000271			X		
Lyle Creek Elementary	370069002573			X		
Oxford Elementary	370069000287			X		
Saint Stephens Elementary	370069000289			X		
Webb A Murray Elementary	370069000293			X		
Carrboro Elementary	370072000294			X		
Frank P Graham Elementary	370072000299			X		
McDougle Elementary	370072001962			X		
Albemarle Road Elementary	370297001186			X		
Albemarle Road Middle	370297001187			X		
Allenbrook Elementary	370297001190			X		
Ashley Park Elementary	370297001192					X
Billingsville Elem	370297001201			X		
Briarwood Elementary	370297001198			X		
Bruns Avenue Elementary	370297001253			X		
Cochrane Middle	370297001203			X		
Devonshire Elementary	370297001210			X		
Druid Hills Elementary	370297001213			X		
E E Waddell High	370297002592		X		58.7	
Eastway Middle	370297001216			X		
First Ward Elementary	370297001219			X		
Garinger-Business & Finance	370297003004					X
Garinger-Leadership & Pub Serv	370297003003				0.0	X
Garinger-Math/Science/Environm	370297003002					X
Hickory Grove Elementary	370297001223					X
Highland Renaissance Academy	370297001225					X
International Studies School a	370297002859					X
Irwin Avenue Open	370297001230			X		
James Martin Middle	370297002325					X
John T Williams Middle	370297001288			X		
Lincoln Heights Elementary	370297001235			X		
Marie G Davis Military & G	370297003042					X

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Martin Luther King, Jr Middle	370297002784			X		
Merry Oaks Elementary	370297002167			X		
Metro	370297001241				0.0	X
Midwood High/Tate TAPS	370297002228				41.2	X
Morgan School	370297002169				0.0	X
Nathaniel Alexander Elem	370297001886					X
Nations Ford Elementary	370297001246					X
Newell Elementary	370297001247			X		
Pawtucket Elementary	370297001258					X
Pinewood Elementary	370297001261			X		
Ranson Middle	370297001267					X
Reid Park Elementary	370297001212			X		
School of International Busine	370297002894				72.2	X
Sedgefield Elementary	370297001268					X
Sedgefield Middle	370297001269			X		
Spaugh Middle	370297001275			X		
Statesville Road Elementary	370297001277					X
Sterling Elementary	370297001279			X		
Thomasboro Elementary	370297001280			X		
Walter G Byers Elementary	370297002660			X		
West Charlotte High	370297001285				54.5	X
West Mecklenburg High	370297001286		X		55.9	
Westerly Hills Elementary	370297001287			X		
Wilson Middle	370297001289			X		
Windsor Park Elementary	370297001290			X		
Winterfield Elementary	370297001291			X		
Chatham Middle	370075000307			X		
Jordan Matthews High	370075000311				80.3	X
Siler City Elementary	370075000315			X		
Virginia Cross Elementary	370075002815					X
Mountain Youth School	370078002082		X		54.8	
CIS Academy	370004002349			X		
North Shelby	370090002719				0.0	X
Butler Avenue Elementary	370093000352			X		
Langdon C Kerr Elem	370093000355			X		
Sampson Middle	370093000356			X		
Acme Delco Elementary	370096000357			X		
Acme Delco Middle	370096000358			X		
Cerro Gordo Elementary	370096000360			X		
Chadbourn Elementary	370096000362			X		
Chadbourn Middle	370096000361			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

