California State Board of Education

Meeting Agenda Items for January 11-12, 2012

ITEM 5 ADDENDUM

ITEM ADDENDUM

DATE: January 3, 2012

TO: MEMBERS, State Board of Education

FROM: TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: Item 5 – Update on Issues Related to California's Implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Other Federal Programs Including, but not Limited to, the School Improvement Grant Approval of Funding of Local Educational Agencies and Schools for the 2012–13 School Improvement Grant Sub-Grants Under Section 1003(g) and Authorization to Approve California's Fiscal Year 2011 Continuation Awards Only School Improvement Grant Application.

Summary of Key Issues

Federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) regulations provide equal priority for funding Tier I and Tier II schools. The U.S. Department of Education requires states to award SIG funds to serve Tier I and Tier II schools that local education agencies (LEAs) commit to serve prior to awarding any funds to an LEA to serve any Tier III schools. When determining the approvability of an LEA's capacity to implement the selected school interventions, the California Department of Education (CDE) only recommends awarding funds to those LEAs that developed and submitted a comprehensive and viable application likely to improve student academic achievement.

Only LEA applications that met all of the requirements outlined below were considered for funding. This is a competitive grant, and had all LEAs with eligible schools submitted an approvable application, there would have been insufficient funds to meet the request. However, only 25 LEAs applied on behalf of 58 schools, and of those, 14 LEA applications on behalf of 39 schools met the requirements described below. The remaining 11 LEAs did not submit approvable applications. In addition, one school in an approved LEA was not funded because the LEA's application did not adequately articulate a plan for fully implementing all required components of the selected intervention model.

For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA Request for Applications (RFA) required the LEA to demonstrate that it:

- Has analyzed the needs and the appropriateness of each model for each school and then selected the model that will be most effective for each school.

- Has the capacity to use SIG 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(s) it has selected.

Summary of Key Issues (Cont.)

- Has consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

The LEA was also required to describe actions it has taken, or will take, to:

- Design and implement intervention(s) consistent with the final requirements that may include pre-implementation activities to be carried out prior to the beginning of the 2012–13 school year.

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

- Align other resources with the intervention(s) including federal, state, private, and other district resources.

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

- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA also had to include a timeline delineating the steps it would take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application. The LEA also must describe the annual school goals for student achievement on the Standardized Testing and Reporting tests 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.

The list of LEAs and their respective schools recommended for funding using the SIG funds is provided in Attachment 1, Part A.

The list of LEAs and their respective schools not recommended for funding is provided in Attachment 1, Part B.

The list of proposed adjustments to LEA and school budgets based on unallowable or excessive expenditures is provided in Attachment 1, Part C. SIG funds must supplement, not supplant, federal, state, local, or non federal funds. SIG funds may not be used for new construction, most transportation, class size reduction, or purchases not directly related to implementation of the selected intervention model(s).

The Disqualification Summary for the list of LEAs and their respective schools not recommended for funding is provided in Attachment 1, Part D.

Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: Local Educational Agencies and Their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds (11 Pages total)

Part A: Total Recommended Funding – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements (Pages 1–2)

Part B: Funding Summary – Local Educational Agencies that Did Not Meet RFA Requirements (Pages 3–4)

Part C: Adjustment Details – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements (Pages 5–8)

Part D: Disqualification Summary – Local Educational Agencies that Did Not Meet RFA Requirements (Pages 9–11)

