

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 480 205 Jefferson Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant	
Name: Jocelyn Strand	Craig Rector
Position and Office: Coordinator School Improvement Office of Quality Schools	Coordinator Grants & Resources Office of Quality Schools
Contact's Mailing Address: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education P.O. Box 480 205 Jefferson Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480	
Telephone: 573-751-1014 (Strand)	573-526-1594 (Rector)
Fax: 573-526-6698	
Email address: jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov	craig.rector@dese.mo.gov
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Chris L. Nicastro, Ph. D.	Telephone: 573-751-4446
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X <i>Chris L. Nicastro</i>	Date: 12/2/2010
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.	

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Missouri



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



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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

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

FY 2010 Application Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

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

FY 2010 Application Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

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

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Part 1

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

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

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

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

- **Department staff:**
 - **Federal Instructional Improvement Supervisors**
 - **Assistant Director/Supervisor Data System Management**
 - **Coordinator of Federal Grants and Resources and Supervisors**
 - **Coordinator of School Improvement**
 - **Coordinator of the Division of Financial and Administrative Services**
 - **Director of Special Education Effective Practices and Supervisors**
 - **Area Supervisors of Instruction**
- **Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) staff**
 - **RPDC Directors**
 - **Missouri Turnaround Program staff,**
 - **Regional Shepherds**
 - **Trained coaches (work directly with turnaround principals)**
- **University staff who have worked in support and evaluation roles for the Missouri Turnaround Project**
 - **Harris-Stowe State University**
 - **School Improvement Grant Coordinator**
 - **School Improvement Grant Resource Specialist**
 - **University of Missouri, Columbia**
 - **University of Missouri, Kansas City**
 - **Southeast Missouri State University**
 - **Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis, University of Missouri, Columbia**
- **LEA/District and school staff representing relatively high performing LEAs/Districts and schools**
 - **Central office administrators**
 - **Principals**
 - **Teachers**

The Department staff will screen LEA/District Applications before the full team begins the final evaluation process. Applications will be screened to be sure that all required responses have

been submitted and those responses are complete. Applications without the required responses will be eliminated from the initial evaluation process. (LEAs/districts will be given the opportunity to provide the required information and documentation.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

- A description of recent school improvement initiatives the LEA/district has implemented in its low-achieving schools and progress of and results from those initiatives
- Plan details that explain how the LEA/district will implement the required and permissible activities of the selected intervention(s) in a state approved planning and reporting system
- The selected activities are based on the results of the needs analysis
- How the LEA/district will support the interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level
- The plans for the selected interventions address all of the required activities of the required interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools

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

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

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

Part 2

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

If any component of Part 2, LEA/District Implementation Plan and Actions (implementation plan, selecting external providers (if applicable), align other resources, modify policies and practices, and sustain reforms after the funding period) is not determined to be adequate, the standard for this Part cannot be considered met. As directed in the "LEA/District Scoring Guide Outline," the evaluation team will review:

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

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

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

- **Responsible staff members for each strategy**
- **Timelines for each strategy and action step**
- **Funding identified for each strategy**

- **Implementation progress measures for each strategy**
- **LEA/district oversight and support**

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

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

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

- **LEA/district application process for external providers**
 - **Request for proposals**
 - **Memorandum of understanding**
 - **Provider contract**
 - **Evaluation procedures**
- **SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers**
 - **Guidance on related laws and regulations has been provided**
 - **If applicable, the SEA has cooperated in the planning for the selection process**

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity

Section VII. C.— LEA/District Actions

Section VII. D.— Timeline

Section VII. F.— Services and Activities

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

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

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

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

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

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

Insert response to Section C Capacity here:

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

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

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

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

Model(s):All

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

Model(s):All

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

Model(s):All

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

Model(s):All

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

Model(s):All

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

Model(s):Turnaround, Transformation

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

Model(s): All

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

Model(s):Turnaround, Restart, Transformation

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

Model(s):Turnaround, Restart, Transformation

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

Model(s):Turnaround, Restart, Transformation

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

Model(s):Restart

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

Model(s):School Closure

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

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

TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12		
Projected Date	Activity	Responsible Party
March, 2011	Projected receipt of approval of the SEA Application.	USDE
March, 2011	Release the list of Tier I, II, and III schools to the LEAs/districts.	Department
March, 2011- April 2011	Inform LEAs/districts of program requirements and timelines	Department
March, 2011- April 2011	Conduct a thorough needs analysis of each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it intends to commit to serve.	LEAs/Districts
March, 2011- April 2011	Collect necessary data, involve stakeholders, and begin developing LEA/District Applications based on the draft LEA/District Application.	LEAs/Districts
March, 2011- April 2011	Collaborate with the LEAs/districts to assist in determining capacity and commitment to serve Tier I and Tier II schools. (Missouri believes that ongoing communication and support during the application planning as LEAs/Districts determine their commitment and capacity to serve schools is very important. Missouri also believes ongoing communication will expedite the process and reduce time consuming negotiation after the applications are evaluated.)	Department
March, 2011	The final LEA application will be distributed to the LEAs/districts.	Department
March, 2011	The LEAs/districts will have fifteen days from the receipt of the final LEA application to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • declare their commitment to serve schools, • submit a projected list of schools it intends to serve, and the intervention model or improvement. 	LEAs/Districts

TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12		
April, 2011	LEAs/Districts preliminary application content review deadline. (optional)	LEAs/Districts
April, 2011	Convene evaluation teams to preliminarily review the application content.	Department
May 15, 2011	Final LEA/District Application deadline.	LEAs/Districts
May, 2011	Screen the applications for completeness and organize the applications in preparation for the evaluation team review	Department
June, 2011	Convene evaluation teams to review the applications.	Department
June, 2011	Consult with LEAs/districts to get additional information or amend the grant applications to ensure compliance with regulations.	Department
June, 2011	Final determinations and approvals after all grant negotiations are completed	Department
July 1, 2011	Funds available to approved LEAs/districts no later than June 1, 2011 or five days after final approval of the LEA/District Application.	Department
August 1, 2011	All funded applications will start activities if not already engaged in pre- implementation activities	LEAs/Districts

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

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

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

of the final requirements.

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

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

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

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

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

At the end of the first year of implementation, the Department will base its decision on whether to renew an LEA's/district's SIG for one or more Tier I or Tier II schools on the Department's evaluation of implementation progress and fidelity to the implementation plan. The Department will consider the level of implementation of the plan's strategies, adherence to timelines, full funding of the strategies, LEA/district support, data systems in

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

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

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

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

Measures:

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

At the end of the first year of implementation, the Department will base its decision on whether to renew an LEA's/district's SIG for one or more Tier III schools on the Department's evaluation of implementation progress and fidelity to the implementation plan. The Department will consider the level of implementation of the plan's strategies, adherence to timelines, full funding of the strategies, LEA/district support, data systems in place and trained upon, policies and practices have been modified, ongoing professional development is in place, and other strategies and activities. Measures of annual student achievement results will be evaluated. During and at the end of the first year of implementation of the selected improvement activities, fidelity to implementation will be

weighted more heavily in the evaluation. If it is determined that the LEA/district has not substantially demonstrated its commitment to and progress on the implementation plan in one or more of its Tier III schools, SIG funding will not be renewed for the school(s).

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

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

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

Monitoring will include evaluation of:

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

Areas monitored will include but not be limited to:

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

- **Budgets and expenditure reports**

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

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

- **Available funds**
- **The overall merits of the LEA/District Application**
- **The capacity of the LEA/district to serve the identified schools**
- **LEAs/districts will be ranked to determine greatest need by:**
 - **LEAs/Districts with Tier I and Tier II Schools**
 1. **Ranked by the number to Tier I schools in the LEA/District (This ranking is weighted by a factor of 1.5)**
 2. **Ranked by the number of Tier II schools in the LEA/District**
 3. **Ranked by the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA/district commits to serve**
 4. **Ranked by the percent of the LEA's/District's students enrolled in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools**
 5. **The number of Tier III schools in the lowest-achieving decile of achievement in the state,**
 6. **The ranks will be combined to determine greatest need**
 - **LEAs/Districts with Tier III schools only**
 1. **Ranked by the number of Tier III schools in LEA/district**
 2. **Ranked by the number of Tier III schools in the lowest-achieving decile in the State**
 3. **Ranked by the number of Tier III schools the LEA/district commits to serve**
 4. **Ranked by the percent of students enrolled in Tier III schools**
 5. **The ranks will be combined to determine greatest need among LEAs/districts with Tier III schools only.**

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

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

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

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

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

The Department does not currently plan to take over schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. ASSURANCES

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

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

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

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

Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:

The Department will use the SEA reservations to fund:

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

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

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

needed for reform

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

Assurance

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

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

Assurances

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

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

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

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

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

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

Assurances

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

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

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

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

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

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

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

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

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

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

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

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

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

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

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

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

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

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

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

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

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

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

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

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

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

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

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

LEA Budgets

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

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

SEA Allocations to LEAs

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B

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

[‡] “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEA/District School Improvement Grant Application

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



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

2011

FAST FACTS

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

AWARD: In no instance will an award exceed \$2,000,000 or be less than \$50,000. Pre-implementation grant activities may begin upon grant approval; this is anticipated to be July 1, 2011. All other grant activities will begin August 1, 2011. All grant activities for year one must end as of September 30, 2012.

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

REQUIREMENT: To be considered, the Department must receive an original and three copies of the entire application package. The applicant will also submit an electronic copy of the application package (including attachments) to webrephysig2010@dese.mo.gov by 11:59 p.m. Monday, May 16, 2011.

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

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

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION QUESTIONS:

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM QUESTIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

Funding is subject to Federal appropriation.

DIRECTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section IV. LEA/District Year One Total Budget: This is the total of Year One Pre-Implementation, Implementation and Administration budgets for all building and district activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this form to itemize the SIG funded LEA/district/building Year One and Pre-implementation budgets listed in Section VI. B. Also use this form to itemize the SIG funded LEA/district/building Year One and Pre-

implementation Administrative Costs budgets listed in Section VI. B. Complete a budget itemization only for year one grant funds the district may request.

Section VII. – PROJECT NARRATIVE/PLAN

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

Tentative timeline for the SIG application process pending U.S. Department of Education approval of the Missouri SEA Application:

TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12		
Projected Date	Activity	Responsible Party
March, 2011	Projected receipt of approval of the SEA Application.	USDE
March, 2011	Release the list of Tier I, II, and III schools to the LEAs/districts.	Department
March, 2011 -April 2011	Inform LEAs/districts of program requirements and timelines	Department
March, 2011 -April 2011	Conduct a thorough needs analysis of each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it intends to commit to serve.	LEAs/Districts
March, 2011 -April 2011	Collect necessary data, involve stakeholders, and begin developing LEA/District Applications based on the draft LEA/District Application.	LEAs/Districts
March, 2011 -April 2011	Collaborate with the LEAs/districts to assist in determining capacity and commitment to serve Tier I and Tier II schools. (Missouri believes that ongoing communication and support during the application planning as LEAs/Districts determine their commitment and capacity to serve schools is very important. Missouri also believes ongoing communication will expedite the process and reduce time consuming negotiation after the applications are evaluated.)	Department

TIMELINE FOR THE SIG APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-12		
March, 2011	The final LEA application will be distributed to the LEAs/districts.	Department
March, 2011	The LEAs/districts will have fifteen days from the receipt of the final LEA application to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • declare their commitment to serve schools, • submit a projected list of schools it intends to serve, and the intervention model or improvement. 	LEAs/Districts
April, 2011	LEAs/Districts preliminary application content review deadline. (optional)	LEAs/Districts
April, 2011	Convene evaluation teams to preliminarily review the application content.	Department
May 16, 2011	Final LEA/District Application deadline.	LEAs/Districts
May, 2011	Screen the applications for completeness and organize the applications in preparation for the evaluation team review	Department
June 2011	Convene evaluation teams to review the applications.	Department
June 2011	Consult with LEAs/districts to get additional information or amend the grant applications to ensure compliance with regulations.	Department
June 2011	Final determinations and approvals after all grant negotiations are completed	Department
July 1, 2011	Funds available to approved LEAs/districts no later than July 1, 2011 or five days after final approval of the LEA/District Application.	Department
August 1, 2011	All funded applications will start activities if not already engaged in pre- implementation activities	LEAs/Districts



FEDERAL GRANTS AND RESOURCES
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
PO BOX 480, JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-0480
FEDERAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT, TITLE I, SECTION 1003 (G) OF ESEA
Project Dates: July 1, 2011 to September 30, 2012

DIRECTIONS

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

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

THE DEPARTMENT'S APPROVAL - FOR DESE USE ONLY

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

SECTION I. - LEA/DISTRICT AND PROGRAM CONTACT INFORMATION

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

SECTION II. - ASSURANCES

An LEA/district must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.
 Check the boxes in this table to include the assurances in this application.

The LEA/district must assure that it will—

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

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

SECTION III. - WAIVERS

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

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION IV. - LEA/DISTRICT YEAR ONE TOTAL BUDGET

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

YEAR ONE SIG FUNDS	6100 Certificated Salaries	6150 Noncertificated Salaries	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials & Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	6600 Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction (Title I) <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
2100 Support Services – Pupils <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
3000 Parent Involvement <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
Program Costs Subtotal <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
Indirect Costs								
Administrative Costs <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS SUBTOTAL <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								
GRAND TOTAL <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>								

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

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

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME		COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE
Budget Codes	Related Strategies and Activities	
1100 Instruction		
1100 Instruction <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)		
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
2100 Support Services – Pupils		
2100 Support Services – Pupils <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)		
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services		
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
3000 Parent Involvement		
3000 Parent Involvement <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		
Administrative Costs		
Administrative Costs <i>1003 (g) SIG</i>		

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

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

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

PRE-IMPLEMENTATION
 YEAR ONE IMPLEMENTATION
 YEAR TWO IMPLEMENTATION
 YEAR THREE IMPLEMENTATION

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME					COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE			
Year One 2011-12	6100 Certificated Salaries	6150 Noncertificated Salaries	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	6600 Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1100 Instruction 1003 (g) SIG								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I) 1003 (g) SIG								
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2100 Support Services – Pupils 1003 (g) SIG								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development) 1003 (g) SIG								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services 1003 (g) SIG								
3000 Parent Involvement								
3000 Parent Involvement 1003 (g) SIG								
Administrative Costs								
Administrative Costs 1003 (g) SIG								
Program Costs Subtotal (Not including 1003 (g) SIG)								
1003 (g) SIG Subtotal								
Grand Total								

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

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

LEA/DISTRICT/BUILDING NAME					COUNTY-DISTRICT - BUILDING CODE			
Year One 2011-12	6100 Certificated Salaries	6150 Noncertificated Salaries	6200 Employee Benefits	6300 Purchased Services	6400 Materials/ Supplies	6500 Capital Outlay	6600 Other	TOTAL
1100 Instruction								
1251 Culturally Different Instruction(Title I)								
2100 Support Services - Pupils								
2210 Improvement of Instruction Services (Professional Development)								
2620 Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation Services								
3000 Parent Involvement								
Administrative Costs								
Program Costs Subtotal								
Grand Total								

SECTION VII. – PROJECT NARRATIVE/PLAN

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

SECTION VII A - NEEDS AND CAPACITY

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

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

SECTION VII B - NOT SERVING ALL TIER I SCHOOLS

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

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

SECTION VII C - LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS

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

SECTION VII C - LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS - continued

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

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

SECTION VII D - TIMELINE

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

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

SECTION VII E - ANNUAL GOALS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

SECTION VII F - SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

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

Clearly identify any pre-implementation activities included above

SECTION VII G - ANNUAL GOALS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

SECTION VII H - CONSULTATION WITH AND INVOLVEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

SECTION VII I – COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES

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

Appendix A

FAQs

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

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

H. LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Modified for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See section III.A of the final requirements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. PRE-IMPLEMENTATION*

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

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

Yes. Carrying out SIG-related activities during a —pre-implementation|| period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Staffing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Development of External Partnerships

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

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

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

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

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

Instructional Programs

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

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

Professional Development and Support

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

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

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

Preparation for Accountability Measures

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

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

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

Other

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix B

MISSOURI PLANNING, BUDGET, AND REPORTING SYSTEM

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES, and ACTION STEPS

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

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

Student Performance

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

Highly Qualified Staff

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

Facilities, Support, and Instructional Resources

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

Parent and Community Involvement

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

Governance and Leadership

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

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

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

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

Appendix C

DETERMINING LEA/DISTRICT CAPACITY

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

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

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

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

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

The decisions will be based on:

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

- Direct services provided by the SEA and others

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

Appendix D

LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Align other resources with the interventions

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

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

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

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

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

**MISSOURI TITLE I, SECTION 1003 (G) SIG
EVALUATION CRITERIA
2011-2012**

LEA/District: _____ Group: _____ Number: _____

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

Department Review

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

Section II.—Assurances yes/no

Section III.—Waivers

LEA/district intends to implement all applicable waivers yes/no

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

SEA Direct Services Approved yes/no

Section V.— Schools to be Served

The LEA/district has Tier I and/or Tier II schools and has committed to serving at least one of those schools. yes/no

The LEA/district has only Tier III schools and has committed to serve at least one of those schools. yes/no

Section VII. A. —Needs and Capacity

LEA/district has lack of capacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools **Valid Claim-**yes/no

Section VII. I.— Competitive Priorities

LEA/district has addressed all six competitive priorities Addressed/Not Addressed

Determining “greatest need”:

LEAs/Districts applying to serve Tier I, Tier II and Tier III or Tier I and Tier II Schools

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

Combined Rank _____

LEAs/Districts applying to serve Tier III schools only

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

Combined Rank _____

Reader Score

Section IV. --- LEA/District Year One Budget

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

Section VI. B.— LEA/District/Building Budget Template

Section VI. C.— LEA/District/Building Year One Budget Itemization (15 points possible) _____

Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity

Section VII. B.—Not Serving all Tier I Schools

Needs Analysis of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (10 points possible) _____

Capacity to serve Tier I and Tier II Schools (40 points possible) _____

Section VII. C.— LEA/District Actions

LEA/District implementation plan for Tier I and Tier II schools (20 points possible) _____

Section VII. D.— Timeline

Tier I and/or II timeline (10 points possible) _____

Section VII. E.— Annual Goals for Student Achievement

Tier I and/or Tier II annual goals (10 points possible) _____

Section VII. F.— Services and Activities

Tier III improvement activities *(score only if Tier III buildings are included)* (20 points possible) _____

Section VII. G.— Annual Goals for Student Achievement

Tier III annual goals *(score only if Tier III buildings are included)* (10 points possible) _____

Section VII. H.— Consultation with and Involvement of Stakeholders

Stakeholder involvement in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (10 points possible) _____

Section VI. B.— LEA/District/Building Budget Template

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

Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity

Section VII. C.— LEA/District Actions

Section VII. D.— Timeline

Section VII. F.— Services and Activities

Fund all pre-implementation activities yes/no

Reader Scored Total Points (Choose One Only)

LEAs/districts with Tier I and/or II, and III Schools Total points Received _____/155

LEAs/districts with only Tier I and Tier II Schools Total points Received _____/125

LEAs/districts with Tier III Schools only Total points Received _____/75

Section VII. A. —Needs and Capacity (Department Use Only)

LEA/district has lack of capacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools

yes/no

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Claim is valid ____ Yes ____ No

Section VII. I.— Competitive Priorities (Department Use Only)

LEA/district has addressed all six competitive priorities

yes/no

The LEA/district has addressed **all** six competitive priorities listed below.