East Columbus High	370096000145				71.2	X
Evergreen Elementary	370096000363			X		
Guideway Elementary	370096000366			X		
Hallsboro Middle	370096000368			X		
Hallsboro-Artesia Elementary	370096000367			X		
South Columbus High	370096000237				72.9	X
Tabor City Elementary	370096000371			X		
Tabor City Middle	370096000372			X		
West Columbus High	370096000373				71.4	X
Williams Township	370096000374			X		
Community Charter School	370003202327					X
Havelock Elementary	370331002175			X		
James W Smith Elementary	370331002211			X		
Trent Park Elementary	370331002179			X		
West Craven High	370331002180				71.6	X
Crossnore Academy	370007702427				66.7	X
Crossroads Charter High	370012202591				49.6	X
Alger B Wilkins Elementary	370001100446			X		
Brentwood Elementary	370001100397			X		
C Wayne Collier Elementary	370001102121			X		
Cliffdale Elementary	370001100407			X		
Cumberland Mills Elem	370001100410			X		
Cumberland Road Elementary	370001100411			X		
Douglas Byrd High	370001100400				79.1	X
Douglas Byrd Middle	370001100399			X		
E E Miller Elementary	370001102283			X		
E E Smith High	370001102124				73.5	X
Ed V Baldwin Elementary	370001100416			X		
Elizabeth M Cashwell Elem	370001100403			X		
Ferguson-Easley Elementary	370001102125			X		
Gallberry Farm Elementary	370001102513			X		
Gray's Creek Elementary	370001100414			X		
Gray's Creek High School	370001102663				76.3	X
Howard L Hall Elementary	370001102128			X		
Ireland Drive Middle	370001102440			X		
J W Coon Elementary	370001100409			X		
J W Seabrook Elementary	370001100431			X		
Lake Rim Elementary	370001102514			X		
Lillian Black Elementary	370001100396			X		
Lucile Souders Elementary	370001102129			X		
Luther "Nick" Jeralds Middle	370001102123			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Manchester Elementary	370001100424			X		
Margaret Willis Elementary	370001102130			X		
Morganton Road Elementary	370001100423			X		
Pine Forest High	370001100426				82.5	X
Ponderosa Elementary	370001100427					X
Seventy-First High	370001100433				76.7	X
Sherwood Park Elementary	370001100434			X		
Spring Lake Middle	370001100437			X		
Sunnyside Elementary	370001100440			X		
Teresa C Berrien Elementary	370001102133			X		
Walker-Spivey	370001102136		X		3.4	
Warrenwood Elementary	370001100442			X		
Westarea Elementary	370001100443					X
Westover High	370001100445				72.7	X
Westover Middle	370001100444					X
William H Owen Elementary	370001100447			X		
William T Brown Elementary	370001101097					X
Dare Co Alternative High	370111002093		X		45.0	
Manteo Elementary	370111000456			X		
Davidson County Ext Day	370114000462		X		32.7	
South Davidson High	370114002216				63.2	X
Dillard Academy	370007402420			X		
Downtown Middle	370002602105			X		
Beulaville Elementary	370120000493			X		
East Duplin High	370120000497				75.0	X
James Kenan High	370120000498				60.4	X
North Duplin Elementary	370120000501			X		
Rose Hill-Magnolia Elementary	370120000503			X		
Wallace-Rose Hill High	370120000505				74.1	X
Warsaw Elementary	370120000506			X		
Warsaw Middle	370120000507			X		
Bethesda Elementary	370126000528			X		
Burton Elementary	370126000308			X		
C C Spaulding Elementary	370126000571			X		
Chewning Middle	370126000531					X
Club Boulevard Elementary	370126000334			X		
Durham's Performance Learning	370126003085		X		55.0	
E K Powe Elementary	370126000568			X		
Eastway Elementary	370126001850			X		
Eno Valley Elementary	370126000532			X		
Fayetteville Street Elementary	370126000480			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Forest View Elementary	370126000537			X		
George Watts Elementary	370126000538			X		
Glenn Elementary	370126000534			X		
Hillandale Elementary	370126000535			X		
Hillside High	370126000385				52.4	X
Hillside New Tech High School	370126002920					X
Holt Elementary	370126000536			X		
Hope Valley Elementary	370126002442			X		
Lakewood Elementary	370126000472					X
Lowe's Grove Middle	370126000540					X
Merrick-Moore Elementary	370126000543			X		
Neal Middle	370126000544					X
Northern High	370126000545				74.6	X
Oak Grove Elementary	370126000546			X		
Parkwood Elementary	370126000547			X		
Sherwood Githens Middle	370126000549					X
SHS City of Medicine Academy					95.2	X
Southern High	370126000550				63.1	X
Southern School of Engineering	370126002913					X
Southwest Elementary	370126002218			X		
Spring Valley Elementary						X
W G Pearson Elementary	370126000572			X		
Y E Smith Elementary	370126000573			X		
Chowan Middle	370084000327			X		
D F Walker Elementary	370084000328			X		
John A Holmes High	370084000330				70.6	X
White Oak Elementary	370084000331			X		
C B Martin Middle	370132001766					X
Coker-Wimberly Elementary	370132000553			X		
G W Bulluck Elementary	370132000551			X		
North Edgecombe High	370132000555				60.0	X
Phillips Middle	370132000556			X		
Princeville Montessori	370132001769			X		
South Edgecombe Middle	370132000558					X
SouthWest Edgecombe High	370132000559				56.7	X
Stocks Elementary	370132001767					X
W A Pattillo A+ Elementary Sch	370132001768					X
West Edgecombe Middle	370132000560					X
Ashley Elementary	370150002446			X		
Bolton Elementary	370150000588			X		
Brunson Elementary	370150000590			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Carter Vocational High	370150000640				0.0	X
Carver High	370150000592				72.3	X
Cook Elementary	370150002448			X		
Diggs Elementary	370150001567					X
Easton Elementary	370150000601			X		
Forest Park Elementary	370150000603			X		
Gibson Elementary	370150002578			X		
Griffith Elementary	370150000605			X		
Hall-Woodward Elementary	370150000607			X		
Hill Middle	370150000609			X		
Ibrahim Elementary	370150000610			X		
Jacket Academy at Carver High	370150002986					X
Kennedy Learning	370150002194	X				
Kimberley Park Elementary	370150000615					X
Konnoak Elementary	370150000616			X		
Latham Elementary	370150000617			X		
Lowrance Middle	370150000619					X
Middle Fork Elementary	370150002728			X		
Mineral Springs Elementary	370150000620			X		
Mineral Springs Middle	370150000621			X		
North Hills Elementary	370150002091			X		
Old Town Elementary	370150000628			X		
Parkland High	370150000631				64.2	X
Petree Elementary	370150002451	X				
Philo Middle	370150000633			X		
Sch Computer Technology Atkins	370150002766				55.3	X
Sch of Biotechnology Atkins Hi	370150002767			X	65.5	
Sch Pre-Engineering Atkins Hig	370150002768				60.3	X
South Fork Elementary	370150000639			X		
Speas Elementary	370150000642			X		
Wiley Middle	370150000649					X
Winston-Salem Preparatory Acad	370150002729				91.5	X
Forsyth Academies	370008302452			X		
Franklinton Elementary	370153000660			X		
Louisburg Elementary	370153000657			X		
Louisburg High	370153000658				71.6	X
Bessemer City Central Elem	370162000667			X		
Bessemer City High	370162000668				65.3	X
Bessemer City Middle	370162000694					X
Bessemer City Primary	370162000669			X		
Carr Elementary	370162000670			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Edward D Sadler, Jr Elementary	370162002731			X		
Forest Heights Elementary	370162002040			X		
Hunter Huss High	370162000691				63.5	X
Lingerfeldt Elementary	370162000695			X		
Pleasant Ridge Elementary	370162000705			X		
Rhyne Elementary	370162000707			X		
Southwest Middle	370162000712					X
Warlick School	370162002263		X		0.0	
Webb St Special Education	370162000684				0.0	X
Woodhill Elementary	370162000717			X		
York Chester Middle	370162002195			X		
Buckland Elementary	370168000718			X		
Gatesville Elementary	370168000721			X		
T S Cooper Elementary	370168000723			X		
Grandfather Academy	370001602068			X	0.0	
Butner-Stem Elementary	370180000737			X		
C G Credle Elementary	370180000738					X
Center for Innovative Learning						X
Creedmoor Elementary	370180000739			X		
Granville Central High	370180002829				0.0	X
Northern Granville Middle	370180002264					X
West Oxford Elementary	370180000747					X
Greene Central High	370183000750				62.1	X
Greene County Middle	370183002294					X
Greene Early College High	370183002860					X
Snow Hill Primary	370183000754			X		
West Greene Elementary	370183000755			X		
Allen Jay Elementary	370192000817			X		
Ben L Smith High	370192000798				73.3	X
Bessemer Elementary	370192000760			X		
Bluford Elementary	370192000761			X		
Brightwood Elementary	370192000818					X
C D McIver Special Education	370192000786		X		0.0	
Cesar Cone Elementary	370192000766			X		
Clara J Peck Elementary	370192000794			X		
Dudley High	370192000768				78.2	X
Eastern Guilford High	370192000821				75.3	X
Fairview Elementary	370192000954			X		
Ferndale Middle	370192000955			X		
Gateway Education Center	370192000764		X		0.0	
Gillespie Park Elementary	370192002668			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