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
A. Total Recommended Funding – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency	LEA Priority	School	School Priority	Charter School	Tier	Model	Year 1 Request	Adjusted	Total YR 1 Recommended
Oakland Unified	**3**						$ 855,216.00	$ (422,862.00)	
		ROOTS International Academy	6		I	Transformation	$ 1,622,007.00	$ (158,000.00)	
		Alliance Academy	42		I	Transformation	$ 1,653,199.00	$ (200,000.00)	
							$ 4,130,422.00	**$ (780,862.00)**	**$ 3,349,560.00**
Visalia Unified	**4**						$ 32,541.00	$ -	
		Highland Elementary	18		I	Turnaround	$ 927,086.00	$ -	
							$ 959,627.00	**$ -**	**$ 959,627.00**
West Contra Costa Unified	**5**						$ 130,418.00		
		Helms Middle	13		II	Transformation	$ 2,547,608.00	$ (547,608.00)	
		De Anza Senior High	68		II	Transformation	$ 1,686,592.00	$ (94,802.00)	
							$ 4,364,618.00	**$ (642,410.00)**	**$ 3,722,208.00**
Stockton Unified	**9**						$ 614,740.00	$ (350,000.00)	
		Roosevelt Elementary	8		I	Transformation	$ 1,383,269.00		
		Taylor Leadership Academy	12		I	Turnaround	$ 1,409,695.00		
		Nightingale Elementary	15	X	I	Restart	$ 1,731,099.00		
		John C. Fremont Elementary	23		I	Transformation	$ 1,669,022.00	$ (4,000.00)	
		Wilhelmina Henry Elementary	36		I	Transformation	$ 1,795,985.00	$ (75,047.00)	
		Pittman Charter	39	X	I	Restart	$ 1,585,432.00	$ (34,155.00)	
		Harrison Elementary	63		I	Transformation	$ 1,655,317.00		
							$ 11,844,559.00	**$ (463,202.00)**	**$ 11,381,357.00**
Los Angeles Unified	**10**						$ 822,201.00	$ (200.00)	
		Henry Clay Middle*	2		I	Restart	$ 1,950,000.00	$ (452,380.00)	
		William Jefferson Clinton Middle	3		I	Turnaround	$ 1,950,000.00	$ (7,000.00)	
		Charles Drew Middle	7		I	Transformation	$ 1,950,000.00	$ (131,580.00)	
		Woodcrest Elementary	10		I	Transformation	$ 1,944,795.00	$ (1,944,795.00)	
		George Washington Preparatory High	14		I	Restart	$ 1,920,359.00	$ (25,944.00)	
		Crenshaw Senior High	22		I	Transformation	$ 1,894,722.00	$ (75,000.00)	
		John Muir Middle	5		I	Transformation	$ 1,950,000.00		
		Manual Arts Senior High	17		I	Transformation	$ 1,950,000.00		
		Henry T. Gage Middle	34		I	Transformation	$ 1,950,000.00	$ (30,000.00)	
		East Valley Senior High	56		I	Transformation	$ 1,818,152.00	$ (50,000.00)	
		Belmont Senior High	69		I	Transformation	$ 1,949,971.00		
		South East High	91		II	Transformation	$ 1,950,000.00	$ (6,000.00)	
							$ 24,000,200.00	**$ (2,722,899.00)**	**$ 21,277,301.00**
		** Pending clarification from ED*							
Mount Diablo Unified	**12**						$ 442,110.00	$ (118,369.00)	
		Oak Grove Middle	27		I	Transformation	$ 1,588,359.00	$ (68,000.00)	
		Meadow Homes Elementary	32		I	Transformation	$ 2,000,000.00		

