

**MISSOURI TITLE I, SECTION 1003(g) SIG  
EVALUATION CRITERIA  
2016-2017**

LEA _____
Group _____
Number _____

**DESE Review**

The LEA 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 —LEA Approval**

LEA has provided the original signature of Board-Authorized Representative yes/no

LEA has provided the original signature of Superintendent, if other than the Authorized Representative. yes/no

**Section III —Assurances**

SEA Direct Services Approved yes/no

**Section VIII — Schools to be Served**

The LEA has Priority schools and has committed to serving at least one of those schools. yes/no

**Section X-A —LEA Needs and Capacity**

LEA has lack of capacity to serve Priority schools Valid Claim-yes/no

**Section X-G — LEA Competitive Priorities & Section XI.G.— School Level Competitive Priorities**

LEA has addressed all competitive priorities for the LEA and Schools

LEA Competitive Priorities Addressed/Not Addressed

School Level Competitive Priorities Addressed/Not Addressed

**DESE Priorities**

School is Designated a Priority School If yes, add 40 points \_\_\_\_\_/40

School has Proposed a Pre-Implementation Year If yes, add 35 points \_\_\_\_\_/35

School's enrollment is above 180 students for the 2015-16 school year If yes, add 15 points \_\_\_\_\_/15

**TOTAL DESE PRIORITY POINTS** **\_\_\_\_\_ /90**

**AVERAGE READER SCORE** \_\_\_\_\_ /210

**BUILDING GRAND TOTAL** **\_\_\_\_\_ /300**

# Reader Score

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

## Budgets

Section IV - LEA Year One Total Budget for ePeGS Entry

Section V - LEA Five Year Budget

Section VI - LEA Year One Total Budget By District Administration and Building Budgets

Section IX-A - LEA Administrative Yearly Budget Itemization

Section IX-B - School Yearly Budget Itemization

(15 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

## LEA Replies

Section X-A —LEA Needs and Capacity

Section X-B —LEA Not Serving all Priority Schools

Needs Analysis of Schools

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Capacity to Serve Priority Schools

(35 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section X-C - LEA Actions

LEA implementation plan to support schools

(20 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section X-D – LEA Pre-Implementation

LEA pre-implementation plan to support schools

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section X-E — LEA Timeline

LEA timeline for LEA level support to schools

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section X-F — LEA Consultation with and Involvement of Stakeholders

Stakeholder involvement in schools

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

## School Level Replies

Section XI-A — School Level Needs and Capacity

Needs Analysis of Identified Schools

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

School Plan and Activities

(30 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section XI-B — School Level Actions

School Level Implementation Plan

(20 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section XI-C – School Level Pre-Implementation

School Level Pre-Implementation Plan

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section XI-D — School Level Timeline

School Level Timeline

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section XI-E — School Level Annual Goals for Student Achievement

Annual Goals for Identified Schools

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

Section XI-F — School Level Consultation with and Involvement of Stakeholders

Stakeholder Involvement in Planning and Implementation

(10 points possible) \_\_\_\_\_

**Reader Scored Total Points**

**Points Received \_\_\_\_\_/210**

**Section X-B — LEA Not Serving All Priority Schools (Department Use Only)**

LEA has lack of capacity to serve Priority schools

yes/no

**The LEA application will not be evaluated until the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has determined that the claim of lack of capacity is valid.**

The LEA has listed each Priority 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 DESE. DESE will evaluate the LEA's lack of capacity based on documentation and consultation with the LEA. The guidance below will be used to determine if the LEA's claim is valid.)*

- An LEA might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Priority 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.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Claim is valid \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

**Section X-G — LEA Competitive Priorities (DESE Use Only)**  
**Section XI-G – School Level Competitive Priorities (DESE Use Only)**

LEA has addressed all competitive priorities. yes/no

The LEA has addressed **all** competitive priorities listed below.

*(This section will be evaluated by DESE. DESE will evaluate the LEA’s intent to address all competitive priorities in their application. The guidance below will be used to determine if the LEA’s claim is valid.)*

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

1. **Design an innovative plan for recruiting, evaluating, and retaining the best teachers and leaders, and removing those who are ineffective.** To include:
  - a. Annual evaluations of teachers using multiple measures, including student-growth data as one significant factor;
  - b. Strategies for removing staff found to be ineffective in improving student outcomes;
  - c. Incentives to attract teachers to high need areas; and
  - d. Strategies to ensure high performing teachers and staff are placed in identified schools.
2. **Be bold and innovative.** To receive these SIG funds, LEAs 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. LEAs that request SIG funding must change personnel policies that lead to turnover among school leaders and staff. LEAs 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.