High School Ahead Academy	370192002987					X
Hunter Elementary	370192000776			X		
Jackson Middle	370192001127			X		
Johnson Street Elementary	370192000957			X		
Julius I Foust Elementary	370192000770			X		
Kirkman Park Elementary	370192000958			X		
Laurin Welborn Middle	370192000961			X		
McLeansville Elementary	370192002774					X
Montlieu Avenue Elementary	370192000960			X		
Murphey Traditional Academy	370192000791					X
Northeast Guilford High	370192000836				81.1	X
Northwood Elementary	370192000962			X		
Oak Hill Elementary	370192000963	X				
Oak View Elementary	370192000964			X		
Otis L Hairston Sr Middle	370192002586			X		
Parkview Village Elementary	370192000965			X		
Rankin Elementary	370192000843			X		
Sedgefield Elementary	370192000848			X		
Sumner Elementary	370192000853			X		
T Wingate Andrews High	370192000967				66.8	X
Union Hill Elementary	370192000854			X		
Vandalia Elementary	370192000800					X
W M Hampton Elementary	370192000775			X		
Waldo C Falkener Sr Elementary	370192002583			X		
Washington Elementary	370192000801			X		
Wiley Accel/Enrichment	370192000803			X		
Guilford Preparatory	370012102582			X	0.0	
Aurelian Springs Elementary	370195000856			X		
Dawson Elementary	370195000859			X		
Enfield Middle	370195000861	X				
Everetts Elementary	370195000862			X		
Hollister Elementary	370195000863					X
Inborden Elementary	370195000864			X		
Northwest High	370195000866			X	57.8	
Scotland Neck Primary	370195000869					X
Southeast Halifax High	370195002157	X			58.9	
William R Davie Middle	370195000872			X		
Haliwa-Saponi Tribal School	370011502562	X			58.3	
Anderson Creek Primary	370201000874			X		
Angier Elementary	370201000875			X		
Benhaven Elementary	370201000876			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Boone Trail Elementary	370201000877			X		
Coats Elementary	370201000879			X		
Erwin Elementary	370201000881			X		
Gentry Primary	370201000882			X		
Harnett Primary	370201000883			X		
Highland Elementary	370201002630			X		
Johnsonville Elementary	370201000885			X		
Lillington-Shawtown Elementary	370201002670			X		
South Harnett Elementary	370201000892			X		
Wayne Avenue Elem	370201000893			X		
Central Haywood High	370204001147		X		48.4	
Healthy Start Academy	370002302090			X		
Balfour Education Center	370210001568		X		47.1	
Clear Creek Elementary	370210002631			X		
Ahoskie Elementary	370216000931			X		
Bearfield Primary	370216002526			X		
Hertford County High	370216002208				60.8	X
Hertford County Middle	370216002207			X		
Riverview Elementary	370216000938			X		
Catawba Valley High	370219002108	X			19.4	
Northview Middle	370219000940			X		
Southwest Elementary	370219000949			X		
Hoke County High	370225000968				63.8	X
J W McLaughlin Elementary	370225000969					X
Sandy Grove Elementary	370225002459			X		
Scurlock Elementary	370225000972			X		
South Hoke Elementary	370225000973			X		
West Hoke Elementary	370225000975					X
West Hoke Middle	370225000970					X
Mattamuskeet Elementary	370228002460			X		
Mattamuskeet High	370228002461				78.2	X
Mattamuskeet Middle	370228002462			X		
Celeste Henkel Elementary	370231000982			X		
East Iredell Elementary	370231000985			X		
N B Mills Elementary	370231002298			X		
Third Creek Elementary	370231002634			X		
Troutman Elementary	370231000995			X		
Blue Ridge Virtual Early Colle					100.0	X
Jackson Co Early College						X
Jackson Co Sch of Alt	370234002467		X		17.4	
Cooper Elementary	370237000810			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Meadow Elementary	370237001019			X		
Selma Elementary	370237001025			X		
South Campus Community High	370237001580		X		6.7	
South Smithfield Elementary	370237001030			X		
Kannapolis Interm	370243002751			X		
Shady Brook Elementary	370243001046			X		
Kennedy Charter	370006302398			X	78.8	
Kinston Charter Academy	370013402735			X		
Floyd L Knight Children Center	370256001077				0.0	X
Contentnea Elementary	370261001087			X		
E B Frink Middle	370261001088			X		
Kinston High	370261000585				69.3	X
North Lenoir High	370261001091				68.3	X
Rochelle Middle	370261000589			X		
Southeast Elementary	370261000596			X		
Woodington Middle	370261001096			X		
Charles England Intermediate	370264001098			X		
Lexington Middle	370264001101			X		
Lexington Senior High	370264001102				70.1	X
F.D. Jack Kiser Intermediate	370268002875			X		
G E Massey Elementary	370268001109					X
Lincolnton Middle	370268001115			X		
North Brook Elementary	370268002197			X		
West Lincoln Middle	370268001125			X		
Macon Middle	370276001141			X		
Union Academy					57.1	X
E J Hayes Elementary	370288001159			X		
East End Elementary	370288001160			X		
Edna Andrews Elementary	370288001161			X		
Roanoke High	370288001165				70.6	X
Williamston Middle	370288001170			X		
Williamston Primary	370288001171			X		
Eastfield Elementary	370294001176			X		
Glenwood Elementary	370294001177			X		
North Cove Elementary	370294001181			X		
West Marion Elementary	370294001184			X		
Bowman Middle	370300001292			X		
Deyton Elementary	370300001294			X		
Greenlee Primary	370300002531			X		
Harris Middle	370300001296			X		
Candor Elementary	370306001306			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

East Middle	370306002267					X
Page Street Elementary	370306002532			X		
Troy Elementary	370306001312			X		
Aberdeen Elementary	370309001315			X		
Aberdeen Primary	370309001314			X		
Elise Middle	370309001318			X		
Pinckney Academy	370309001929		X		22.2	
Robbins Elementary	370309001324			X		
Southern Pines Elementary	370309001327			X		
Southern Pines Primary	370309001326			X		
Vass-Lakeview Elementary	370309001329			X		
Westmoore Elementary	370309001331			X		
Park View Elementary	370312001335			X		
South Elementary	370312001336			X		
Bruce H Tharrington Elem	370321001337			X		
Jones Elementary	370321001338			X		
Baskerville Elementary	370327000703			X		
Benvenue Elementary	370327001342			X		
D S Johnson Elementary	370327000725			X		
Englewood Elementary	370327000726			X		
Nash Central High	370327002643				66.6	X
Nash Central Middle	370327001345					X
Nashville Elementary	370327001349			X		
O R Pope Elementary	370327000762			X		
Rocky Mount High	370327000763				68.8	X
Spring Hope Elementary	370327001356			X		
W L Greene Alternative	370327001218		X		23.8	
Williford Elementary	370327001358			X		
Winstead Avenue Elementary	370327002401			X		
Annie H Snipes Elementary	370333001392			X		
Charles P Murray Middle	370333002594			X		
College Park Elementary	370333001369			X		
D C Virgo Middle	370333001370			X		
Edwin A Alderman Elementary	370333001371			X		
Emma B Trask Middle	370333001372			X		
Forest Hills Elementary	370333001374			X		
Gregory Elementary	370333001375			X		
Mary C Williams Elementary	370333001382			X		
Murrayville Elementary	370333002787			X		
New Hanover High	370333001384				55.2	X
Rachel Freeman Elementary	370333001366			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Roland-Grise Middle	370333001388			X		
Sunset Park Elementary	370333001390			X		
Williston Middle	370333001394			X		
Wrightsboro Elementary	370333001396			X		
Conover Special Education	370336001398				0.0	X
Conway Middle	370342001407			X		
Gaston Middle	370342001410					X
NCHS-West / STEM (Science, Tec	370342003005					X
Northampton High East	370342001412				71.9	X
Squire Elementary	370342001413					X
Bell Fork Elementary	370345001417			X		
Blue Creek Elementary	370345001418			X		
Clyde Erwin Elementary	370345001419			X		
Dixon Elementary	370345002270			X		
Morton Elementary	370345001424			X		
Richlands Elementary	370345001428			X		
Richlands Primary	370345002599			X		
Silverdale Elementary	370345001430			X		
Southwest Elementary	370345001233			X		
Swansboro Elementary	370345001436			X		
Pamlico County High	370351001450				81.4	X
Elizabeth City Middle	370354001453					X
J C Sawyer Elementary	370354001455			X		
Northside Elementary	370354002274			X		
P W Moore Elementary	370354002275					X
Pasquotank County High	370354002537				65.1	X
Pasquotank Elementary	370354001458			X		
Sheep-Harney Elementary	370354001459			X		
Burgaw Elementary	370357001462			X		
Malpass Corner Elementary	370357000895			X		
Penderlea Elementary	370357001467			X		
West Pender Middle	370357001471			X		
Hertford Grammar	370360001474			X		
Perquimans Central	370360001473			X		
Northern Middle	370363001482					X
South Elementary	370363001485					X
Belvoir Elementary	370001201492			X		
Creekside Elementary School	370001202789			X		
Eastern Elementary	370001202138			X		
Elmhurst Elementary	370001202140			X		
Farmville Central High	370001201497		X		51.4	