(This section will be evaluated by the Department. The Department will evaluate the LEA's/district's intent to address all six competitive priorities in their application. The guidance below will be used to determine if the LEA's/district's claim is valid.)

Competitive Priorities for Section 1003(g) Missouri School Improvement Grants

1) Implement one plan.

LEAs should demonstrate that policies, processes, and procedures support (and do not contradict) the implementation of the building's turn-around plan.

2) Set ambitious targets for improvement.

LEAs should create improvement targets rigorous enough to demonstrate significant growth in student achievement over the three-year grant period, as agreed to by the Department.

3) Design an innovative plan for recruiting, evaluating, and retaining the best teachers and leaders—and removing those who are ineffective.

To include:

- (1) annual evaluations of teachers using multiple measures, including student-growth data as one significant factor;
- (2) strategies for removing staff found to be ineffective in improving student outcomes;
- (3) incentives to attract teachers to high need areas.

4) Identify high-risk students and create opportunities to succeed.

Strong proposals will feature early warning systems that use a combination of common formative assessment results and attendance measures to identify students at risk of failure. Such proposals also will provide supports designed to ensure that high-need students, including low income students, English-language learners, and special-needs students are achieving at grade level and are being prepared for success in college or a career.

5) Be bold and innovative.

To receive these new SIG funds districts must demonstrate that they provide their schools with consistent support, freedom to innovate, and autonomy to make personnel decisions. True reform requires structural changes in the school day and year. Bold proposals will lengthen the school day and add weekend or summer programs for all students. Districts that request SIG dollars must pledge to change personnel policies that lead to turnover among school leaders and staff. Districts must ensure that schools can select their staff, remove ineffective employees, avoid an imbalance of novice teachers (unless part of an intentional staffing strategy), and retain high-performing staff members. In addition, Districts must ensure that SIG dollars supplement, not supplant, the existing state, local, and federal funding that schools receive.

6) Demonstrate teacher commitment.

Individual teachers have the largest single school effect on student performance. Strong proposals will demonstrate that at least 80% of the teachers agree to implement the plans included in the School Improvement Grant application.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

_____ Addressed _____ Not Addressed

Section IV. --- LEA/District Year One Budget
Section VI. A.— LEA/District/Building Year One Strategies and Activities Template
Section VI. B.— LEA/District/Building Budget Template
Section VI. C.— LEA/District/Building Year One Budget Itemization

Pre-implementation activities will NOT be reviewed in this section.

15 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—12-15 points	Meets standards at an acceptable level—9-11 points	Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-8 points
<p>The LEA/district has submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current year’s school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds) ○ Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability • A budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve. • A budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. • Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities 	<p>The LEA/district has submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current year’s school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds) ○ Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability • A budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve. • A budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. • Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities 	<p>The LEA/district has submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete budgets for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve with references to specific activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current year’s school budget (The year before interventions are implemented and supported by SIG funds) ○ Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability • A budget for improvement activities funded by the grant in each Tier III school it commits to serve. • A budget to support LEA/district-level school improvement activities to support Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. • Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA/district that describe the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/15 points possible

Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity
Section VII. B.—Not Serving all Tier I Schools

Needs Analysis of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools
 Pre-implementation activities will NOT be reviewed in this section.

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

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

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

- The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of:
- Student Performance
 - Curriculum Development and Learning Management
 - Professional Development
 - Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
 - Parent and Community Involvement
 - Information Technology and Data Management
 - Human Resources
 - Leadership and Governance
 - Fiscal and Budget

- The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of **student performance** and a **majority** of:
- Student Performance
 - Curriculum Development and Learning Management
 - Professional Development
 - Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
 - Parent and Community Involvement
 - Information Technology and Data Management
 - Human Resources
 - Leadership and Governance
 - Fiscal and Budget

- The needs analysis is **not** thorough and/or **does not** include evaluation of a majority of:
- Student Performance
 - Curriculum Development and Learning Management
 - Professional Development
 - Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment
 - Parent and Community Involvement
 - Information Technology and Data Management
 - Human Resources
 - Leadership and Governance
 - Fiscal and Budget

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

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

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

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

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

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

The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis

The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis

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

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity
Section VII. B.—Not Serving all Tier I Schools

Capacity to serve Tier I and Tier II Schools

40 POINTS POSSIBLE

Pre-implementation activities will NOT be reviewed in this section.

Meets standards at a high level—32-40 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—20-31 points

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

Refer to Appendix A, Determining LEA/District Capacity for detailed information for the measures below.

This section evaluates Tier I and Tier II school plans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The LEA/district has not implemented turnaround initiatives in low-achieving schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Score _____/40 points possible

Section VII. C.— LEA/District Actions

LEA/District implementation plan for Tier I and Tier II schools
Pre-implementation activities will NOT be reviewed in this section.

20 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—16-20 points	Meets standards at an acceptable level—10-15 points	Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-9 points
--	---	---

Refer to Appendix B, LEA/District Actions for detailed information for the measures below.
This section scores the evaluation of the LEA/district-level plan.

<p><i>The LEA/district has:</i></p> <p><i>Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a detailed plan to implement the intervention(s). <p><i>Aligned other resources with the interventions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA/district has listed a wide variety of additional resources that will support the interventions. The resources directly align with the findings of the needs analysis and support the planned interventions and improvement activities. <p><i>Modified LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA/district policies and practices have been modified LEA/district has projected impact of those changes <p><i>Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attainable long range plans are in place for sustainable processes . Means to identify effective procedures are in place and are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts. <p><i>If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA/district application process for external providers is in place. SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers. 	<p><i>The LEA/district has:</i></p> <p><i>Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a plan to implement the intervention(s). <p><i>Aligned other resources with the interventions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA/district has listed a wide variety of additional resources that will support the interventions. The resources loosely align with the findings of the needs analysis and support the planned interventions and improvement activities. <p><i>Modified LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA/district policies will practices modified LEA/district has projected impact of those changes <p><i>Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of long range plans will place focus on sustainable processes. Means to identify effective procedures are in place and are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts. <p><i>If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA/district application process for external providers is in place. SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers. 	<p><i>The LEA/district has:</i></p> <p><i>Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a plan to implement the intervention(s). <p><i>Aligned other resources with the interventions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA/district has listed a wide variety of additional resources that will support the interventions. The resources loosely align with the findings of the needs analysis and support the planned interventions and improvement activities. <p><i>Modified LEA/district practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA/district policies will practices modified LEA/district has projected impact of those changes <p><i>Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of long range plans will place focus on sustainable processes. Means to identify effective procedures are in place and are portable to other schools that would benefit from improvement efforts. <p><i>If applicable, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA/district application process for external providers is in place. SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers.
---	--	--

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS FOR B (3)

Score _____/20 points possible

Section VII. D.— Timeline

Tier I and/or II timeline

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Pre-implementation activities will NOT be reviewed in this section.

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

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

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

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

Section VII. E.— Annual Goals for Student Achievement

Tier I and/or Tier II annual goals

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

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

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

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

Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

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

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

Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

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

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

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

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

Section VII. F.— Services and Activities

Tier III improvement activities (score only if Tier III buildings are included)
 Pre-implementation activities will NOT be reviewed in this section.

20 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—16-20 points	Meets standards at an acceptable level—10-15 points	Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-9 points
<p>The LEA’s/district’s plan is written in precise detail to clearly describe how the activities will be implemented, funded, and evaluated. The plan has specific strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible staff members for each strategy • Timelines for each strategy and action step • Funding identified for each strategy • Implementation progress measures for each strategy • Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step • LEA/district oversight and support 	<p>The LEA’S/district’s plan is written in adequate detail to describe how the improvement activities will be implemented, funded, and evaluated. Additional detail would improve the plan. The plan has strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible staff members for each strategy • Timelines for each strategy and action step • Funding identified for each strategy • Implementation progress measures for each strategy • Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step • LEA/district oversight and support 	<p>The LEA/district has strategies and action plans based on the needs assessment for each Tier III school that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible staff members for each strategy • Timelines for each strategy and action step • Funding identified for each strategy • Implementation progress measures for each strategy • Regularly scheduled evaluation for each strategy and action step • LEA/district oversight and support <p>However, the plan(s) lacks the detail necessary to determine how the activities will be implemented, funded, and/or evaluated.</p>
<p>COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS</p>		

Score _____/20 points possible

Section VII. G.— Annual Goals for Student Achievement

Tier III annual goals (score only if Tier III buildings are included)

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

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

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

Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

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

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

Targets have been set in consultation with the Department

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

Section VII. H.— Consultation with and Involvement of Stakeholders

Stakeholder involvement in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

Meets standards at a high level—8-10 points

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

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

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

Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score _____/10 points possible

Section VI. A.— LEA/District/Building Year One Strategies and Activities Template
Section VI. B.— LEA/District/Building Budget Template
Section VI. C.— LEA/District/Building Year One Budget Itemization
Section VII. A.—Needs and Capacity
Section VII. C.— LEA/District Actions
Section VII. D.— Timeline
Section VII. F.— Services and Activities

Only pre-implementation activities will be reviewed in this section. The applicant must affirmatively respond to all six items to receive funding for pre-implementation activities. If the reviewer selects a “no” response, they must identify the pre-implementation activity and the location in the narrative that did not provide sufficient information.