Local Educational Agency	LEA Priority	School	School Priority	Charter School	Tier	Model	Year 1 Request	Adjusted	Total YR 1 Recommended
							$ 4,030,469.00	**$ (186,369.00)**	**$ 3,844,100.00**
Parlier Unified	**13**						$ 203,477.00	$ (67,333.00)	
		John C Martinez Elementary	24		I	Turnaround	$ 1,625,146.00		
		Parlier Junior High	38		I	Transformation	$ 1,478,276.00		
							$ 3,306,899.00	**$ (67,333.00)**	**$ 3,239,566.00**
North Monterey County Unified	**14**						$ 117,610.00	$ (137,291.00)	
		Castroville Elementary	33		I	Transformation	$ 2,000,427.00		
							$ 2,118,037.00	**$ (137,291.00)**	**$ 1,980,746.00**
Inglewood Unified	**16**						$ 752,893.00	**$ (266,367.00)**	
		Lane (Warren) Elementary	95		I	Turnaround	$ 2,000,000.00		
		Crozier (George W.) Middle	45		II	Turnaround	$ 2,000,000.00	$ (122,550.00)	
		Monroe (Albert F.) Middle	21		II	Turnaround	$ 1,019,284.00	$ (107,964.00)	
							$ 5,772,177.00	**$ (496,881.00)**	**$ 5,275,296.00**
Lynwood Unified	**17**						$ 228,562.00	$ -	
		Lynwood Middle	29		I	Transformation	$ 1,821,429.00	$ (731,000.00)	
		Lynwood High	62		I	Transformation	$ 1,821,311.00	$ (40,000.00)	
							$ 3,871,302.00	**$ (771,000.00)**	**$ 3,100,302.00**
Sacramento City Unified	**19**						$ 151,587.00		
		Oak Ridge Elementary	43		I	Turnaround	$ 1,519,114.00	$ (3,000.00)	
							$ 1,670,701.00	**$ (3,000.00)**	**$ 1,667,701.00**
Pajaro Valley Unified	**33**						$ 476,989.00	$ (133,333.00)	
		E. A. Hall Middle	66		II	Transformation	$ 1,321,817.00	$ (178,882.00)	
		Watsonville High	76		II	Transformation	$ 1,953,174.00		
							$ 3,751,980.00	**$ (312,215.00)**	**$ 3,439,765.00**
Modesto City Elementary	**43**						$ 228,562.00		
		Robertson Road Elementary	90		I	Transformation	$ 1,388,654.00		
							$ 1,617,216.00	**$ -**	**$ 1,617,216.00**
Bellevue Elementary	**44**						$ 124,407.00		
		Kawana Elementary	5		I	Restart	$ 1,873,139.00	$ (300,000.00)	
							$ 1,997,546.00	**$ (300,000.00)**	**$ 1,697,546.00**
								Total Recommended	**$ 65,945,107.00**

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
B. Funding Summary – Local Educational Agencies that Did Not Meet RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency	LEA Priority	School	School Priority	Charter School	Tier	Model	Waiver	Year 1 Request
Reef-Sunset Unified	**6**							$ 203,477.00
		Avenal Elementary	19		I	Tranformation	-	$ 1,835,189.00
								$ 2,038,666.00
Compton Unified	**7**							$ 11,384,336.00
		Centennial High	40		I	Transformation	-	$ 1,127,302.00
		Davis Middle	11		I	Transformation	-	$ 1,336,536.00
		Dominguez High	83		I	Transformation	-	$ 1,856,942.00
		Martin Luther King Elementary	51		I	Transformation	-	$ 1,009,232.00
		Vanguard Learning Center	31		I	Transformation	-	$ 554,915.00
		Walton Middle	16		I	Transformation	-	$ 793,329.00
		Whaley Middle	4		I	Transformation	-	$ 860,184.00
		Willowbrook Middle	30		II	Transformation	-	$ 721,693.00
								$ 19,644,469.00
Los Angeles Unified	**10**							$ -
		Woodcrest Elementary	10		I	Transformation	-	$ 1,944,795.00
								$ 1,944,795.00
Alta Vista Elementary	**11**							$ -
		Alta Vista Elementary	28		I	Transformation	-	$ 811,711.00
								$ 811,711.00
Klamath-Trinity Joint Unified	**15**							$ 1,432,086.00
		Hoopa Valley Elementary	35		I	Transformation	-	$ 882,098.00
								$ 2,314,184.00
Palo Verde Unified	**18**							$ 476,989.00
		Palo Verde High	41		II	Transformation	-	$ 2,060,671.09
								$ 2,537,660.09
Antelope Valley Union High	**20**							$ 67,397.00
		Antelope Valley High	50		II	Turnaround	-	$ 1,929,882.00
								$ 1,997,279.00
San Diego Unified	**25**							$ 48,671.00
		San Diego Business	52	X	I	Transformation	-	$ 1,547,353.00
		San Diego MVP Arts	59	X	I	Transformation	-	$ 1,314,384.00
								$ 2,910,408.00
Alisal Union	**28**							$ 99,318.00
		Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Elementary	26		I	Transformation	-	$ 691,750.00
								$ 791,068.00