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

G R Whitfield Elementary	370001201499			X		
Grifton Elementary	370001201500			X		
H B Sugg Elementary	370001201501			X		
North Pitt High	370001201502		X		54.3	
Northwest Elementary	370001202604			X		
Pactolus Elementary	370001201503			X		
Sadie Saulter Elementary	370001202144			X		
Sam D Bundy Elementary	370001201504			X		
South Central High	370001202616		X		55.1	
South Greenville Elementary	370001202145			X		
W H Robinson Elementary	370001201506			X		
Wahl Coates Elementary	370001202147			X		
Wellcome Middle	370001201507			X		
Wintergreen Intermediate	370001202199			X		
Wintergreen Primary	370001202408			X		
PreEminent Charter	370011302553			X		
Eastern Randolph High	370378001519				73.4	X
Liberty Elem	370378001523			X		
Ramseur Elementary	370378001525			X		
Randleman High	370378001527				92.2	X
Southmont Elementary	370378002606			X		
Research Triangle Charter	370008102444			X		
Cordova Elementary	370387001548			X		
Ellerbe Junior High	370387001549				0.0	X
Hamlet Junior High	370387001551				0.0	X
Leak Street	370387000788				23.8	X
Mineral Springs Elementary	370387001555			X		
Monroe Avenue Elementary	370387001556			X		
Richmond Co Transitional						X
Richmond Senior High	370387001557				79.1	X
Roberdel Children's Center	370387002047				0.0	X
Rohanen Junior High	370387001559				0.0	X
Rohanen Primary	370387001560					X
Washington Street	370387002278					X
Deep Branch Elementary	370393001569			X		
Fairgrove Middle	370393001570			X		
Fairmont High	370393002232		X		59.4	
Fairmont Middle	370393002233			X		
Janie C Hargrave Elem	370393002234			X		
L Gilbert Carroll Middle	370393002235			X		
Littlefield Middle	370393001572			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Long Branch Elementary	370393001573			X		
Lumberton Junior High	370393002236			X		
Lumberton Senior High	370393002237		X		57.9	
Magnolia Elementary	370393001574			X		
Orrum Middle	370393001575			X		
Oxendine Elementary	370393001576					X
Parkton Elementary	370393001577			X		
Pembroke Elementary	370393001578			X		
Pembroke Middle	370393001579			X		
Peterson Elementary	370393002238			X		
Prospect Elementary	370393001583			X		
Purnell Swett High	370393002102				70.4	X
R B Dean Elementary	370393002051			X		
Red Springs High	370393002239				69.7	X
Red Springs Middle	370393002240			X		
Rex-Rennert Elementary	370393001585			X		
Rosenwald Elementary	370393002241			X		
Rowland Middle	370393002183			X		
Saint Pauls Elementary	370393002243			X		
Saint Pauls High	370393002244				71.1	X
Saint Pauls Middle	370393002245			X		
South Robeson High	370393002184				60.8	X
Southside/Ashpole Elem	370393001588					X
Townsend Middle	370393002052			X		
Union Chapel Elementary	370393001589			X		
Union Elementary	370393001590			X		
W H Knuckles	370393002247					X
Dalton McMichael High	370399002306				71.6	X
Draper Elementary	370399001068			X		
Lawsonville Ave Elem	370399001539					X
Leaksville-Spray Elementary	370399001242			X		
Lincoln Elementary	370399002542			X		
Moss Street Elementary	370399001540			X		
Reidsville High	370399001543				62.0	X
Reidsville Middle	370399001542					X
Williamsburg Elementary	370399001545			X		
Rocky Mount Preparatory	370003402334			X	77.8	
E Hanford Dole Elementary	370405002251			X		
Elizabeth Duncan Koontz Elemen	370405002850			X		
Granite Quarry Elementary	370405001619			X		
H D Isenberg Elementary	370405002250			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Henderson Independent High	370405002409		X		10.4	
Hurley Elementary	370405001620			X		
Knollwood Elementary	370405001621			X		
Knox Middle	370405002252					X
Landis Elementary	370405001622			X		
Millbridge Elementary	370405002792			X		
North Rowan Elementary	370405001627			X		
North Rowan High	370405001625				61.0	X
North Rowan Middle	370405001626					X
Rockwell Elementary	370405001628			X		
Chase High	370408001636				59.4	X
Cliffside Elementary	370408001637			X		
R-S Central High	370408001651				66.4	X
Rutherford Opportunity Center	370408002607		X		45.2	
Sallie B Howard School	370004902365			X		
Charles E Perry Elementary	370414001665			X		
Hobbton Elementary	370414001673			X		
Hobbton High	370414001672				69.1	X
Hobbton Middle	370414000939			X		
Lakewood High	370414001674				60.7	X
Midway Middle	370414002481			X		
Roseboro-Salemburg Middle	370414001679			X		
Salemburg Elementary	370414001680			X		
Union Elementary	370414001682			X		
Union High	370414001683				57.4	X
Union Middle	370414000790			X		
Sandhills Theatre Arts Renaiss	370009102473			X		
Covington Street Elementary	370420001686			X		
North Laurinburg Elementary	370420001690			X		
Scotland Accelerated	370420002608					X
Scotland High School of Busine	370420002869				78.3	X
Scotland High School of Leader	370420002885				88.5	X
Scotland High School of Visual	370420002909				80.8	X
Shaw Elementary	370420002545			X		
Albemarle High	370432000022				69.4	X
Badin Elementary	370432001708			X		
Central Elementary	370432000024			X		
East Albemarle Elementary	370432000025			X		
North Albemarle Elementary	370432000026			X		
Norwood Elementary	370432001714			X		
Stanly Academy Learning Center	370432003008				0.0	X