Yes	No	The applicant must address whether the activities proposed to be carried out during pre-implementation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are directly related to the selected model;
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA’s needs assessment;
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Represent a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years;
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are research-based; and
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Appendix A DETERMINING LEA/DISTRICT CAPACITY

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

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

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

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

- Procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation of the strategies
- The plans indicate that the required activities of the selected interventions for Tier I and Tier II schools will be implemented
- The plans indicate that appropriate permissible activities of the selected interventions will be implemented
- How the LEA/district will support the interventions and improvement activities at the LEA/district level
 - Responsible staff are identified
 - Staff responsibilities and expectations are listed
 - Planned LEA/district-level activities are listed

Appendix B

LEA/DISTRICT ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Align other resources with the interventions

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

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

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

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

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

**SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY2009 SIG FUNDS
MISSOURI**

LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	GRAD RATE
Hickman Mills C-1	2914340	Ervin Jr. High	00653		X		
Hickman Mills C-1	2914340	Smith-Hale Jr. High	00660		X		
Kansas City 33	2916400	Central High	00840		X		
Kansas City 33	2916400	Northeast High	00860		X		
Kansas City 33	2916400	East High School	00880		X		
Alta Vista Charter Sch.	2900029	Alta Vista Charter Sch.	02741		X		
Genesis School Inc.	2900016	Genesis School Inc.	02746	X			
Urban Com. Leadership Academy	2900018	Urban Com. Leadership Academy	02745	X			
B. Banneker Academy	2900011	B. Banneker Academy	02750	X			
Hayti R-II	2913800	Hayti High	00611		X		
Caruthersville 18	2907470	Caruthersville Middle	01023		X		
Hazelwood	2913830	East Middle	00629		X		
Ferguson-Florissant R-II	2912010	McCluer South-Berkeley High	02691		X		
Ferguson-Florissant R-II	2912010	Berkeley Middle	00354		X		
Jennings	2916290	Jennings Jr. High	00767		X		
Normandy	2922650	Normandy High	01248		X		
Normandy	2922650	Normandy Middle	01244		X		
Riverview Gardens	2926670	Riverview Gardens Sr. High	01586		X		
Riverview Gardens	2926670	R. G. Central Middle	02539		X		
Riverview Gardens	2926670	Westview Middle	02687		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Vashon High School	02011	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Fanning Middle Community Ed.	01922	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Langston Middle	01957	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	L'Ouverture Middle	01954	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Ashland Elem. And Br.	01877	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Columbia Elem. Comm. Ed. Center	02693	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Hamilton Elem. Community Ed.	01937	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Jefferson Elem.	01950	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Mann Elem.	01968	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Sigel Elem. Comm. Ed. Center	02000	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Walbridge Elem. Community Ed.	02015	X			
Construction Careers Center	2900583	Construction Careers Center	02788		X		

**SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS
MISSOURI**

LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
Don Bosco Education Ctr.	2900012	Don Bosco Education Ctr.	02742	X			
Della Lamb Elem.	2900013	Della Lamb Elem.	02751	X			
Gordon Parks Elem.	2900015	Gordon Parks Elem.	02752	X			
Brookside Charter School	2900024	Brookside Frontier Math/Sci	02986		X		
Derrick Thomas Academy	2900026	Derrick Thomas Jr. Acad.	02987		X		
Kipp Endeavor Academy	2900031	Kipp Endeavor Academy	03013		X		
Lift for Life Academy	2900574	Lift for Life Academy	02828		X		
Imagine Ren Acad Env Sci & Ma	2900578	Wallace Campus	02977	X			
Imagine Ren Acad Env Sci & Ma	2900578	Kensington Campus	02982	X			
Imagine Academy of Careers	2900580	IA of Careers Elem.	03018	X			
Imagine Acad. Of Careers	2900580	IA of Careers Middle	03019	X			
Imagine Acad. Academic Success	2900581	IA of Academic Success	03015	X			
Imagine Acad. ES and Math	2900582	IA of Environ. Science/Math	03020	X			
Center 58	2908250	Center Middle	00230		X		
Charleston R-I	2908670	Charleston Middle	01780		X		
Community R-VI	2910020	Community High	00319		X		
Ferguson-Florissant R-II	2912010	Ferguson Middle	00462		X		
Grandview C-4	2913140	Grandview Middle	00551		X		
Hazelwood	2913830	Hazelwood East High	02696		X		
Hazelwood	2913830	Central Middle	03000		X		
Hazelwood	2913830	Southeast Middle	03005		X		
Kansas City 33	2916400	Attucks Elem.	00800	X			
Kansas City 33	2916400	C. A. Franklin Elem.	00808	X			
Kansas City 33	2916400	George Melcher Elem.	00826	X			
Kansas City 33	2916400	Milton Moore Elem.	00856	X			
Kansas City 33	2916400	Pitcher Elem.	00864	X			
Kansas City 33	2916400	Troost Elem.	00879	X			
Malta Bend R-V	2919920	Malta Bend High	01060		X		
Scott Co. Central	2921420	Scott Co. Central High	01177		X		
Pattonsburg R-II	2923670	Pattonsburg High	01410		X		
North Pemiscot Co. R-I	2923760	North Pemiscot Sr High	01431		X		
Ritenour	2926640	Hoeh Middle	01567		X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS

MISSOURI

LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Riverview Gardens	2926670	Lemasters Elem.	01582	X			
Riverview Gardens	2926670	Lewis and Clark Elem.	01583	X			
Riverview Gardens	2926670	Moline Elem.	02701	X			
Northeast Vernon Co. R-I	2927600	Northeast Vernon Co. R-I High	01695		X		
South Pemiscot Co. R-V	2928530	South Pemiscot High	01764		X		
Southwest R-V	2928710	Southwest Middle	02801		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Bunche International Studies	00287		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Carr Lane VPA Middle	00792		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Gateway Middle	01585		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Beaumont High	01882		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Dunbar and Br.	01916	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Compton-Drew ILC Middle	01927		X		
St. Louis City	2929280	Meramec Elem.	01975	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Oak Hill Elem.	01986	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Stevens Middle Community Ed.	02006	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Lyon at Blow Elem.	02403	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Washington Montessori	02572	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Earl Nance, Sr. Elem.	02853	X			
St. Louis City	2929280	Yeatman-Liddell Middle School	02878	X			
Sturgeon R-V	2929700	Sturgeon Middle	01392		X		
University City	2930660	University City Sr. High	02113		X		
University City	2930660	Brittany Woods	02511		X		
Winfield R-IV	2932190	Winfield Middle	02814		X		
Wright City R-II	2932310	Wright City Middle	02576		X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
KIRKSVILLE R-III	2916740	RAY MILLER ELEM.	00917	X		
ADAIR CO. R-II	2905790	ADAIR CO. ELEM.	00124	X		
SAVANNAH R-III	2927570	AMAZONIA ELEM.	01688	X		
SAVANNAH R-III	2927570	MINNIE CLINE ELEM.	01692	X		
VAN-FAR R-I	2930780	VAN-FAR ELEM.	02125	X		
MEXICO 59	2920810	EUGENE FIELD ELEM.	01132	X		
MEXICO 59	2920810	HAWTHORNE ELEM.	01133	X		
WHEATON R-III	2931950	WHEATON ELEM.	02236	X		
SOUTHWEST R-V	2928710	SOUTHWEST ELEM.	01773	X		
EXETER R-VI	2911670	EXETER ELEM.	00426	X		
CASSVILLE R-IV	2908170	CASSVILLE INTERMEDIATE	02718	X		
LAMAR R-I	2917850	LAMAR ELEM.	00953	X		
RICH HILL R-IV	2926310	RICH HILL ELEM.	01545	X		
BUTLER R-V	2906360	BUTLER ELEM.	00157	X		
WARSAW R-IX	2931070	NORTH ELEM.	02153	X		
WARSAW R-IX	2931070	SOUTH ELEM.	02154	X		
COLE CAMP R-I	2909900	COLE CAMP ELEM.	00292	X		
HARRISBURG R-VIII	2913710	HARRISBURG ELEM.	00598	X		
COLUMBIA 93	2901000	FREDERICK DOUGLASS HIGH	00281	X		
COLUMBIA 93	2901000	THOMAS BENTON ELEM.	00313	X		
COLUMBIA 93	2901000	BLUE RIDGE ELEM.	00298	X		
COLUMBIA 93	2901000	DERBY RIDGE ELEM.	02665	X		
COLUMBIA 93	2901000	PARKADE ELEM.	00307	X		
COLUMBIA 93	2901000	WEST BLVD. ELEM.	00316	X		
EAST BUCHANAN CO. C-1	2911250	EAST BUCHANAN ELEM.	00390	X		
ST. JOSEPH	2927060	EDISON ELEM.	01649	X		
ST. JOSEPH	2927060	HALL ELEM.	01653	X		
ST. JOSEPH	2927060	HUMBOLDT ELEM.	01658	X		
ST. JOSEPH	2927060	LAKE ELEM.	01661	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
ST. JOSEPH	2927060	NOYES ELEM.	01666	X		
NEELYVILLE R-IV	2921750	NEELYVILLE ELEM.	01202	X		
POPLAR BLUFF R-I	2925450	EUGENE FIELD ELEM.	01467	X		
POPLAR BLUFF R-I	2925450	POPLAR BLUFF 5TH & 6TH CTR.	01947	X		
TWIN RIVERS R-X	2930520	FISK ELEM.	02093	X		
TWIN RIVERS R-X	2930520	QULIN ELEM.	02094	X		
BRECKENRIDGE R-I	2905850	BRECKENRIDGE ELEM.	00128	X		
POLO R-VII	2925410	POLO ELEM.	01464	X		
NORTH CALLAWAY CO. R-I	2922740	AUXVASSE ELEM.	01252	X		
NEW BLOOMFIELD R-III	2921875	NEW BLOOMFIELD ELEM.	01218	X		
SOUTH CALLAWAY CO. R-II	2928430	SOUTH CALLAWAY ELEM.	01756	X		
STOUTLAND R-II	2929580	STOUTLAND ELEM.	02045	X		
CAMDENTON R-III	2906990	OAK RIDGE INTERMEDIATE	02580	X		
CAMDENTON R-III	2906990	HAWTHORN ELEM.	02983	X		
CLIMAX SPRINGS R-IV	2909810	CLIMAX SPRINGS ELEM.	00283	X		
MACKS CREEK R-V	2919380	MACKS CREEK ELEM.	01048	X		
CAPE GIRARDEAU 63	2907120	BLANCHARD ELEM.	02722	X		
CAPE GIRARDEAU 63	2907120	JEFFERSON ELEM.	00189	X		
CAPE GIRARDEAU 63	2907120	CENTRAL MIDDLE	02798	X		
NELL HOLCOMB R-IV	2907320	NELL HOLCOMB ELEM.	00194	X		
BOSWORTH R-V	2905610	BOSWORTH ELEM.	00106	X		
EAST CARTER CO. R-II	2911100	EAST CARTER CO. R-II ELEM.	00380	X		
VAN BUREN R-I	2930750	VAN BUREN HIGH	02121	X		
RAYMORE-PECULIAR R-II	2923730	PECULIAR ELEM.	01426	X		
RAYMORE-PECULIAR R-II	2923730	BRIDLE RIDGE INTERMEDIATE	02889	X		
SHERWOOD CASS R-VIII	2910320	SHERWOOD ELEM.	00334	X		
EAST LYNNE 40	2911160	EAST LYNNE ELEM.	00384	X		
HARRISONVILLE R-IX	2913760	HARRISONVILLE MIDDLE	02659	X		
HARRISONVILLE R-IX	2913760	HARRISONVILLE ELEM.	00602	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
MIDWAY R-I	2931800	MIDWAY ELEM.	02223	X		
BELTON 124	2904620	CAMBRIDGE ELEM.	00051	X		
BELTON 124	2904620	SCOTT ELEM.	00054	X		
BELTON 124	2904620	KENTUCKY TRAIL ELEM.	02988	X		
STOCKTON R-I	2929520	STOCKTON ELEM.	02043	X		
EL DORADO SPRINGS R-II	2911310	EL DORADO SPRINGS ELEM.	00400	X		
BRUNSWICK R-II	2906030	BRUNSWICK ELEM.	00144	X		
SALISBURY R-IV	2927520	SALISBURY ELEM.	01683	X		
SPARTA R-III	2928740	SPARTA ELEM.	01775	X		
EXCELSIOR SPRINGS 40	2911650	LEWIS ELEM.	00417	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	NORTH KANSAS CITY HIGH	01284	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	WINNETONKA HIGH	01293	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	EASTGATE MIDDLE	01268	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	MAPLE PARK MIDDLE	01278	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	NORTHGATE MIDDLE	02730	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	GRACEMOR ELEM.	01274	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	LINDEN WEST ELEM.	01277	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	MAPLEWOOD ELEM.	01279	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	WEST ENGLEWOOD ELEM.	01292	X		
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	2922800	WINNWOOD ELEM.	01294	X		
CAMERON R-I	2907020	PARKVIEW ELEM.	00178	X		
CLINTON CO. R-III	2925290	ELLIS ELEM.	01457	X		
BLAIR OAKS R-II	2909930	BLAIR OAKS ELEM.	00294	X		
COLE CO. R-V	2911550	EUGENE ELEM.	00410	X		
BOONVILLE R-I	2905580	DAVID BARTON ELEM.	00103	X		
CRAWFORD CO. R-I	2905640	BOURBON ELEM.	00108	X		
STEELVILLE R-III	2929430	STEELVILLE MIDDLE	02482	X		
GREENFIELD R-IV	2913320	GREENFIELD ELEM.	00565	X		
DALLAS CO. R-I	2906120	MALLORY ELEM.	00150	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
DALLAS CO. R-I	2906120	LONG LANE ELEM.	00152	X		
NORTH DAVIESS R-III	2915630	NORTH DAVIESS ELEM.	00740	X		
GALLATIN R-V	2912660	COVEL D. SEARCY ELEM.	00529	X		
SALEM R-80	2927090	SALEM UPPER ELEM.	01676	X		
NORTH WOOD R-IV	2910650	NORTH WOOD ELEM.	00359	X		
SKYLINE R-II	2911010	SKYLINE ELEM.	00376	X		
AVA R-I	2904050	AVA MIDDLE	02548	X		
MALDEN R-I	2919890	MALDEN LOWER ELEM.	01056	X		
SENATH-HORNERSVILLE C-8	2927870	HORNERSVILLE MIDDLE	01714	X		
KENNETT 39	2916500	SOUTH ELEM.	00902	X		
UNION R-XI	2930570	CENTRAL ELEM.	02098	X		
SULLIVAN	2929760	SULLIVAN ELEM.	02055	X		
WASHINGTON	2931110	SOUTH POINT ELEM.	02164	X		
GASCONADE CO. R-II	2923340	OWENSVILLE ELEM.	01345	X		
GASCONADE CO. R-I	2914280	HERMANN MIDDLE	02464	X		
WILLARD R-II	2932010	WILLARD MIDDLE	02242	X		
WILLARD R-II	2932010	WILLARD SOUTH ELEM.	02241	X		
ASH GROVE R-IV	2903270	ASH GROVE ELEM.	00027	X		
WALNUT GROVE R-V	2930990	WALNUT GROVE ELEM.	02140	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	PIPKIN MIDDLE	01813	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	REED MIDDLE	01818	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	STUDY MIDDLE	01827	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	BOYD ELEM.	01784	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	HOLLAND ELEM.	01801	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	MARK TWAIN ELEM.	01805	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	MCGREGOR ELEM.	01806	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	SUNSHINE ELEM.	01828	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	WEAVER ELEM.	01832	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	WELLER ELEM.	01833	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	WESTPORT ELEM.	01834	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	WILLIAMS ELEM.	01837	X		
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	2928860	YORK ELEM.	01838	X		
TRENTON R-IX	2930360	RISSLER ELEM.	02079	X		
SOUTH HARRISON CO. R-II	2900002	SOUTH HARRISON ELEM.	01641	X		
RIDGEWAY R-V	2926490	RIDGEWAY ELEM.	01558	X		
HENRY CO. R-I	2932110	WINDSOR ELEM.	02254	X		
CALHOUN R-VIII	2906480	CALHOUN ELEM.	00165	X		
CLINTON	2909860	HENRY ELEM.	00289	X		
WHEATLAND R-II	2931920	WHEATLAND ELEM.	02234	X		
SOUTH HOLT CO. R-I	2923190	SOUTH HOLT ELEM.	01333	X		
NEW FRANKLIN R-I	2921940	NEW FRANKLIN ELEM.	01222	X		
FAYETTE R-III	2911990	LAURENCE J. DALY ELEM.	00446	X		
GLASGOW	2912900	HOWARD CO. ELEM.	00539	X		