Local Educational Agency	LEA Priority	School	School Priority	Charter School	Tier	Model	Waiver	Year 1 Request
Del Norte County Office of Education	**34**							$ 544,052.00
		Castle Rock	71	X	II	Transformation	-	$ 416,764.00
								$ 960,816.00
Lindsay Unified	**37**							$ 72,229.00
		Lindsay Senior High	78		II	Transformation	-	$ 1,906,759.00
								$ 1,978,988.00
South Monterey County Joint Union High	**41**							$ 2,861,737.00
		Greenfield High	82		I	Transformation	-	$ 1,432,086.00
								$ 4,293,823.00

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
C. Adjustment Details – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**YR 1 Adjusted**	**YR 1 Rec**	**Details**
Oakland Unified	**$ 4,130,422.00**	$ (130,422.00)		Amount over the maximum allowable request amount.
		$ (189,000.00)		Community School Directors salary/benefits reduced to one as positions and expenditures are deemed excessive.
		$ (84,000.00)		Best Practices and Research Coordinator removed as administration positions are deemed excessive.
		$ (19,440.00)		Transformation Network Professional Development is being met by the TA providers already contracted w/ LEA.
Alliance Academy		$ (10,000.00)		Student incentives are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (15,000.00)		Supplemental and instructional experiences lack sufficient detail and are not incorporated into the narrative or implementation chart.
		$ (84,000.00)		Extended Learning Coordinator and School Culture Coordinator is deemed excessive, and is supported by other programs.
		$ (49,000.00)		Recruitment Specialist lacks sufficient detail and is not tied to model implementation or improved student achievement.
ROOTS Academy		$ (10,000.00)		Student incentives are an inappropriate use of SIG funds.
		$ (15,000.00)		Supplemental instructional experiences lack sufficient detail and not incorporated into the narrative.
		$ (42,000.00)		Science coach lacks sufficient detail and is not tied to the needs assessment.
		$ (84,000.00)		Extended Learning Coordinator and School Culture Coordinator is deemed excessive, and is supported by other programs.
		$ (49,000.00)		Recruitment Specialist lacks sufficient detail and is not tied to model implementation or improved student achievement.
		$ (780,862.00)	**$ 3,349,560.00**	
West Contra Costa Unified	**$ 4,364,618.00**			
Helms Middle		$ (547,608.00)		Amount over the maximum allowable request amount.
De Anza High		$ (6,176.00)		Extended year Cashier salary/benefits lack sufficient detail in the narrative and implementation chart to justify the expenditure.
		$ (45,000.00)		Student incentives are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (43,626.00)		Two Site Supervisor salary/benefits lack sufficient detail and are missing from the narrative and implementation chart and were reduced by 50 percent.
		$ (642,410.00)	**$ (642,410.00)**	
Stockton Unified	**$11,844,559.00**	$ (350,000.00)		Saturday school enrichment supplies in the LEA budget are excessive and are already included in school budgets and were reduced by 60 percent.
John C Fremont Elementary		$ (4,000.00)		Family suppers are not an allowable use of SIG funds
Wilhelmina Henry Elementary		$ (75,047.00)		2.0 FTE Parent Liaison salary/benefits lack sufficient detail regarding the role of liaison in implementation chart and were reduced by 50 percent.
Richard A Pittman Charter		$ (34,155.00)		Student incentives are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (463,202.00)	**$11,381,357.00**	
Los Angeles Unified	**$24,000,200.00**	$ (200.00)		Amount over the maximum allowable request amount.
Henry Clay Middle		$ (320,000.00)		8 Special Education Aides salary/benefits lacks sufficient detail to determine if expenditure is supplanting.