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Success Charter	370010602527			X		
Sugar Creek Charter	370008902472			X		
Swain County High	370444001763				71.1	X
Swain County Middle	370444002314			X		
Liberty Drive Elementary	370450001774			X		
Thomasville High	370450001776				65.3	X
Thomasville Middle	370450001775					X
Thomasville Primary	370450000792			X		
Torchlight Academy	370009802495					X
Davidson River School	370453002351		X		47.1	
Columbia High	370459001788		X		57.9	
Benton Heights Elementary	370462001299			X		
East Elementary	370462001300			X		
Forest Hills High	370462001792				75.0	X
Marshville Elementary	370462001795			X		
Monroe High	370462001301				68.7	X
Monroe Middle	370462001302					X
Rock Rest Elementary	370462002862					X
South Providence	370462001284		X		15.2	
Walter Bickett Elementary	370462001303			X		
Carver Elementary	370465001813					X
Clark Street Elementary	370465001814			X		
E M Rollins Elementary	370465001822			X		
Eaton-Johnson Middle	370465001816					X
Henderson Middle	370465001817					X
L B Yancey Elementary	370465001824			X		
Northern Vance High	370465001823				68.2	X
Pinkston Street Elementary	370465001821			X		
Southern Vance High	370465002280				60.7	X
Aversboro Elementary	370472001831			X		
Barwell Road Elementary	370472002854			X		
Brentwood Elementary	370472001836			X		
Briarcliff Elementary	370472001837			X		
Bugg Elementary	370472001840			X		
Conn Elementary	370472001847			X		
Creech Road Elementary	370472000027			X		
East Wake School of Arts Educ	370472002819				85.2	X
East Wake School of Engineerin	370472002834				84.8	X
East Wake School of Integrated	370472002876				80.7	X
Fox Road Elementary	370472002222			X		
Hodge Road Elementary	370472001677			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Lynn Road Elementary	370472001876			X		
Moore Square Museum Magnet Mid	370472002654					X
Mount Vernon	370472002104					X
Poe Elementary	370472001887			X		
Smith Elementary	370472001894			X		
Wendell Elementary	370472001904			X		
York Elementary	370472001911			X		
Zebulon Elementary	370472001912			X		
Northside Elementary	370474001919			X		
South Warren Elementary	370474001920			X		
Warren County High	370474002189				68.0	X
Warren County Middle	370474000329					X
Pines Elementary	370480002190			X		
Plymouth High	370480001930				68.8	X
Washington County Union	370480001933			X		
Brogden Middle	370488001945			X		
Carver Heights	370488000349					X
Dillard Middle	370488000398					X
Goldsboro High	370488000502		X		44.8	
North Drive Elementary	370488000677					X
School Street Elementary	370488000638					X
Southern Wayne High	370488001963				70.9	X
Spring Creek Elementary	370488002498			X		
Weldon Elementary	370489001965			X		
Weldon Middle	370489002116			X		
Weldon Science Technology Engi	370489002994					X
Central Middle	370492001967			X		
Edgewood Elementary	370492001968			X		
Whiteville Primary	370492001969			X		
Millers Creek Elementary	370495002656			X		
B O Barnes Elementary	370502001992					X
Beddingfield High	370502001994		X		57.2	
Charles H Darden Middle	370502002061			X		
Margaret Hearne Elementary	370502002003					X
Milton M Daniels Learning Ctr.	370502002423				0.0	X
Vick Elementary	370502002564					X
Winstead Elementary	370502002012			X		
Courtney Elementary	370504002014			X		
East Bend Elementary	370504002015			X		
Jonesville Elementary	370504002019			X		
West Yadkin Elementary	370504002021			X		

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Yadkin Success Academy	370504002659		X		0.0	
Yadkinville Elementary	370504002022			X		

**Appendix C**

From "Glenn Joyner" [JoynerG.chi@pitt.k12.nc.us](mailto:JoynerG.chi@pitt.k12.nc.us)

I hope our state will consider turning down title one monies from the Federal Government, if accepting those monies means we will have to restructure schools that are in school improvement and dismiss principals and staff members. Title one does not supply enough funding to justify such drastic measures, and these measures will likely not solve the problems of schools whose students are struggling with extreme poverty. Rejecting title one money would also allow us to reject No Child Left Behind, or ESEA or whatever they have renamed it now, which we should have done long ago.

From "Steven Sheets" [spsheets@iss.k12.nc.us](mailto:spsheets@iss.k12.nc.us)

I am a school in corrective action with 55% free and reduced lunch. Do I understand correctly that the waiver would allow money to perhaps go to schools in more need than ours since we had 86% proficiency in math and 74% proficiency in reading?

"Donna Brown" [DBrown@dpi.state.nc.us](mailto:DBrown@dpi.state.nc.us)

Hi Steven:

I'm not sure which specific waiver you are referencing, but in general, priority for SIG funds go to schools identified as the "persistently lowest achieving" in NC identified either as Title I in improvement or Title I eligible. Schools with high proficiency scores may not receive highest priority for funding under SIG rules.

Hope this helps. Please don't hesitate to call if you need additional information. ---D

From "Steven Sheets" [spsheets@iss.k12.nc.us](mailto:spsheets@iss.k12.nc.us)

Donna,

It does. This makes good sense to use our dollars wisely. I am hoping the feds make some adjustments next month and some of us with high scores (at least above state average) will not be labeled in corrective action because of rotating subgroups (EC or ED).

From "JEANNE TYNER" <[jbtyner@yanceync.net](mailto:jbtyner@yanceync.net)>

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Donna,  
I have reviewed the waiver requests. It seems the waivers would allow LEAs needed flexibility in maximizing the use of SIG funds to benefit students. Thank you for all you do for our LEAs and students.