MOUNTAIN VIEW-BIRCH TREE R-III	2921540	LIBERTY MIDDLE	03026	X		
MOUNTAIN VIEW-BIRCH TREE R-III	2921540	MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEM.	01187	X		
WILLOW SPRINGS R-IV	2932070	WILLOW SPRINGS MIDDLE	02246	X		
WILLOW SPRINGS R-IV	2932070	WILLOW SPRINGS ELEM.	02249	X		
WEST PLAINS R-VII	2931680	WEST PLAINS ELEM.	02543	X		
FAIRVIEW R-XI	2911850	FAIRVIEW ELEM.	00435	X		
IRON CO. C-4	2915510	VIBURNUM ELEM.	00730	X		
FORT OSAGE R-I	2912290	BLUE HILLS ELEM.	00489	X		
GRAIN VALLEY R-V	2913080	MATTHEWS ELEM.	00547	X		
LEE'S SUMMIT R-VII	2918300	MEADOW LANE ELEM.	00980	X		
LEE'S SUMMIT R-VII	2918300	WESTVIEW ELEM.	00984	X		
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	2914340	BURKE ELEM.	00651	X		
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	2914340	JOHNSON ELEM.	02595	X		
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	2914340	SYMINGTON ELEM.	00662	X		
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	2914340	TRUMAN ELEM.	00663	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	2914340	SANTA FE ELEM.	00659	X		
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	2914340	INGELS ELEM.	00655	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	BLUE RIDGE ELEM.	00545	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	EASTWOOD HILLS ELEM.	01518	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	FLEETRIDGE ELEM.	01519	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	LAUREL HILLS ELEM.	01520	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	NORFLEET ELEM.	01521	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	SOUTHWOOD ELEM.	01530	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	SPRING VALLEY ELEM.	01531	X		
RAYTOWN C-2	2926070	WESTRIDGE ELEM.	01532	X		
GRANDVIEW C-4	2913140	BELVIDERE ELEM.	00548	X		
GRANDVIEW C-4	2913140	BUTCHER-GREENE ELEM.	00549	X		
GRANDVIEW C-4	2913140	CONN-WEST ELEM.	00550	X		
GRANDVIEW C-4	2913140	MARTIN CITY ELEM.	00554	X		
GRANDVIEW C-4	2913140	MEADOWMERE ELEM.	00555	X		
INDEPENDENCE 30	2915480	THOMAS HART BENTON ELEM.	00707	X		
INDEPENDENCE 30	2915480	WILLIAM SOUTHERN ELEM.	00725	X		
INDEPENDENCE 30	2915480	SYCAMORE HILLS ELEM.	00721	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	TRAILWOODS ELEM.	02603	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	ROGERS ELEMENTARY	02375	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	FOREIGN LANGUAGE ACADEMY	02376	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	GLADSTONE ELEM.	02529	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	JAMES ELEM.	00837	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	LONGFELLOW ELEM.	00848	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	WENDELL PHILLIPS ELEM.	00882	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	SATCHEL PAIGE ELEM.	02609	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	B. BANNEKER ELEM.	02602	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	HOLLIDAY MONTESSORI	02606	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	SWINNEY ELEMENTARY	00818	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	PRIMITIVO GARCIA ELEM.	02530	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	PHILLIS WHEATLEY ELEM.	00863	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	WHITTIER ELEM.	00887	X		
KANSAS CITY 33	2916400	R. J. DELANO	00865	X		
CENTER 58	2908250	BOONE ELEM.	00223	X		
CENTER 58	2908250	INDIAN CREEK ELEM.	00226	X		
UNIVERSITY ACADEMY	2900027	UNIVERSITY ACADEMY-UPPER	02808	X		
UNIVERSITY ACADEMY	2900027	UNIVERSITY ACADEMY-MIDDLE	02914	X		
HOGAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY	2900014	HOGAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY	02743	X		
ALLEN VILLAGE	2900025	ALLEN VILLAGE SCHOOL	02748	X		
LEE A. TOLBERT COM. ACADEMY	2900028	LEE A. TOLBERT COM. ACADEMY	02749	X		
SCUOLA VITA NUOVA	2900019	SCUOLA VITA NUOVA CHARTER	02754	X		
BROOKSIDE CHARTER SCH.	2900024	BROOKSIDE CHARTER SCH.	02838	X		
DERRICK THOMAS ACADEMY	2900026	DERRICK THOMAS ELEM. ACADEMY	02839	X		
CARL JUNCTION R-I	2907350	CARL JUNCTION INTERMEDIATE	00196	X		
JASPER CO. R-V	2916140	JASPER CO. ELEM.	00744	X		
CARTHAGE R-IX	2907460	COLUMBIAN ELEM.	00204	X		
CARTHAGE R-IX	2907460	STEADLEY ELEM.	01980	X		
CARTHAGE R-IX	2907460	FAIRVIEW ELEM.	00206	X		
JOPLIN SCHOOLS	2916350	CECIL FLOYD ELEM.	02432	X		
JOPLIN SCHOOLS	2916350	DUQUESNE ELEM.	00774	X		
JOPLIN SCHOOLS	2916350	WEST CENTRAL ELEM.	00793	X		
NORTHWEST R-I	2922890	HIGH RIDGE ELEM.	01303	X		
NORTHWEST R-I	2922890	MAPLE GROVE ELEM.	01306	X		
DESOTO 73	2910500	VINELAND ELEM.	00351	X		
JOHNSON CO. R-VII	2908320	CREST RIDGE MIDDLE	02406	X		
KNOB NOSTER R-VIII	2916830	KNOB NOSTER ELEM.	00931	X		
WARRENSBURG R-VI	2931020	MARTIN WARREN ELEM.	02513	X		
WARRENSBURG R-VI	2931020	STERLING ELEM.	01729	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LACLEDE CO. R-I	2910110	EZARD ELEM.	00323	X		
LEBANON R-III	2918270	HILLCREST SCHOOL	00969	X		
LEBANON R-III	2918270	MAPLECREST ELEM.	00973	X		
LACLEDE CO. C-5	2917000	JOEL E. BARBER ELEM.	00940	X		
LAFAYETTE CO. C-1	2914400	GRANDVIEW ELEM.	00669	X		
ODESSA R-VII	2923100	ODESSA UPPER ELEM.	01743	X		
SANTA FE R-X	2903000	SANTA FE ELEM.	00012	X		
LEXINGTON R-V	2918480	LEXINGTON MIDDLE	01000	X		
LEXINGTON R-V	2918480	LESLIE BELL ELEM.	00998	X		
MILLER R-II	2921000	CENTRAL ELEM.	01440	X		
PIERCE CITY R-VI	2925110	PIERCE CITY MIDDLE	01987	X		
MARIONVILLE R-IX	2920310	MARIONVILLE ELEM.	01076	X		
AURORA R-VIII	2904020	AURORA HIGH	00031	X		
AURORA R-VIII	2904020	AURORA JR. HIGH	01517	X		
AURORA R-VIII	2904020	ROBINSON ELEM.	00033	X		
AURORA R-VIII	2904020	ROBINSON INTERMEDIATE	02981	X		
CANTON R-V	2907080	CANTON ELEM.	00181	X		
SILEX R-I	2928290	SILEX ELEM.	01747	X		
ELSBERRY R-II	2911400	CLARENCE CANNON ELEM.	00406	X		
TROY R-III	2930450	HAWK POINT ELEM.	02087	X		
TROY R-III	2930450	WM. R. CAPPEL ELEM.	02089	X		
LINN CO. R-I	2906000	LINN CO. ELEM.	00142	X		
BROOKFIELD R-III	2905940	BROOKFIELD ELEM.	00137	X		
CHILLICOTHE R-II	2908760	CHILLICOTHE MIDDLE	02815	X		
CHILLICOTHE R-II	2908760	CENTRAL ELEM.	00259	X		
CHILLICOTHE R-II	2908760	FIELD ELEM.	00262	X		
MCDONALD CO. R-I	2920610	ANDERSON ELEM.	01100	X		
MCDONALD CO. R-I	2920610	NOEL ELEM.	01101	X		
MCDONALD CO. R-I	2920610	ROCKY COMFORT ELEM.	01103	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
MCDONALD CO. R-I	2920610	SOUTHWEST CITY ELEM.	01105	X		
MCDONALD CO. R-I	2920610	WHITE ROCK ELEM.	01106	X		
MACON CO. R-I	2919410	MACON ELEM.	01050	X		
MARQUAND-ZION R-VI	2920370	MARQUAND-ZION HIGH	01080	X		
MARIES CO. R-II	2900001	MARIES CO. MIDDLE	02547	X		
PALMYRA R-I	2923490	PALMYRA ELEM.	01360	X		
HANNIBAL 60	2913650	A. D. STOWELL ELEM.	00587	X		
HANNIBAL 60	2913650	EUGENE FIELD ELEM.	00589	X		
HANNIBAL 60	2913650	OAKWOOD ELEM.	00593	X		
HANNIBAL 60	2913650	VETERANS ELEM.	02781	X		
PRINCETON R-V	2925590	PRINCETON R-V ELEM.	02299	X		
ELDON R-I	2911340	SOUTH ELEM.	00403	X		
SCHOOL OF THE OSAGE	2927630	OSAGE MIDDLE	01020	X		
IBERIA R-V	2915420	IBERIA ELEM.	00702	X		
EAST PRAIRIE R-II	2911220	A. J. MARTIN ELEM.	00385	X		
CHARLESTON R-I	2908670	WARREN E. HEARNES ELEM.	00255	X		
MONITEAU CO. R-I	2906510	CALIFORNIA ELEM.	00167	X		
MONTGOMERY CO. R-II	2921330	MONTGOMERY CITY ELEM.	01172	X		
PORTAGEVILLE	2900003	PORTAGEVILLE ELEM.	02459	X		
NEW MADRID CO. R-I	2900004	LILBOURN ELEM.	01482	X		
NEW MADRID CO. R-I	2900004	NEW MADRID ELEM.	01484	X		
EAST NEWTON CO. R-VI	2930420	TRIWAY	02085	X		
SENECA R-VII	2927900	SENECA ELEM.	01717	X		
NEOSHO R-V	2921810	BENTON ELEM.	01203	X		
NEOSHO R-V	2921810	GOODMAN ELEM.	01206	X		
OSAGE CO. R-II	2919080	OSAGE CO. ELEM.	01029	X		
BAKERSFIELD R-IV	2904140	BAKERSFIELD HIGH	00040	X		
LUTIE R-VI	2923400	LUTIE HIGH	02565	X		
NORTH PEMISCOT CO. R-I	2923760	ROSS ELEM.	01429	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
HAYTI R-II	2913800	WALLACE ELEM.	00610	X		
PEMISCOT CO. R-III	2923790	PEMISCOT CO. R-III ELEM.	01436	X		
SOUTH PEMISCOT CO. R-V	2928530	SOUTH PEMISCOT ELEM.	02670	X		
CARUTHERSVILLE 18	2907470	CARUTHERSVILLE HIGH	00214	X		
CARUTHERSVILLE 18	2907470	CARUTHERSVILLE ELEM.	00216	X		
PERRY CO. 32	2924530	PERRYVILLE ELEM.	02386	X		
LA MONTE R-IV	2916920	LA MONTE ELEM.	00936	X		
PETTIS CO. R-XII	2924690	PETTIS CO. ELEM.	01713	X		
SEDALIA 200	2927830	HEBER HUNT ELEM.	01703	X		
ST. JAMES R-I	2929250	LUCY WORTHAM JAMES ELEM.	01873	X		
NEWBURG R-II	2922140	NEWBURG ELEM.	01228	X		
ROLLA 31	2926890	ROLLA MIDDLE	01635	X		
ROLLA 31	2926890	HARRY S. TRUMAN ELEM.	01632	X		
BOWLING GREEN R-I	2905660	BOWLING GREEN ELEM.	00112	X		
LOUISIANA R-II	2919260	LOUISIANA ELEM.	01042	X		
PLATTE CO. R-III	2925230	BARRY SCH.	01451	X		
PARK HILL	2923550	PLAZA MIDDLE	01369	X		
PARK HILL	2923550	SOUTHEAST ELEM.	01372	X		
PARK HILL	2923550	PARK HILL DAY SCH.	02537	X		
MARION C. EARLY R-V	2920160	MARION C. EARLY ELEM.	01072	X		
PLEASANT HOPE R-VI	2925350	PLEASANT HOPE MIDDLE	02436	X		
PLEASANT HOPE R-VI	2925350	PLEASANT HOPE ELEM.	01462	X		
SWEDEBORG R-III	2929850	SWEDEBORG ELEM.	02061	X		