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

1. **Implement one plan.** The LEA should demonstrate that policies, processes and procedures support (and do not contradict) the implementation of the school’s turnaround plan.
2. **Set ambitious targets for improvement.** The LEA should create, for the identified school, improvement targets rigorous enough to demonstrate significant growth in student achievement over the five-year grant period, as agreed to by DESE.
3. **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 students with disabilities) are achieving at grade level and are being prepared for success in college or a career.
4. **Be bold and innovative.** To receive these SIG funds, LEAs must demonstrate, for the identified school, that they provide 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. LEAs that request SIG dollars must pledge to change personnel policies that lead to turnover among school leaders and staff. LEAs 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.
5. **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 SIG application.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ Addressed \_\_\_\_\_ Not Addressed

**Section IV - LEA Year One Total Budget for ePeGS Entry**  
**Section V - LEA Five Year Budget**  
**Section VI - LEA Year One Total Budget By District Administration and Building Budgets**  
**Section IX-A - LEA Administrative Yearly Budget Itemization**  
**Section IX-B - School Yearly Budget Itemization**

**15 POINTS POSSIBLE**

<b>Meets standards at a high level— 12-15 points</b>	<b>Meets standards at an acceptable level—9-11 points</b>	<b>Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-8 points</b>
<p>The LEA has submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete budgets for each 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"> <li>○ Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A budget to support LEA-level school improvement activities to support identified schools.</li> <li>• Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA describes the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA has submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete budgets for each school it commits to serve with references to some activities funded by the grant for each year of the funding period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Detailed budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A budget to support LEA-level school improvement activities to support identified schools.</li> <li>• Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school and the LEA describes the implementation of the selected intervention and improvement activities.</li> </ul>	<p>The LEA has submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgets for each school it commits to serve. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget for each year of the period of SIG funds availability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A budget to support LEA-level school improvement activities to support identified schools.</li> <li>• Budgets reflect funding of strategies in the plans for each school.</li> </ul>

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

**Score \_\_\_\_\_/15 points possible**

**Section X-A - LEA Needs And Capacity**  
**Section X-B - LEA Not Serving All Priority Schools**

Needs Analysis of Schools 10 POINTS POSSIBLE

<b>Meets standards at a high level— 8-10 points</b>	<b>Meets standards at an acceptable level—5-7 points</b>	<b>Partially meets or does not meet standards—0-4 points</b>
---	--	--

This section determines if the LEA’s needs analysis for LEA-level activities meets the criteria.

<p>The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Performance</li> <li>• Curriculum Development and Learning Management</li> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment</li> <li>• Parent and Community Involvement</li> <li>• Information Technology and Data Management</li> <li>• Human Resources</li> <li>• Leadership and Governance</li> <li>• Fiscal and Budget</li> </ul> <p>The LEA has identified the most significant results of the needs analysis and the data submitted support those decisions.</p> <p>The LEA used a variety of appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.</p> <p>The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis.</p>	<p>The needs analysis is thorough and includes evaluation of <b>student performance</b> and a <b>majority</b> of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Performance</li> <li>• Curriculum Development and Learning Management</li> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment</li> <li>• Parent and Community Involvement</li> <li>• Information Technology and Data Management</li> <li>• Human Resources</li> <li>• Leadership and Governance</li> <li>• Fiscal and Budget</li> </ul> <p>The LEA has identified the most significant results of the needs analysis and the data submitted supports those decisions.</p> <p>The LEA used appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.</p> <p>The selected intervention reflects the findings of the needs analysis.</p>	<p>The needs analysis is <b>not</b> thorough and/or <b>does not</b> include evaluation of a majority of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Performance</li> <li>• Curriculum Development and Learning Management</li> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Safe, Secure, and Engaging Environment</li> <li>• Parent and Community Involvement</li> <li>• Information Technology and Data Management</li> <li>• Human Resources</li> <li>• Leadership and Governance</li> <li>• Fiscal and Budget</li> </ul> <p>There is <b>not</b> adequate data, or the data does not adequately support the decisions made.</p> <p>The LEA did <b>not</b> use appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.</p> <p>The selected intervention does not reflect the findings of the needs analysis.</p>
---	---	--

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section X-A - LEA Needs And Capacity *continued***

**Section X-B - LEA Not Serving All Priority Schools *continued***

**Capacity to Serve Priority Schools**

**35 POINTS POSSIBLE**

**Meets standards at a high level—  
28-35 points**

**Meets standards at an acceptable  
level—14-27 points**

**Partially meets or does not meet  
standards—0-13 points**

Refer to Appendix B, State Guidance for Determining Capacity for detailed information for the measures below.