**Appendix D  
SIG Scoring Rubric**

LEA Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
LEA Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_  
Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

A. The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.			
Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>The LEA sufficiently describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A selected intervention that clearly aligns to the identified needs;</li> <li>• Needs of the school, students, and community it will serve with sufficient information for conducting the needs assessment;</li> <li>• Analysis from all four measures of data—student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data;</li> <li>• Data analysis utilizes trend data over a minimum of three years; and</li> <li>• Summary of needs that includes charts and/or graphs thoroughly displaying the results of the data analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selected intervention aligned to the identified needs;</li> <li>• Needs of the school, students, and community it will serve with sufficient information for conducting the needs assessment;</li> <li>• Analysis from three of the four measures of data—student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data; and</li> <li>• Summary of needs that includes charts and/or graphs displaying the results of the data analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selected intervention; however, intervention not clearly aligned to the needs.</li> <li>• The needs of the school it will serve with some information for conducting the needs assessment; and</li> <li>• Analysis from two of the four measures of data—student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks the selection of an intervention aligned to the needs;</li> <li>• Lacks a detailed description of the school it will serve;</li> <li>• Lacks multiple measures of data with clear analysis of needs; or</li> <li>• Lacks disaggregated data.</li> </ul>
<b>Points Awarded:</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>			
B. If the LEA does not serve each of its Tier I schools, the LEA must describe why it lacks sufficient capacity.			
Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>The LEA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a detailed description demonstrating a lack of capacity for serving each of its Tier I schools; or</li> <li>• Commits to serving each of its Tier I schools (N/A).</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a brief description demonstrating a lack of capacity for serving each of its Tier I schools.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a description; however, information insufficiently describes a lack of capacity for serving each of its Tier I schools.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not explain why it lacks capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools.</li> </ul>
<b>Points Awarded:</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>			

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**C. Describe the actions the LEA 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.**

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>The LEA sufficiently describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities of the school intervention models clearly aligned to SIG final requirements;</li> <li>• Effective alignment of resources with the selected interventions;</li> <li>• Specific practices or policies that will be modified to enable its schools to align resources and implement the interventions fully and effectively; and</li> <li>• The specific actions that will be taken to sustain the reform efforts after the funding period ends including resources, timelines, and responsibilities; and</li> <li>• If applicable, a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers which includes the experience level and qualifications and how those qualifications were considered in selection process.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities of the school intervention models aligned to SIG final requirements.</li> <li>• Effective alignment of resources with the selected interventions;</li> <li>• Specific practices or policies that will be modified to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively;</li> <li>• A plan for sustaining the efforts of interventions beyond the period of SIG fund availability; and</li> <li>• If applicable, a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers which includes the experience level and qualifications and how those qualifications were considered in selection process.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities of the school intervention models somewhat aligned to SIG final requirements.</li> <li>• Resources with the selected interventions with no clear alignment to the interventions;</li> <li>• Little information related to practices or policies that will be modified;</li> <li>• Some general plans for sustaining the efforts of interventions beyond the period of SIG fund availability; and</li> <li>• If applicable, a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides activities that are not aligned to SIG final requirements;</li> <li>• Lacks specific information related to resources needed for the selected interventions;</li> <li>• Provides no information related to modifying practices or policies;</li> <li>• Lacks a plan for sustaining reform efforts of the interventions; or</li> <li>• If applicable, provides no clear process for selecting external providers.</li> </ul>

**Points Awarded:**

**Comments:**

**D. The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.**

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>LEA sufficiently describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing resources clearly aligned to selected interventions including district and school staff that will be used to implement intervention;</li> <li>• Additional resources that will be needed to implement the intervention and identifies the source;</li> <li>• Specific annual goals and</li> </ul>	<p>LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing resources that will be used to implement intervention;</li> <li>• Additional resources that will be needed to implement the intervention;</li> <li>• Specific annual goals and measurable objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools;</li> <li>• A monitoring plan for</li> </ul>	<p>LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing resources that will be used to implement intervention;</li> <li>• Some additional resources that will be needed to implement the intervention; however, no specific information related to source;</li> <li>• Broad goals and objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools;</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks sufficient information related to resources;</li> <li>• Provides little to no information related to goals and objectives;</li> <li>• Provides no specific monitoring plan; or</li> <li>• Provides no specific evaluation measures.</li> </ul>

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

<p>measurable objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A monitoring plan for ongoing review of the implementation of interventions with timeline and persons responsible;</li> <li>• Periodic evaluation measures clearly aligned to all of the measurable objectives for each school's progress toward achieving its goals with timeline and persons responsible.</li> </ul>	<p>ongoing review of the implementation of interventions with timeline and persons responsible; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Periodic evaluation measures for each school's progress toward achieving its goals with timeline and persons responsible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A monitoring plan for review of the implementation of interventions; and</li> <li>• Provides some evaluation measures for each school's progress toward achieving its goals.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--	--

**Points Awarded:**

**Comments:**

**E. The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).**

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>LEA provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget that clearly aligns to activities implemented for each selected intervention;</li> <li>• Detailed three-year budget for each school for which funds are requested of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected interventions for each school;</li> <li>• Detailed description of LEA activities needed to support the implementation of selected interventions clearly aligned to the school level activities; and</li> <li>• Appropriate budget codes from the DPI Chart of Accounts indicating how funds will be allocated to the schools it commits to serve and demonstrating compliance with allowable use of funds including any LEA-level activities.</li> </ul>	<p>LEA budget provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget that aligns to activities implemented for each selected intervention;</li> <li>• A three-year budget for each school for which funds are requested of to support implementation of the selected interventions for each school;</li> <li>• Some description of LEA activities needed to support the implementation of selected interventions aligned to the school level activities; and</li> <li>• Budget codes from the DPI Chart of Accounts indicating how funds will be allocated to the schools it commits to serve and demonstrating compliance with allowable use of funds including any LEA-level activities.</li> </ul>	<p>LEA budget provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget for each school for which funds are requested with some alignment to selected interventions;</li> <li>• A budget that covers a three-year period of implementation;</li> <li>• Some description of LEA activities needed to support the implementation of selected interventions; and</li> <li>• Budget codes from the DPI Chart of Accounts indicating how funds will be allocated to the schools it commits to serve and demonstrating compliance with allowable use of funds including any LEA-level activities.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA budget description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks sufficient information related to selected interventions;</li> <li>• Is not of sufficient scope to fully and effectively implement the intervention;</li> <li>• Provides little to no information on LEA activities needed to support the implementation of selected interventions; or</li> <li>• Lacks use of appropriate budget codes demonstrating compliance with use of funds.</li> </ul>

**Points Awarded:**

**Comments:**

**F. As appropriate, the LEA has consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.**

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Included: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:
<b>G. The LEA has indicated any waivers it intends to implement and for which schools it will implement the waivers.</b>
Included: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:

**SIG Scoring Rubric for Tier III Schools**

LEA Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
LEA Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_  
Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>1. The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application and has identified school improvement activities for each school.</b>			
--	--	--	--

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>The LEA sufficiently describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A selected activities that clearly aligns to the identified needs;</li> <li>The needs of the school, students, and community it will serve with sufficient information for conducting the needs assessment;</li> <li>Analysis from all four measures of data—student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data;</li> <li>Data analysis utilizes trend data over a minimum of three years; and</li> <li>A summary of needs that includes charts and/or graphs thoroughly displaying the results of the data analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The selected activities aligned to the identified needs;</li> <li>The needs of the school, students, and community it will serve with sufficient information for conducting the needs assessment;</li> <li>Analysis from three of the four measures of data—student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data; and</li> <li>A summary of needs that includes charts and/or graphs displaying the results of the data analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The selected activities; however, activities not clearly aligned to the needs.</li> <li>The needs of the school it will serve with some information for conducting the needs assessment; and</li> <li>Analysis from two of the four measures of data—student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks the selection of activities aligned to the needs;</li> <li>Lacks a detailed description of the school it will serve;</li> <li>Lacks multiple measures of data with clear analysis of needs; or</li> <li>Lacks disaggregated data.</li> </ul>

Points Awarded:

Comments:

<b>2. The LEA describes the actions the taken, or that will be taken, to design and implement activities for Tier III schools that are aligned to other resources and to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</b>			
---	--	--	--

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>The LEA sufficiently describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective alignment of resources with the selected</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective alignment of resources with the selected</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources with the selected activities with no clear</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks specific information related to resources needed</li> </ul>

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>activities; and</li> <li>The specific actions that will be taken to sustain the reform efforts after the funding period ends including resources, timelines, and responsibilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>activities;</li> <li>A plan for sustaining the efforts of activities beyond the period of SIG fund availability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>alignment to the activities; and</li> <li>Some general plans for sustaining the efforts of activities beyond the period of SIG fund availability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for the selected activities; or</li> <li>Lacks a plan for sustaining reform efforts of the activities.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

**3. The LEA describes the goals and measurable objectives it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds as well as its monitoring plan to evaluate the implementation of activities and evaluate the progress of its Tier III schools.**

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>The LEA sufficiently describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific annual goals and measurable objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools; and</li> <li>A monitoring plan for ongoing review of the implementation of interventions with timeline and persons responsible.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific annual goals and measurable objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools; and</li> <li>A monitoring plan for ongoing review of the implementation of interventions with timeline and persons responsible.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA briefly describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad goals and objectives for each intervention implemented in the schools; and</li> <li>A monitoring plan for review of the implementation of interventions.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides little to no information related to goals and objectives; and</li> <li>Provides no specific monitoring plan.</li> </ul>

**4. The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected activities fully and effectively in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).**

Leading (10)	Developing (6)	Emerging (2)	Lacking (0)
<p>LEA budget sufficiently provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A budget that clearly aligns to activities implemented for each selected activities;</li> <li>Detailed description of LEA activities needed to support the implementation of activities clearly aligned to the school level activities; and</li> <li>Appropriate budget codes from the DPI Chart of Accounts indicating how funds will be allocated to the schools it commits to serve and demonstrating compliance with allowable use of funds including any LEA-level activities.</li> </ul>	<p>LEA budget provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A budget that aligns to activities implemented for each selected activities;</li> <li>Some description of LEA activities needed to support the implementation of activities aligned to the school level activities; and</li> <li>Budget codes from the DPI Chart of Accounts indicating how funds will be allocated to the schools it commits to serve and demonstrating compliance with allowable use of funds including any LEA-level activities.</li> </ul>	<p>LEA budget provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A budget for each school for which funds are requested with some alignment to selected activities;</li> <li>Some description of LEA activities needed to support the implementation of selected activities; and</li> <li>Budget codes from the DPI Chart of Accounts indicating how funds will be allocated to the schools it commits to serve and demonstrating compliance with allowable use of funds including any LEA-level activities.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA budget description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks sufficient information related to selected activities;</li> <li>Provides little to no information on LEA activities needed to support the implementation of selected activities; or</li> <li>Lacks use of appropriate budget codes demonstrating compliance with use of funds.</li> </ul>

**Points Awarded:**

**Comments:**

**5. As appropriate, the LEA has consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier III schools.**

Included:  Yes  No

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

Comments:
6. The LEA has indicated any waivers it intends to implement and for which schools it will implement the waivers.
Included: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:

**Appendix E  
Local Education Agency Application for 1003(g) Funding  
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Funds  
Tier I and Tier II Schools**

**LEA** \_\_\_\_\_ **LEA Code** \_\_\_\_\_

**LEA Contact** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Person's Title** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Person's Telephone Number** \_\_\_\_\_

**Purpose of the Program**  
*School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring 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 their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January, 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("Tier III schools"). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.*

**As the applicant designated above, the LEA hereby applies for a grant of federal funds and commits to serving:**

- Tier I and Tier II schools in our LEA
- Tier I schools in our LEA
- Tier II schools in our LEA

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

If funds remain after DPI determines that sufficient funding is available to support the proposed plans for Tier I and Tier II schools, then the remaining SIG funds will be made available to LEAs serving Tier III schools. In order to serve Tier III schools demonstrating the greatest need, the SEA will allocate funds for Tier III schools in following order of priority (Attachment B):

- First - Title I eligible non-secondary schools that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates
- Second - Title I eligible secondary schools that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates
- Third - Title I schools in Restructuring
- Fourth - Title I schools in Corrective Action
- Fifth - Title I schools in School Improvement

**ASSURANCES**

The LEA assures that it will:

1. Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
2. Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds;
3. If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
4. Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements. The following metrics constitute the leading indicators for the SIG program:
  - Number of minutes within the school year;
  - Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
  - Dropout rate;
  - Student attendance rate;
  - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
  - Discipline incidents;
  - Truants;
  - Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
  - Teacher attendance rate.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct; the agency named above has authorized me as its representative to file this application.

---

*Name of Superintendent*

---

*Signature of Superintendent*

---

*Date Signed*

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**SECTION A: Schools to be Served**

An LEA must identify each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. An LEA must sufficiently describe the comprehensive needs assessment conducted for each school it commits to serve.

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**Tier I and Tier II Interventions**

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION			
				TA	RS	CL	TF
	<b>TOTALS</b>						

**KEY:** TA – Turnaround    RS – Restart    CL – Closure    TF – Transformation

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

**Needs Assessment Description**

<b>Needs of the school, students, and community for each school to be served with sufficient information for conducting the needs assessment</b>
<b>Analysis of multiple measures of data including student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data</b>
<b>Summary of the results of the data analysis</b>
<b>How needs assessment results align to the selected intervention model</b>

**SECTION B: Lack of Capacity**  
**If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.**

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

NA

**SECTION C: Descriptive Information**

An LEA must describe the actions the LEA 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. Information must be provided for each Tier I and Tier II school served.

**Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements**

**Align other resources with the interventions**

**Modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively**

**Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends**

**Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality**

**SECTION D: Capacity**

The LEA must include the following information in its application for each Tier I and Tier

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**II school that will be served with School Improvement Grant funds.**

Notes: For each Tier I and Tier II school, the LEA must complete the following table (add rows as needed). The LEA must sufficiently describe:

- Available resources and additional resources needed to implement each of the selected interventions;
- Annual goals and measurable objectives for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established;
- Specific steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Periodic evaluation measures clearly aligned to all of the measurable objectives for each school’s progress toward achieving its goals;
- Timeline for implementing the steps including responsibilities; and
- Monitoring plan for ongoing review of the implementation of interventions with timeline and persons responsible.

<b>Name of School:</b>				
<b>Intervention Model:</b>				
<b>Existing Resources:</b>				
<b>Additional Resources:</b>				
<b>Annual Goals:</b>				
<b>Measurable Objectives:</b>	<b>Implementation Steps</b>	<b>Periodic Evaluation</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>Monitoring Plan:</b>				
<b>Name of School:</b>				
<b>Intervention Model:</b>				
<b>Existing Resources:</b>				
<b>Additional Resources:</b>				
<b>Annual Goals:</b>				
<b>Measurable Objectives:</b>	<b>Implementation Steps</b>	<b>Periodic Evaluation</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>Monitoring Plan:</b>				
<b>Name of School:</b>				
<b>Intervention Model:</b>				

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

<b>Existing Resources:</b>				
<b>Additional Resources:</b>				
<b>Annual Goals:</b>				
<b>Measurable Objectives:</b>	<b>Implementation Steps</b>	<b>Periodic Evaluation</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>Monitoring Plan:</b>				

**SECTION E: Budget**

**The LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; and conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools.**

Notes:

1. Attach school level budget summary indicating how the funds will be allocated to the school utilizing the DPI Chart of Accounts.
2. An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.
3. An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.
4. The SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's SIG grant if one or more schools within the LEA are not meeting the goals identified for the interventions an LEA is implementing, student achievement outcomes, and leading indicators as described in the Assurances.

**1. LEA Fund Request**

School Name	Selected Model	Year 1 2010-11 Budget	Year 2 2011-12 Budget	Year 3 2012-13 Budget	Total School Funds Requested
1.		\$	\$	\$	\$
2.		\$	\$	\$	\$
3.		\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>LEA-level Activities</b>					
1.		\$	\$	\$	\$
2.		\$	\$	\$	\$
3.		\$	\$	\$	\$
4.		\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL SIG Funds Requested for LEA Budget</b>					\$

**2. Use of Funds**

<b>Name of School:</b>				
<b>Model Implementation Activities</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total</b>

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	
<b>1.</b>				
<b>2.</b>				
<b>3.</b>				
<b>Totals</b>				
<b>Name of School:</b>				
<b>Model Implementation Activities</b>	<b>Year 1 2010-11</b>	<b>Year 2 2011-12</b>	<b>Year 3 2012-13</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1.</b>				
<b>2.</b>				
<b>3.</b>				
<b>Totals</b>				
<b>Name of School:</b>				
<b>Model Implementation Activities</b>	<b>Year 1 2010-11</b>	<b>Year 2 2011-12</b>	<b>Year 3 2012-13</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1.</b>				
<b>2.</b>				
<b>3.</b>				
<b>Totals</b>				

**SECTION F: Consultation**

**As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Provide a description of stakeholder involvement in the development of this application.**

Consultation Activities	Committee/Team Members	Meeting Dates

**SECTION G: Waivers**

**The LEA must indicate which of the following waivers it intends to 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.**

1. Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- Applicable to all served schools.
- Applicable to the following school(s) only:
2. Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- Applicable to all served schools.
- Applicable to the following school(s) only:
3. 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 school that does not meet the poverty threshold.
- Applicable to all served schools.
- Applicable to the following school(s) only:

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**Local Education Agency Application for 1003(g) Funding  
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Funds  
Tier III Schools**

**LEA** \_\_\_\_\_ **LEA Code** \_\_\_\_\_

**LEA Contact** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Person's Title** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Person's Telephone Number** \_\_\_\_\_

The LEA has no identified Tier I or Tier II schools and submits this application in order to serve Tier III schools only. *(Note: If funds remain after DPI determines that sufficient funding is available to support the proposed plans for Tier I and Tier II schools, then the remaining SIG funds will be made available to LEAs serving Tier III schools.)*

The LEA has identified Tier I and Tier II schools and submits this as an addendum to the LEA's original application for 1003(g) funds, which established the LEAs commitment to serve Tier I and/or Tier II schools. *(Note: An LEA in which one or more Tier I schools are located and that does not apply to serve at least one of these schools may not apply for a grant to serve only Tier III schools.)*

**Statement of Assurances**

Assurances are hereby provided to the State Education Agency (SEA) that the Local Education Agency/Charter School will:

- Carry out the responsibilities outlined in section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
- Use funds to supplement and not supplant funds from other non-federal sources.
- Not reduce other federal funding the school is eligible to receive (e.g., Title I, Part A).
- Maintain records and provide information to the SEA as may be required for fiscal audits and program evaluations consistent with the responsibilities of the SEA under this program.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct; the agency named above has authorized me as its representative to file this application.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Name of Superintendent*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature of Superintendent*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date Signed*

**For State Use Only**

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

In order to serve Tier III schools demonstrating the greatest need, the SEA will allocate funds for Tier III schools in following order:

**Priority Levels**

- First - Title I eligible non-secondary schools that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates;
- Second - Title I eligible secondary schools that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates;
- Third - Title I schools in Restructuring;
- Fourth - Title I schools in Corrective Action; and
- Fifth - Title I schools in School Improvement.

**1. In the table below, list the Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, the “Priority Level” (e.g., First) for each Tier III school identified, and the requested budget amount for each year to support school improvement activities at the school or LEA level. Additional rows may be added. An LEA must sufficiently describe the comprehensive needs assessment conducted for each school it commits to serve.**

Tier III Schools: (list schools below)	School Code	Priority Level
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

**Needs Assessment Description**

<b>Needs of the school, students, and community for each school to be served with sufficient information for conducting the needs assessment</b>
<b>Analysis of multiple measures of data including student achievement data, process data, perception data, and demographic data</b>
<b>Summary of the results of the data analysis</b>
<b>How needs assessment results align to the selected intervention model</b>

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**2. For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the actions the LEA has taken, or will take, to design and implement activities for Tier III schools that are aligned to other resources and to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

**3. The LEA must describe the goals and measurable objectives it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds as well as its monitoring plan to evaluate the implementation of activities and evaluate the progress of its Tier III schools.**

**4. The LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to implement the selected model in each Tier III school it commits to serve; and conduct LEA-level activities designed to support improvement activities in the LEA's Tier III schools.**

School Name	Year 1 2010-11 Budget	Year 2 2011-12 Budget	Year 3 2012-13 Budget	Total School Funds Requested
<b>1.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>2.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>3.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>LEA-level Activities</b>				
<b>1.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>2.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>3.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>4.</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL SIG Funds Requested for Tier III Schools</b>				

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION  
2009-2010**

**5. As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier III schools. Provide a description of stakeholder involvement in the development of this application.**

Consultation Activities	Committee/Team Members	Meeting Dates

**6. The LEA must check the waiver below if applicable. 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.**

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.

Applicable to all served schools.

Applicable to the following school(s) only:

**Please submit the completed application by April 30, 2010 to:**

**Donna Brown, Section Chief  
Program Monitoring Section  
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
MSC # 6351  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-6351**