RICHLAND R-IV	2926430	RICHLAND ELEM.	01550	X		
LAQUEY R-V	2917880	LAQUEY R-V ELEM.	00956	X		
WAYNESVILLE R-VI	2931440	WOOD ELEM.	02874	X		
RALLS CO. R-II	2925710	NEW LONDON ELEM.	01512	X		
HIGBEE R-VIII	2914370	HIGBEE ELEM.	00666	X		
MOBERLY	2921100	GRATZ BROWN ELEM.	02820	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
LAWSON R-XIV	2918220	SOUTHWEST ELEM.	00964	X		
ORRICK R-XI	2923220	ORRICK ELEM.	01335	X		
RICHMOND R-XVI	2926480	SUNRISE ELEM.	01878	X		
SOUTHERN REYNOLDS CO. R-II	2928590	SOUTHERN ELEM.	01767	X		
NAYLOR R-II	2921720	NAYLOR ELEM.	01197	X		
DONIPHAN R-I	2910920	DONIPHAN MIDDLE	02586	X		
DONIPHAN R-I	2910920	DONIPHAN ELEM.	00371	X		
RIPLEY CO. R-IV	2926580	RIPLEY CO. ELEM.	01561	X		
FT. ZUMWALT R-II	2908370	FOREST PARK ELEM.	00234	X		
FT. ZUMWALT R-II	2908370	LEWIS & CLARK ELEM.	00236	X		
FT. ZUMWALT R-II	2908370	HAWTHORN ELEM.	02369	X		
FRANCIS HOWELL R-III	2928950	CENTRAL ELEM.	01857	X		
FRANCIS HOWELL R-III	2928950	HARVEST RIDGE ELEM.	02681	X		
WENTZVILLE R-IV	2931650	DUELLO ELEM.	03080	X		
ST. CHARLES R-VI	2928920	COVERDELL ELEM.	01844	X		
ST. CHARLES R-VI	2928920	LINCOLN ELEM.	01843	X		
ST. CHARLES R-VI	2928920	MONROE ELEM.	01846	X		
NORTH ST. FRANCOIS CO. R-I	2905430	INTERMEDIATE SCH.	00095	X		
CENTRAL R-III	2929170	WEST ELEM.	01871	X		
STE. GENEVIEVE CO. R-II	2929370	STE. GENEVIEVE MIDDLE	02032	X		
HAZELWOOD	2913830	KEEVEN ELEM.	00614	X		
HAZELWOOD	2913830	GRANNEMANN ELEM.	00621	X		
HAZELWOOD	2913830	LARIMORE ELEM.	00630	X		
HAZELWOOD	2913830	TWILLMAN ELEM.	00636	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	AIRPORT ELEM.	00449	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	BERMUDA ELEM.	00452	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	CENTRAL ELEM.	00454	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	COOL VALLEY ELEM.	00457	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	DUCHESNE ELEM.	00460	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	GRIFFITH ELEM.	00466	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	HALLS FERRY ELEM.	00467	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	HOLMAN ELEM.	00468	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	LEE HAMILTON ELEM.	00469	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	JOHNSON WABASH ELEM.	02784	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	ROBINWOOD ELEM.	00475	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	VOGT ELEM.	01092	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	WALNUT GROVE ELEM.	00477	X		
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	2912010	WEDGWOOD ELEM.	00478	X		
PATTONVILLE R-III	2923700	BRIAR CREST ELEM.	01411	X		
PATTONVILLE R-III	2923700	PARKWOOD ELEM.	01416	X		
PATTONVILLE R-III	2923700	ROBERT DRUMMOND ELEM.	02848	X		
MEHLVILLE R-IX	2920670	BIERBAUM ELEM.	01111	X		
PARKWAY C-2	2923580	CARMAN TRAILS ELEM.	01377	X		
PARKWAY C-2	2923580	CRAIG ELEM.	01382	X		
PARKWAY C-2	2923580	HANNA WOODS ELEM.	01386	X		
PARKWAY C-2	2923580	RIVER BEND ELEM.	01396	X		
PARKWAY C-2	2923580	SORRENTO SPRINGS ELEM.	01400	X		
AFFTON 101	2902910	ROGERS MIDDLE	02461	X		
AFFTON 101	2902910	GOTSCH INTERMEDIATE SCH.	00005	X		
BAYLESS	2904500	BAYLESS INTERMEDIATE	00045	X		
HANCOCK PLACE	2913620	HANCOCK PLACE ELEM.	00584	X		
JENNINGS	2916290	FAIRVIEW PRIMARY	00766	X		
JENNINGS	2916290	FAIRVIEW INTERMEDIATE	03081	X		
JENNINGS	2916290	NORTHVIEW ELEM.	00768	X		
JENNINGS	2916290	GARY GORE ELEM.	02763	X		
JENNINGS	2916290	KENNETH C. HANRAHAN ELEM.	02786	X		
MAPLEWOOD-RICHMOND HEIGHTS	2920010	MRH ELEM.	02860	X		
NORMANDY	2922650	GARFIELD ELEM.	01241	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
NORMANDY	2922650	LUCAS CROSSING ELEM. COMPLEX	02850	X		
NORMANDY	2922650	PINE LAWN ELEM.	01247	X		
NORMANDY	2922650	WASHINGTON ELEM.	01249	X		
RITENOUR	2926640	IVELAND ELEM.	01568	X		
RITENOUR	2926640	KRATZ ELEM.	01569	X		
RITENOUR	2926640	MARVIN ELEM.	01571	X		
RITENOUR	2926640	WYLAND ELEM.	01575	X		
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	2926670	DANFORTH ELEM.	01577	X		
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	2926670	GIBSON ELEM.	00726	X		
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	2926670	GLASGOW ELEM.	01579	X		
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	2926670	HIGHLAND ELEM.	02627	X		
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	2926670	MEADOWS ELEM.	01584	X		
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	2926670	KOCH ELEM.	01581	X		
UNIVERSITY CITY	2930660	BARBARA JORDAN ELEM.	02105	X		
WEBSTER GROVES	2931530	STEGER SIXTH GRADE CTR.	02195	X		
MALTA BEND R-V	2919920	MALTA BEND ELEM.	01059	X		
MARSHALL	2920410	EASTWOOD ELEM.	01084	X		
MARSHALL	2920410	NORTHWEST ELEM.	01085	X		
SLATER	2928360	ALEXANDER ELEM.	01749	X		
SCHUYLER CO. R-I	2927660	SCHUYLER CO. ELEM.	01698	X		
GORIN R-III	2913020	GORIN ELEM.	00543	X		
SCOTT CITY R-I	2915450	SCOTT CITY ELEM.	00704	X		
SCOTT CO. R-IV	2904890	SCOTT CO. ELEM.	00058	X		
SIKESTON R-6	2928260	LEE HUNTER ELEM.	01739	X		
SIKESTON R-6	2928260	MATTHEWS ELEM.	01566	X		
SIKESTON R-6	2928260	MOREHOUSE ELEM.	01740	X		
SIKESTON R-6	2928260	SOUTHEAST ELEM.	01742	X		
EMINENCE R-I	2911450	EMINENCE ELEM.	00408	X		
SHELBY CO. R-IV	2928110	SHELBYNA ELEM.	01726	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
PUXICO R-VIII	2925650	PUXICO ELEM.	01507	X		
BLOOMFIELD R-XIV	2905250	BLOOMFIELD HIGH	00073	X		
GALENA R-II	2912630	GALENA-ABESVILLE ELEM.	00527	X		
CRANE R-III	2910290	CRANE MIDDLE	02148	X		
CRANE R-III	2910290	CRANE ELEM.	00332	X		
REEDS SPRING R-IV	2926160	REEDS SPRING ELEM.	03034	X		
MILAN C-2	2920940	MILAN ELEM.	01143	X		
BRADLEYVILLE R-I	2905700	BRADLEYVILLE ELEM.	00117	X		
FORSYTH R-III	2912240	FORSYTH MIDDLE	00789	X		
BRANSON R-IV	2905760	BRANSON ELEM. WEST	02462	X		
KIRBYVILLE R-VI	2916710	KIRBYVILLE MIDDLE	02824	X		
SUCCESS R-VI	2929730	SUCCESS ELEM.	02054	X		
HOUSTON R-I	2914840	HOUSTON ELEM.	00685	X		
LICKING R-VIII	2918600	LICKING ELEM.	01013	X		
CABOOL R-IV	2906430	CABOOL ELEM.	00160	X		
PLATO R-V	2925210	PLATO HIGH	01450	X		
PLATO R-V	2925210	PLATO ELEM.	01449	X		
NEVADA R-V	2921840	NEVADA MIDDLE	01216	X		
NEVADA R-V	2921840	TRUMAN ELEM.	01122	X		
WRIGHT CITY R-II	2932310	WRIGHT CITY ELEM.	02265	X		
WARREN CO. R-III	2931050	REBECCA BOONE ELEM.	02416	X		
WARREN CO. R-III	2931050	WARRIOR RIDGE ELEM.	02989	X		
RICHWOODS R-VII	2931230	RICHWOODS ELEM.	02167	X		
GREENVILLE R-II	2913380	WILLIAMSVILLE ELEM.	00570	X		
CLEARWATER R-I	2909750	CLEARWATER MIDDLE	01904	X		
CLEARWATER R-I	2909750	CLEARWATER ELEM.	00280	X		
MARSHFIELD R-I	2920430	DANIEL WEBSTER ELEM.	02470	X		
SEYMOUR R-II	2927930	SEYMOUR MIDDLE	01580	X		
SEYMOUR R-II	2927930	SEYMOUR ELEM.	01720	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
NORWOOD R-I	2922950	NORWOOD ELEM.	01312	X		
MOUNTAIN GROVE R-III	2921510	MOUNTAIN GROVE MIDDLE	02619	X		
MOUNTAIN GROVE R-III	2921510	MOUNTAIN GROVE ELEM.	01181	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	GATEWAY HIGH	00434	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	SOLDAN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	00790	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	CENTRAL VISUAL/PERF. ARTS HIGH	02013	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	BUSCH/ACADEMIC-ATHLETIC ACAD.	02569	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	ADAMS ELEM.	02789	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	BRYAN HILL ELEM.	01888	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	AMES VISUAL/PERF. ARTS	02570	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	CLAY ELEM.	01903	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	COLE ELEM.	01906	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	DEWEY SCH.-INTERNAT'L. STUDIES	02641	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	FARRAGUT ELEM.	01923	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	FORD-FORD BR. ELEM. COMM. ED.	02571	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	FROEBEL ELEM.	01928	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	GATEWAY ELEM.	01587	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	HICKEY ELEM.	00444	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	HODGEN ELEM.	02170	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	LACLEDE ELEM.	01955	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	MALLINCKRODT A.B.I. ELEM.	01967	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	ELIAS MICHAEL ELEM.	01917	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	MONROE ELEM.	02790	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	MULLANPHY BOTANICAL GARDENS	00798	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	PEABODY ELEM.	02454	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	SHAW VISUAL/PERF. ARTS CTR.	02404	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	SHENANDOAH ELEM.	01997	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	SHERMAN ELEM. COMM. ED. CTR.	01999	X		
ST. LOUIS CITY	2929280	WOODWARD ELEM.	02026	X		