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
C. Adjustment Details – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**YR 1 Adjusted**	**YR 1 Rec**	**Details**
		$ (25,000.00)		Psychology Services lacks sufficient detail to determine if expenditure is supplanting.
		$ (44,380.00)		Special Education Conslutants lacks sufficient detail to determine if expenditure is supplanting.
		$ (15,000.00)		Safe Passage patrol car is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (20,000.00)		LAUSD Security/Emergency Response Service Fee is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (28,000.00)		School Guard lacks detail and explanation of how this differs from the LAUSD security.
William Jefferson Clinton Middle		$ (7,000.00)		Custodial overtime overtime/benefits do not support or relate to the intervention model.
Crenshaw Senior High		$ (75,000.00)		Bus transportation for internships, job shadowing and community college classes are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
Charles Drew Middle		$ (122,330.00)		Intervention Instructional Leader salary/benefits are deemed excessive as the school already employes an intervention coordinator and instructional specialist.
		$ (9,250.00)		Curricular trips and field trips are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
East Valley High		$ (30,000.00)		Student textbooks lacks sufficient detail to determine if expenditure is supplanting.
		$ (20,000.00)		General supplies lacks sufficient detail and is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
Henry T Gage Middle		$ (30,000.00)		Transportation for SWDs lacks sufficient detail and is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
South East High		$ (6,000.00)		Transportation for SWDs lacks sufficient detail and is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
George Washington Prep High		$ (25,944.00)		Curricular trips and field trips are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
Woodcrest Elementary		$ (1,944,795.00)		The narrative and implementation charts do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will fully meet all required components of the selected intervention model for this school.
		$ (2,722,899.00)	**$ 21,277,301.00**	
Mount Diablo Unified	**$ 4,030,469.00**	$ (30,469.00)		Amount over the maximum allowable request amount.
		$ (18,000.00)		Five LEA administrators for two schools is deemed excessive and reduced to two administrators in total.
		$ (40,000.00)		Contract for PD consultants is duplicative and is already included in a previous expenditure.
		$ (29,900.00)		Write Institute Lead Trainer Program is duplicative and is already included in a previous expenditure.
Oak Grove Middle		$ (3,000.00)		Transportation for college field trips are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (2,000.00)		Materials and supplies for a student reward program are not allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (63,000.00)		FACT coach is duplicative and two are already hired at the LEA level.
		$ (186,369.00)	**$ 3,844,100.00**	
Parlier Unified	**$ 3,207,631.73**	$ (30,000.00)		Parent and student incentives are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (33,500.00)		Materials and supplies for classroom teachers lack sufficient detail in the narrative and implementation chart to justify the expenditure.
		$ (3,833.00)		Student planners and student flash drives are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (67,333.00)	**$ 3,140,298.73**	
North Monterey County Unified	**$ 2,118,037.00**	$ (118,037.00)		Flat cut for exceeding the maximum allowable request amount.
		$ (13,254.00)		Bilingual translator salary/benefits lack sufficient detail and explanation why this position is needed at the LEA level.
		$ (6,000.00)		College visit field trips are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (137,291.00)	**$ 1,980,746.00**	