This section evaluates LEA-level activities.

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

The LEA 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 identified schools. (4-5 points)

The LEA has a written plan that outlines the LEA-level activities to support the identified schools in implementing one of the six required intervention models. 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)

There is a plan for LEA-level support and oversight for identified schools that reflects the LEA’s strong commitment to lead improvement efforts. (4-5 points)

The LEA has implemented turnaround initiatives in low-achieving schools. Those initiatives included activities required by SIG intervention models for identified schools. (2-4 points)

The LEA has a written plan that outlines the LEA-level activities to support the identified schools in implementing one of the six required intervention models. (6-12 points)

Each plan is aligned with the findings of the needs analysis. (2-4 points)

Written procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation and progress toward the measurable objectives of the plan. (2-4 points)

There is a plan for LEA-level support and oversight for identified schools that reflects only a moderate commitment to lead improvement efforts. (2-3 points)

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

or  
The LEA implemented turnaround initiatives that did not include activities listed in the SIG regulations.

and/or  
The LEA has little or no evidence that improvement initiatives have led to improved student achievement. (0-3 points)

The LEA has a written plan that outlines the LEA-level activities to support schools that lack detail and specificity. (0-4 points)

There is little or no alignment with the findings of the needs analysis. (0-2 points)

The written procedures are not adequate to measure the implementation of the plan and progress toward the measurable objectives of the plan. (0-2 points)

A plan for LEA-level support and oversight for identified schools is not detailed and does not reflect the responsibility of the LEA to lead improvement efforts. (0-2 points)

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/35 points possible



**Section X-C — LEA Actions**

LEA Implementation Plan to Support Schools

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 A, Federal Guidance (March 2015) for detailed information for the measures below.  
This section scores the evaluation of the LEA-level plan.

The LEA has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a detailed plan to implement the intervention(s).

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The LEA 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.

Modified LEA practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

- LEA policies and practices have been modified.
- LEA has projected the impact of those changes.

Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends.

- 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.

**If applicable**, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model.

- LEA application process for external providers is in place.

SEA has been part of the planning process for selecting external providers.

The LEA has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a plan to implement the intervention(s).

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The LEA has listed 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.

Modified LEA practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

- LEA policies will be modified.
- LEA has projected the impact of those changes.

Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends

- Explanation of how the reforms will be sustained is in place but long-range plans have not yet been identified.

**If applicable**, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model.

- LEA application process for external providers is in place.

The LEA has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- The plan **lacks necessary detail** to direct the implementation of the intervention(s).

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The LEA has listed insufficient resources to support the interventions;  
and/or
- The LEA has listed sufficient resources but these resources do not align with the findings of the needs analysis nor support the planned interventions and improvement activities.

Modified LEA practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

- There are no plans or minimal plans are in place to modify LEA policies and practices.

Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends.

- Long range plans for sustainable processes and procedures are not in place.

**If applicable**, screen, select, and insure the quality of external providers such as CMOs and EMOs to implement the restart intervention model.

- LEA does not have an application process for external providers.

**Section X-C — LEA Actions *continued***

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Empty rectangular box for comments and/or suggestions.

Score \_\_\_\_\_/20 points possible

**Section X-D – LEA Pre-Implementation**

LEA Pre-Implementation Plan to Support Schools

**10 POINTS POSSIBLE****Meets standards at a high level—  
8-10 points**

The LEA has a plan for detailed pre-implementation activities that are:

- Aligned with the needs analysis.
- Reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Designed to prepare identified schools to implement their selected intervention model on the first day of school in their first year of implementation.
- Implemented and evaluated according to a written timeline. Specific implementation and evaluation dates are included in the LEA plan.

**Meets standards at an acceptable  
level—5-7 points**

The LEA has a plan for pre-implementation activities that are:

- Aligned with the needs analysis.
- Reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Designed to prepare identified schools to implement their selected intervention model on the first day of school in their first year of implementation.
- Implemented and evaluated according to a written timeline.

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

The LEA has a plan for pre-implementation activities that are:

- Partially aligned with the needs analysis.
- Reasonable, achievable.
- Unlikely to prepare identified schools to implement their selected intervention model on the first day of school in their first year of implementation.
- Inconsistently implemented and evaluated.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section X-E — LEA Timeline**

LEA Timeline for LEA Level Support to Schools

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

**Meets standards at a high level—  
8-10 points**

The LEA timeline includes specific dates for implementation of all LEA level activities.

- The timeline is detailed, reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Specific implementation and evaluation dates are included in the LEA plan.

**Meets standards at an acceptable  
level—5-7 points**

The LEA timeline identifies time periods for implementation of all LEA level activities.

- The timeline is reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation periods are included in the LEA plan.

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

The LEA timeline is not specific and/or does not include specific dates for implementation of all LEA level activities.

- The timeline is **not** reasonable or achievable, and/or does **not** reflect urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation dates are **not** included in the LEA plan.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section X. F.— LEA Consultation with and Involvement of Stakeholders**

Stakeholder Involvement in Schools		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
<p>The LEA has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in identified schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students</li> <li>• Staff                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building</li> <li>○ LEA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parents</li> <li>• Teacher organizations and/or unions</li> <li>• Colleges and universities</li> <li>• Community representatives                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local government and other public sector representatives</li> <li>○ Business community</li> <li>○ Other organizations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other stakeholders</li> </ul> <p><i>There is considerable evidence that the LEA has involved or has planned to involve representatives of all groups on the list in a meaningful way.</i></p> <p>The LEA has provided a detailed description of how it will ensure that the selected buildings will have a meaningful, ongoing engagement with families and the community.</p>	<p>The LEA has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in identified schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students</li> <li>• Staff                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building</li> <li>○ LEA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parents</li> <li>• Teacher organizations and/or unions</li> <li>• Colleges and universities</li> <li>• Community representatives                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local government and other public sector representatives</li> <li>○ Business community</li> <li>○ Other organizations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other stakeholders</li> </ul> <p><i>There is evidence that the LEA has involved or has planned to involve representatives of most of the groups on the list in a meaningful way.</i></p> <p>The LEA has provided a description of how it will ensure that the selected buildings will have a meaningful, ongoing engagement with families and the community.</p>	<p>The LEA has provided evidence of and plans for consultation with and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in identified schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students</li> <li>• Staff                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building</li> <li>○ LEA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parents</li> <li>• Teacher organizations and/or unions</li> <li>• Colleges and universities</li> <li>• Community representatives                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local government and other public sector representatives</li> <li>○ Business community</li> <li>○ Other organizations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other stakeholders</li> </ul> <p><i>There is <b>little or no</b> evidence that the LEA has involved or has planned to involve representatives of most of the groups on the list in a meaningful way.</i></p> <p>The LEA has provided a limited description of how it will ensure that the selected buildings will engage families and the community.</p>
<p>COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS</p>		

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section XI-A – School Level Needs And Capacity**

Needs Analysis of Identified Schools

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 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 **the 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 school has identified the most significant results of the needs analysis and the data submitted support those decisions.

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

The school used appropriate methods to gather and analyze the needs analysis data.

The school 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 XI-A – School Level Needs And Capacity**

School Plan and Activities

**30 POINTS POSSIBLE**

**Meets standards at a high level—  
24-30 points**

**Meets standards at an acceptable  
level—12-23 points**

**Partially meets or does not meet  
standards—0-11 points**

Refer to Appendix B, State Guidance for Determining Capacity for detailed information for the measures below.  
This section evaluates identified school plans.  
Each component in the columns below have separate point values that should be considered as the total score is determined.

There is a written plan for the school to implement one of the six required intervention models. 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 written plan for the school to implement one of the six required intervention models. (6-11 points)

Each plan is aligned with the findings of the needs analysis. (2-4 points)

Written procedures are in place to evaluate the implementation and progress toward the measurable objectives of the plan. (2-4 points)

The plan explains in detail how all of the required and appropriate permissible activities of the intervention model will be implemented. (2-4 points)

The written plan for the school lacks detail. (0-5 points)

There is little or no alignment with the findings of the needs analysis. (0-2 points)

The written procedures are not adequate to measure the implementation of the plan and progress toward the measurable objectives of the plan. (0-2 points)

The plan does not detail how the required and appropriate permissible activities of the intervention model will be implemented. (0-2 points)

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

**Section XI-A – School Level Needs And Capacity *continued***

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/30 points possible



**Section XI. B.— School Level Actions**

School Level Implementation Plan

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 A, Federal Guidance (March 2015) for detailed information for the measures below.  
This section scores the evaluation of the school plan.

The school has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a detailed plan to implement the intervention(s).

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The school 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.

Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends.

- 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.

**If applicable**, the school describes one element of the turnaround or transformation model it intends to modify. The school also describes how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

**If applicable**, the school that chooses a whole-school reform model, describes with detail and specificity:

- the evidence supporting the model that includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the school to be served; and
- that has partnered with a whole school reform model developer that meets the definition of “whole school reform model developer” in the SIG requirements.

The school has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- There is a plan to implement the intervention(s).

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The school has listed 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.

Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends

- Explanation of how the reforms will be sustained is in place but long-range plans have not yet been identified.

**If applicable**, the school describes one element of the turnaround or transformation model it intends to modify. The school also describes how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

**If applicable**, the school that chooses a whole-school reform model, describes:

- the evidence supporting the model that includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the school to be served; and
- that has partnered with a whole school reform model developer that meets the definition of “whole school reform model developer” in the SIG requirements.

The school has:

Designed interventions consistent with the final requirements.

- The plan **lacks necessary detail** to direct the implementation of the intervention(s).

Aligned other resources with the interventions.

- The school has listed insufficient resources to support the interventions; and/or
- The school has listed sufficient resources but these resources do not align with the findings of the needs analysis nor support the planned interventions and improvement activities.

Demonstrated sustainability of the reforms after the funding period ends.

- Long range plans for sustainable processes and procedures are not in place.

**If applicable**, the school describes one element of the turnaround or transformation model it intends to modify. However, the school fails to describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

**If applicable**, the school that chooses a whole-school reform model, has a limited description of:

- the evidence supporting the model that includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the school to be served; and
- that has partnered with a whole school reform model developer that meets the definition of “whole school reform model developer” in the SIG requirements.

**Section XI. B.— School Level Actions *continued***

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/20 points possible

**Section XI-C. – School Level Pre-Implementation**

School Level Pre-Implementation Plan

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

**Meets standards at a high level—  
8-10 points**

The school has a plan for detailed pre-implementation activities that are:

- Aligned with the needs analysis.
- Reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Designed to prepare the school to implement the selected intervention model on the first day of school in their first year of implementation.
- Implemented and evaluated according to a written timeline. Specific implementation and evaluation dates are included in the school plan.

**Meets standards at an acceptable  
level—5-7 points**

The school has a plan for pre-implementation activities that are:

- Aligned with the needs analysis.
- Reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Designed to prepare the school to implement the selected intervention model on the first day of school in their first year of implementation.
- Implemented and evaluated according to a written timeline.

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

The school has a plan for pre-implementation activities that are:

- Partially aligned with the needs analysis.
- Reasonable, achievable.
- Unlikely to prepare the school to implement the selected intervention model on the first day of school in their first year of implementation.
- Inconsistently implemented and evaluated.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section XI. D.— School Level Timeline**

School Level Timeline

10 POINTS POSSIBLE

**Meets standards at a high level—  
8-10 points**

The school level timeline includes specific dates for implementation of each component of the selected interventions.

- The timeline is detailed, reasonable, achievable, and reflect urgency.
- Specific implementation and evaluation dates are included in the school plan.

**Meets standards at an acceptable  
level—5-7 points**

The school level timeline identifies time periods for implementation of all components of the selected interventions.

- The timeline is reasonable, achievable, and reflects urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation periods are included in the school plan.

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

The school level timeline is not specific and/or does not include specific dates for implementation of all components of the selected interventions.

- The timeline is **not** reasonable or achievable and/or does **not** reflect urgency.
- Implementation and evaluation dates are **not** included in the school plan.

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section XI. E— School Level Annual Goals for Student Achievement**

Annual Goals for Identified Schools

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
<p>The school has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete and precise baseline data are provided.</li> <li>• Targets will lead to moving out of Priority school status in a reasonable amount of time.</li> </ul> <p>The school utilizes formative assessments to provide for checks of student learning and to adjust instruction based on student learning as it occurs.</p> <p>Targets have been set in consultation with DESE.</p>	<p>The school has set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaningful baseline data are provided.</li> <li>• Targets will lead to moving out of Priority school status in a reasonable amount of time.</li> </ul> <p>The school utilizes formative assessments to provide for checks of student learning and to adjust instruction based on student learning.</p> <p>Targets have been set in consultation with DESE.</p>	<p>The school has <b>not</b> set specific annual targets for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading/communication arts, mathematics, and, where appropriate, graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data are <b>not</b> precise or meaningful.</li> <li>• Targets will <b>not</b> lead to moving out of Priority school status in a reasonable amount of time.</li> </ul> <p>The school utilizes formative assessments to provide for checks of student learning but <b>does not</b> adjust instruction based on the data.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that targets have been set in consultation with DESE</p>

COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Score \_\_\_\_\_/10 points possible

**Section XI. F.— School Level Consultation with and Involvement of Stakeholders**

**Stakeholder Involvement in Planning and Implementation**

**10 POINTS POSSIBLE**

**Meets standards at a high level—  
8-10 points**

The school has provided evidence of and a plan for on-going consultation and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in the school.

- Students
- Staff
  - Building
  - LEA
- 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 school 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 school has provided evidence of and a plan for on-going consultation and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in the school.

- Students
- Staff
  - Building
  - LEA
- 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 school 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 school has provided limited evidence of and a plan for on-going consultation and involvement of stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school improvement models in the school.

- Students
- Staff
  - Building
  - LEA
- 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 school 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

# Appendix A

## Federal Legislation, Regulations, and Guidance for the Title I, 1003(g) School Improvement Grant







### Legislation

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, [Title I, Part A, Section 1003\(g\)](#)
- [American Recovery and Reinvestment Act](#)

### Regulations

- [SIG Final Requirements - Federal Registrar Notice](#) (October 28, 2010)

### Guidance

- SIG Guidance for awards made with FY 2014 funds (March , 2015)  
 [MS Word](#) (683K)
- SIG Guidance for awards made with funds from FY 2013 and previous fiscal years (March 1, 2012)  
 [MS Word](#) (683K)
- SIG Guidance (November 1, 2010)  
 [PDF](#) (683K)
- Addendum to the SIG Guidance (February 16, 2011)  
 [PDF](#) (51K)
- Addendum #2 to the SIG Guidance (March 1, 2012)  
 [MS Word](#) (687K)
- Addendum #3 to the SIG Guidance (January 27, 2014)  
 [MS Word](#) (75K)

## **Appendix B**

### **State Guidance for Determining Capacity for the Title I, 1003(g) School Improvement Grant**

To further assist LEAs and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) in determining capacity, the following guidance will be utilized. DESE will evaluate the LEA's lack of capacity based on documentation and consultation with the LEA. This guidance will be used to determine if the LEA's claim is valid.

If the LEA is not applying to serve each Priority school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each eligible school.

The LEA has listed each Priority school that it **will not** serve and has explained why it lacks the capacity to serve the school (s).

During the application process, these LEAs 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 does not commit to serve each identified Priority school, it will also submit documents to support the decision not to serve each Priority school. Department staff 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 Office of Quality Schools 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 capacity to serve Priority schools as the LEA Application is prepared.

If the LEA does not provide adequate documentation during the application preparation period or DESE determines that the LEA has more capacity, the LEA will be required to submit additional information to support the claim. If the claim of lack of capacity cannot be supported by the LEA documentation or DESE decides that the claim is not valid, the LEA Application will be denied. The LEA will have fourteen days after the decision is made to provide additional information and amend the application. DESE 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-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 might demonstrate that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Priority 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 one of its Priority schools instead of all its Priority schools.



All LEAs who submit applications that are of sufficient quality to be considered for funding by the review team are required to attend a capacity interview with staff from the DESE's Office of Quality Schools. This interview will be held in Jefferson City, Missouri between November 2-4, 2016. Required participants from each LEA include: Superintendent (or equivalent), Building Principal, and Turnaround Officer (if hired). Optional attendees may include: School Board Member, Teacher, and Federal Program Coordinator. This interview will be considered by DESE along with the reviewers ranking to determine funding status.