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY2010 SIG FUNDS MISSOURI						
LEA NAME	NCES LEA ID	SCHOOL NAME	NCES School ID	Tier III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELLIGIBLE
ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCHOOL	2900576	ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCH.	02831	X		
CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES	2900579	OLD NORTH	03037	X		
CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES	2900579	WALNUT PARK	03014	X		
CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES	2900579	SOUTH CITY	03079	X		

**N-SIZE WAIVER LIST
MISSOURI**

N-SIZE WAIVER LIST													
MISSOURI													
NCES LEA ID	NCES School ID	District Name	School Name	Tier	CA 2008	CA 2009	CA 2010	M 2008	M 2009	M 2010	distcode	schnum	
		MO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF	WHEELER HIGH	II	20	15	14	7	15	10	014400	1050	
		MO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF	WHEELER MIDDLE	II	26	21	17	26	21	16	014400	3000	
		MO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF	STARK ELEM.	II	15	15	11	15	15	11	014400	4020	
		BELTON 124	BELTON-OZANAM SOUTHLAND COOP.	II	7	7	7	6	8	9	019152	1025	
		LEE'S SUMMIT R-VII	HILLTOP SCHOOL	II	19	2	15	21	2	14	048071	1015	
		HICKMAN MILLS C-1	CRITTENTON TREATMENT CENTER	II	14	14	24	18	14	30	048072	1030	
		HICKMAN MILLS C-1	DAY TREATMENT	II	22	12	9	28	12	10	048072	5051	
		KANSAS CITY 33	CR ANDERSON ALT HS AT FAIRVIEW	II	16	4	16	8	5	11	048078	1021	
		KANSAS CITY 33	TEENAGE PARENTS CTR.	II	7	10	8	3	9	5	048078	1550	
		SPECL. SCH. DST. ST. LOUIS CO.	JUVENILE DETENTION CTR.	II	18	5	7	28	11	8	096119	1015	
		SPECL. SCH. DST. ST. LOUIS CO.	BRIDGES PROGRAM	II	3	2	3	5	13	3	096119	4039	

**TIER II WAIVER LIST
MISSOURI**

NCES LEA ID	NCES School ID	District Name	School Name	Level Of Achievement	Grades Served	Tier II W/O Waiver	Tier II W/ Waiver
2900004	01991	NEW MADRID CO. R-I	CENTRAL MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2900024	02986	BROOKSIDE CHARTER SCH.	BROOKSIDE FRONTIER MATH/SCI.	Title I No Sanctions	6-12		X
2900026	02987	DERRICK THOMAS ACADEMY	DERRICK THOMAS JR. ACADEMY	School Improvement Level 5, Restructuring, Continuing	6-9		X
2900031	03013	KIPP: ENDEAVOR ACADEMY	KIPP: ENDEAVOR ACADEMY	School Improvement Level 1, Delayed	5-7		X
2900574	02828	LIFT FOR LIFE ACADEMY	LIFT FOR LIFE ACADEMY	School Improvement Level 5, Restructuring, Continuing	6-11		X
2901000	01402	COLUMBIA 93	OAKLAND JR. HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	8-9	X	
2908250	00230	CENTER 58	CENTER MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2908670	01780	CHARLESTON R-I	CHARLESTON MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2910020	00319	COMMUNITY R-VI	COMMUNITY HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 3	6-12	X	
2912010	00462	FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	FERGUSON MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	7-8	X	
2913140	00551	GRANDVIEW C-4	GRANDVIEW MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2913830	02696	HAZELWOOD	HAZELWOOD EAST HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	9-12	X	
2913830	03000	HAZELWOOD	CENTRAL MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 3	6-8	X	
2913830	03005	HAZELWOOD	SOUTHEAST MIDDLE	School Improvement Level 2	6-8		X
2916290	00769	JENNINGS	JENNINGS HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 3, Delayed	9-12	X	
2919920	01060	MALTA BEND R-V	MALTA BEND HIGH	Title I No Sanctions	6-12		X
2920160	01073	MARION C. EARLY R-V	MARION C. EARLY HIGH	Non Title I No Sanctions	6-12	X	
2920410	01083	MARSHALL	BUEKER MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	5-8	X	
2920820	01139	MIAMI R-I	MIAMI HIGH	Non Title I No Sanctions	7-12	X	
2921420	01177	SCOTT CO. CENTRAL	SCOTT CO. CENTRAL HIGH	School Improvement Level 1	7-12		X
2923670	01410	PATTONSBURG R-II	PATTONSBURG HIGH	Non Title I No Sanctions	7-12	X	
2923760	01431	NORTH PEMISCOT CO. R-I	NORTH PEMISCOT SR. HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 2, Delayed	6-12	X	
2926640	01567	RITENOUR	HOECH MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2926640	01572	RITENOUR	RITENOUR MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2927600	01695	NORTHEAST VERNON CO. R-I	NORTHEAST VERNON CO. R-I HIGH	Non Title I No Sanctions	7-12	X	
2928170	01734	SHELDON R-VIII	SHELDON HIGH	Non Title I No Sanctions	7-12	X	
2928260	01741	SIKESTON R-6	5TH AND 6TH GRADE CTR.	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	5-6	X	
2928530	01764	SOUTH PEMISCOT CO. R-V	SOUTH PEMISCOT HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	7-12	X	
2928710	02801	SOUTHWEST R-V	SOUTHWEST MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 3	5-8	X	
2929280	00287	ST. LOUIS CITY	BUNCHE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	School Improvement Level 5, Restructuring, Continuing	6-8		X
2929280	00792	ST. LOUIS CITY	CARR LANE VPA MIDDLE	School Improvement Level 5, Restructuring, Implementation	6-8		X
2929280	01585	ST. LOUIS CITY	GATEWAY MIDDLE	School Improvement Level 5, Restructuring, Continuing	6-8		X
2929280	01882	ST. LOUIS CITY	BEAUMONT HIGH	School Improvement Level 1	9-12		X
2929280	01927	ST. LOUIS CITY	COMPTON-DREW ILC MIDDLE	School Improvement Level 5, Restructuring, Continuing	6-8		X
2929610	01529	MORGAN CO. R-I	MORGAN CO. R-I MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 3, Delayed	5-8	X	
2929700	01392	STURGEON R-V	STURGEON MIDDLE	School Improvement Level 3, Corrective Action	5-8		X

**TIER II WAIVER LIST
MISSOURI**

NCES LEA ID	NCES School ID	District Name	School Name	Level Of Achievement	Grades Served	Tier II W/O Waiver	Tier II W/ Waiver
2930660	02113	UNIVERSITY CITY	UNIVERSITY CITY SR. HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	9-12	X	
2930660	02511	UNIVERSITY CITY	BRITTANY WOODS	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	7-8	X	
2932110	02255	HENRY CO. R-I	WINDSOR HIGH	Non Title I School Improvement Year 1	7-12	X	
2932190	02814	WINFIELD R-IV	WINFIELD MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	
2932310	02576	WRIGHT CITY R-II	WRIGHT CITY MIDDLE	Non Title I School Improvement Year 4	6-8	X	