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
C. Adjustment Details – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**YR 1 Adjusted**	**YR 1 Rec**	**Details**
Inglewood Unified	**$ 5,772,177.00**	$ -		
		$ (142,720.00)		2 Instructional Coaches at the LEA level is demed excessive as each school also has 2 Instructional Coaches serving the same need.
		$ (29,323.00)		School Turnaround Leader duties and responsibilities include some that are not an allowable use of SIG funds and reduced by 25 percent.
		$ (94,324.00)		Travel/Conference for LEA Staff lacks sufficient detail and is deemed excessive and reduced by 50 percent.
Monroe (Albert F.) Middle		$ (107,964.00)		Developing school leader and teacher effectiveness lacks sufficient detail and is deemed excessive and reduced by 50 percent.
Crozier (George W.) Middle		$ (122,550.00)		Developing school leader and teacher effectiveness lacks sufficient detail and is deemed excessive and reduced by 50 percent.
		$ (496,881.00)	**$ 5,275,296.00**	
Sacramento City Unified	**$ 1,670,701.00**			
Oak Ridge Elementary		$ (3,000.00)		Student incentives are not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (3,000.00)	**$ 1,667,701.00**	
Pajaro Valley Unified	**$ 4,130,207.00**			
		$ (68,333.00)		Parent Education Specialist salary/benefits lack sufficient detail and both schools are funding some form of Parent Liaison.
		$ (25,000.00)		Materials and supplies lack sufficient detail to support the need for classroom materials at the LEA level.
		$ (40,000.00)		Teacher Incentives lack sufficient detail and both schools are already funding Teacher Incentives.
E A Hall Middle		$ (75,574.00)		2 FTE Math/ELD Intervention Specialists lacks sufficient detail in the narrative and implementation chart to justify expenditure and were reduced by 50 percent.
		$ (75,574.00)		2 FTE RLA/ELD Intervention Specialists lacks sufficient detail in the narrative and implementation chart to justify expenditure and were reduced by 50 percent.
		$ (27,734.00)		Campus Safety Coordinator/Student Liaison lacks sufficient detail and not tied to intervention model.
		$ -		90 Laptop Computers lack sufficient detail and deemed excessive as 73 desktop computers and 60 iPads were requested and reduced by 66.667 percent.
		$ (312,215.00)	**$ 3,817,992.00**	
Modesto City Unified	**$ 1,617,216.00**	$ -		
		$ -	**$ 1,617,216.00**	
Bellevue Union Elementary	**$ 1,997,546.00**			
Kawana Academy of Arts and Science		$ (300,000.00)		Non-fiction library books do not appear to relate to the described intervention and amounts are excessive.
		$ -		Parent stipend for babysitting services is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ (300,000.00)	**$ 1,697,546.00**	
Visalia Unified	**$ 959,627.00**	$ -		
		$ -	**$ 959,627.00**	

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
C. Adjustment Details – Local Educational Agencies that Met RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**YR 1 Adjusted**	**YR 1 Rec**	**Details**
Lynwood Unified	**$ 3,871,302.00**			
Lynwood High		$ (40,000.00)		Security camera system is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ -		Expenses for parent attendance at workshops are not an allowable use of SIG funds, reduced to only cover teacher expenses.
Lynwood Middle		$ (61,000.00)		Band teacher is not supported by the narrative.
		$ (120,000.00)		Musical instruments are not supported by the narrative.
		$ (550,000.00)		Portable classrooms (moving 10 portables to a non-SIG high school for the transfer of all 9th grade students) is not an allowable use of SIG funds.
		$ -		Expenses for parent attendance at conferences are not an allowable use of SIG funds, reduced to only cover teacher expenses.
		$ (771,000.00)	**$ 3,100,302.00**	

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
D. Disqualification Summary – Local Educational Agencies that Did Not Meet RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**Details**
Reef-Sunset Unified Avenal Elementary	**$ 2,038,666.00**	Narrative has limited information on the process to assess schools, including specific instruments used and multiple sources cited. The implementation charts contain limited detail and do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will meet all required components of the model in the required timeline.
Compton Unified Centennial High Davis Middle Dominguez High Martin Luther King Elementary Vanguard Learning Center Walton Middle Whaley Middle Willowbrook Middle	**$ 19,644,469.00**	The LEA budget forms were completed incorrectly. Multiple positions in the LEA budget are replicated in the school budget with different costs. The LEA has not sufficiently described the process of revision of LEA practices and policies. The LEA has not provided a complete plan for the use of resources other than SIG funds to sustain selected models. The outcome and content of stakeholder meetings was not included.
Los Angeles Unified Woodcrest Elementary	**$ 1,944,795.00**	The narrative and implementation charts do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will fully meet all required components of the selected intervention model for this school.
Alta Vista Elementary Alta Vista Elementary	**$ 811,711.00**	Significant links to needs analysis are omitted and not discussed. No evidence of a connection between assessment results current practice and staff effectiveness. Narrative does not adequately describe the process used to review and reflect prospective providers. There is not a complete plan for use of SIG funds or resources to sustain intervention model beyond SIG years. Stakeholder input has been omitted or not incorporated. LEA did not include a rationale for rejected suggestions. Meetings were not sufficiently described.
Klamath-Trinity Joint Unified Hoopa Valley Elementary	**$ 2,314,184.00**	Narrative does not sufficiently describe a process for analyzing assessment findings. The narrative, implementation chart, and budget do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will fully meet all required components of model. The other resources identified minimally align with the needs analysis and lack specificity and coherence. The plan does not sufficiently describe the process for revision and description of the intended revision and expected outcome. The LEA has not provided a complete plan for use of resources other than SIG. The LEA's description does not adequately demonstrate consultation and meetings with stakeholders.

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
D. Disqualification Summary – Local Educational Agencies that Did Not Meet RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**Details**
Palo Verde Unified Palo Verde High	**$ 2,537,660.09**	The LEA narrative and implementation charts do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will fully meet all required components of the model. The LEA does not clearly identify its process or describe meetings for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs SIG application.
Antelope Valley Union High Antelope Valley High	**$ 1,997,279.00**	The narrative and implementation chart do not fully demonstrate that the LEA will fully meet all required components of the model.
San Diego Unified San Diego Business San Diego MVP Arts	**$ 2,910,408.00**	Limited information on the process including specific instruments used; does not include all stakeholders in analyzing the data. Also does not sufficiently describe the process for analyzing assessments. The rationale omits significant links to the needs analysis. There is little to no correlation with needs analysis of selected interventions; rationale for not selecting other models is not provided/weak. Implementation chart and budget forms are incomplete, not able to link to narrative. The LEA provides a very limited description of how it will use SIG funding to implement the intervention model selected. The LEA has identified few, if any, resources planned for use in implementing selected models. The other resources minimally align with the needs analysis and lack specificity with implementation plan. The LEA has not sufficiently developed or described a plan to modify current practices or policies to implement the intervention model; no process for revision is provided. The LEA does not provide a complete plan for use of resources other than SIG funds to sustain selected intervention model. The annual goals for student achievement were not provided. The LEA does not describe services and activities for the Tier III school that is closing in June 2012. The LEA does not clearly identify its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application. LEA's description does not adequately demonstrate consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application. The LEA has not sufficiently described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the application.
Alisal Union Dr Martin Luther King, Jr , Elementary	**$ 791,068.00**	The narrative, implementation chart, and budget do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will fully meet the required components. The narrative does not adequately describe the process and qualification criteria to select external providers. The plan for monitoring the identified goals and implementation procedures is not provided.

Local Educational Agencies and their Respective Schools Recommended for Funding Using School Improvement Grant Funds
D. Disqualification Summary – Local Educational Agencies that Did Not Meet RFA Requirements

Local Educational Agency/School	**YR 1 Request**	**Details**
Del Norte County Office of Education Castle Rock	**$ 960,816.00**	The narrative and implementation charts do not demonstrate that the LEA will fully meet all required components of the selected model. The LEA has not provided a complete plan for use of resources other than SIG funds to sustain model and activities following end of SIG period.
Lindsay Unified Lindsay Senior High	**$ 1,978,988.00**	Implementation chart does not demonstrate capacity to cover three years of the grant and conflicts with a three year budget. LEA did not respond to Element IV by stating “This section is not applicable”. However, LEA provides evidence throughout application that it is or will be contracting with outside consultants. LEA did not sufficiently develop or describe a plan to modify current practices or policies.
South Monterey County Joint Union High Greenfield High	**$ 4,293,823.00**	The narrative does not identify community stakeholders and does not describe a process for analyzing assessment findings. The narrative, implementation chart, and budget do not demonstrate that the LEA has or will fully meet the required components. The narrative does not adequately provide a record of effectiveness and process/criteria for reviewing providers. The other resources identified minimally align with the LEAs needs analysis. The LEA has not sufficiently developed or described a plan to modify current practices or policies to fully implement the selected intervention model. The LEA has not provided the complete plan for use of resources other than SIG funds. The annual goals for student achievement are not sufficiently identified for each school and goals appear limited. The LEA does not clearly identify its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders.