SIG Form 1 – Application Cover Sheet

School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application for Funding

APPLICATION RECEIPT DEADLINE

June 1, 2010, 4 p.m.

Submit to:
California Department of Education
District and School Improvement Division
Regional Coordination and Support Office
1430 N Street, Suite 6208
Sacramento, CA 95814

NOTE: Please print or type all information.

County Name: Sacramento		**County/District Code:** 34-67314
Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name Elk Grove Unified School District		**LEA NCES Number:** 0612330
LEA Address 9510 Elk Grove Florin Road		
City Elk Grove, CA	**Zip Code** 95624	
Name of Primary Grant Coordinator Mark Vigario	**Grant Coordinator Title** Director, Learning Support Services	
Telephone Number 916-686-7712	**Fax Number** 916-686-5095	**E-mail Address** mvigario@egusd.net

CERTIFICATION/ASSURANCE SECTION: As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I have read all assurances, certifications, terms, and conditions associated with the federal SIG program; and I agree to comply with all requirements as a condition of funding.

I certify that all applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed and that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete.

Printed Name of Superintendent or Designee Steven M. Ladd, Ed.D.	**Telephone Number** 916-686-7700
Superintendent or Designee Signature Steven M. Ladd	**Date** 5/27/2010

PDF processed with CutePDF evaluation edition www.CutePDF.com

SIG Form 2–Collaborative Signatures (page 1 of 2)

Collaborative Signatures: The SIG program is to be designed, implemented, and sustained through a collaborative organizational structure that may include students, parents, representatives of participating LEAs and school sites, the local governing board, and private and/or public external technical assistance and support providers. Each member should indicate whether they support the intent of this application.

The appropriate administrator and representatives for the District and School Advisory Committees, School Site Council, the district or school English Learner Advisory Council, collective bargaining unit, parent group, and any other appropriate stakeholder group of each school to be funded are to indicate here whether they support this sub-grant application. Only schools meeting eligibility requirements described in this RFA may be funded. (Attach as many sheets as necessary.)

Name and Signature	Title	Organization/ School	Support Yes/No

SIG Form 2, Collaborative Signatures, has been removed due to privacy concerns. Each school's SIG Form 2 is on file with the CDE. See the CDE's Public Access Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/cl/pa.asp for information about obtaining access to these forms.

School District Approval: The LEA Superintendent must be in agreement with the intent of this application.

CDS Code	School District Name	Printed Name of Superintendent	Signature of Superintendent
67-67314	Elk Grove Unified	Steven M. Ladd. Ed.D.	
CERTIFICATION AND DESIGNATION OF APPLICANT AGENCY			

Applicant must agree to follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the SIG application, federal and state funding, legal, and legislative mandates.

LEA Name:	Elk Grove Unified School District
Authorized Executive:	Steven M. Ladd, Ed.D., Superintendent
Signature of Authorized Executive	

SIG Form 3 – Narrative Response

Respond to the elements below. Use 12 point Arial font and one inch margins. When responding to the narrative elements, LEAs should provide a thorough response that addresses **all** components of each element. Refer to *Application Requirements*, B. Narrative Response Requirements on page 18 of this RFA, and the SIG Rubric, Appendix A.

i. Needs Analysis

Response:

In the 2009-2010 school year, as a result of entering District-Wide Program Improvement, Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD) carried out a comprehensive analysis of various District programs through the use of the following assessment instruments:

- Academic Performance Survey
- Least Restrictive Environment
- District Assessment Survey

These instruments were administered through a joint effort among our Departments of Secondary and Elementary Education; Special Education, Curriculum and Professional Learning; Learning Support Services and the Research and Evaluation Development. This analysis was completed by Associate Superintendents, Directors, Program Specialists and Academic coaches who worked with school site staff to complete the surveys. Once the information was gathered and disaggregated, parents, teachers, school site and District administration were involved in analyzing the data, the determination of the essential components and ultimately the creation of our Program Improvement Plan. This information was also reviewed with the District's Categorical Advisory Committee and English Learner Advisory Committee.

At the conclusion of this process it was determined that the District plan should focus on the following initiatives:

- Differentiated Instruction
- Intervention Programs
- Common Assessments
- Leadership Development
- Grade Level and Course Alike Meetings

This plan also included strategies for English Learners, opportunities for extended learning and increased parent involvement.

Differentiated instruction has been a focus of the EGUSD throughout the prior LEA Plan period, and remains as such. With the elimination of site-based instructional coaches, the ability to support schools and teachers with instructional strategies for differentiated instruction that meet the needs of ALL students has been a challenge. While the LEA provides support in this area to teachers through professional learning opportunities, the impact of this approach has not been effective.

Efforts are currently underway to identify funding sources that can assist the EGUSD to provide instructional support to schools through teacher support personnel (Program Improvement Coaches)

who have subject-matter and instructional expertise. These personnel, who will work primarily in the classroom with both certificated (general and special education teachers) and classified (paraeducators) staff, will assist with the full and skillful implementation of adopted curricular programs and instructional strategies for differentiated instruction. Program Improvement Coaches will also support teachers with critical design and delivery of reteaching practices when data show that lack of students' mastery of standards has illuminated the need for differentiated instruction. In addition, the EGUSD will continue differentiated instruction that focuses on culturally responsive practices as a strategy for closing the achievement gap.

EGUSD provides intensive and strategic English Language Arts (ELA) intervention programs and materials to all schools. *Language!* is implemented for intensive instruction while universal access components of the core ELA adopted curricula is used for strategic intervention. However implementation of these programs has been somewhat inconsistent across the District. Although students that are in need of intervention support are clearly identified, programs that provide additional time for accelerated instruction and learning are not routinely implemented at all schools.

Although EGUSD has implemented a District-wide mid-year performance assessment of standards (MYPAS) system during the course of the prior LEA Plan, considerable work continues with the analysis of the data and the subsequent instructional planning based upon student achievement. In addition, we are currently designing a Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST) in which teachers use technology to assist them in monitoring students' progress via instantaneous electronic reports. This system will assist the District to support sites with the use of common assessments for grade level and course programs. The SIG grant will be used to assist with these initiatives by providing Instructional Coaches who will give support to grade level teams and departments in both the design of common assessments and the subsequent analysis of data for instructional practices. Coaches will also provide support regarding the critical design and delivery of reteaching practices if common assessment data show lack of student mastery of standards.

During the prior LEA Plan period, grade and course level meetings have occurred with regularity. Most sites conduct regularly scheduled time within the contractual day for teachers to meet to discuss lesson planning/pacing, review assessment data, design lesson plans, and develop and/or implement common assessments. However, a greater emphasis on both the meeting structure and content that is focused on student learning and student work is necessary. Program Improvement Coaches will play a pivotal role in this work. In addition, vertical teaming among elementary/middle school teachers and middle school/high school teachers has diminished over time with the exception of our current SETPD (Special Education Teacher Professional Development) grant program. Program Improvement Coaches will re-institutionalize this initiative throughout the District, serving as the liaison between elementary and secondary levels.

In August of 2003, EGUSD adopted aggressive achievement goals for student achievement, termed "Bold Goals" (see attached). To reach these Bold Goals, performance targets are set and annually adjusted as necessary. Each bold goal and performance target is calculated, reviewed, and monitored at the school and subgroup levels. Reviewing, discussing, and planning to meet these targets and goals has become an institutionalized process beginning with an annual meeting among District and site leaders and then continuing throughout the year at all sites

Our analysis also revealed that, as a District, we needed to:

- Monitor daily instructional time for ELA, ELD, and mathematics in both core and intervention (intensive and strategic) programs to ensure full implementation.

- Monitor the use of district instructional and assessment pacing guides in ELA, ELD, and mathematics to ensure all students receive common grade-level/course instruction and conduct data analysis of common assessment results.

- Provide on-going professional learning to site administrators to ensure full implementation of the essential program components (EPCs) in ELA, ELD, and mathematics and the LEA's five leadership standards. Provide additional support to underperforming schools via the Site Support Team model led by District level administrators.

- Staff all schools with highly qualified teachers and provide ongoing professional learning for teachers in core and intervention curricula in ELA, ELD, and mathematics. Provide additional support to teachers new to the profession via BTSA and to special education teachers and to those teaching in underperforming schools via program improvement and EL coaches.

- Provide instructional assistance and ongoing support to teachers via Program Improvement Coaches who are knowledgeable about current adopted instructional programs. This support will assist teachers in deepening their knowledge about grade-level/course content and instructional delivery in ELA, ELD, and mathematics in both general and special education settings.

- Use SISWEB (LEA's electronic data management system) to provide timely and easily accessible data to schools to ensure the administration and analysis of common assessments in ELA, ELD, and mathematics. The data contained within the system are used to inform teachers and administrators on student placement, academic progress, and effectiveness of instruction.

- Provide structured opportunities for all teachers (including strategic and intensive intervention, special education, and ELD teachers) to collaborate at least one hour monthly to analyze, discuss, and utilize the results of common assessments to guide student placement, instructional planning and lesson delivery, and progress monitoring in ELA, ELD, and mathematics under the guidance of school administration and/or Program Improvement Coaches.

ii. Selection of Intervention Models

Response:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and

grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal and/or closing the school is not realistic given the timeline of the opening of the 2010-11 school year in August, 2010. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

iii. Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models

Response:

The EGUSD is fully equipped to carry out the SIG program plans proposed in this application. Our program improvement strategies have their roots in the excellent work that we have been accomplishing among our lowest performing schools for many years. The Collaborative Academic Support Team (CAST) model was first pioneered in the EGUSD in 1994. The CAST program is an intervention/prevention service delivery model that incorporates all available educational resources to serve at risk students and their families. The goals of the CAST program are to: 1) provide a comprehensive, seamless educational model to prevent school failure; and 2) provide supportive and preventative services to students and families with academic and/or social-emotional needs. The CAST program provides students at risk of school failure immediate access to intervention and prevention services and addresses the needs of at risk families and students through proactive services.

The core of the CAST program is the interdisciplinary team that includes the classroom teacher along with some or all of the following staff: school principal and/or vice principal, speech and language specialist, instructional coach, school psychologist and intervention teacher. The CAST team meets three times per year to analyze assessment data, translate data into an intervention strategy, target specific areas for improvement, collaboratively recommend best practices and systematically monitor students' progress towards identified goals. Students who receive CAST intervention services are typically performing below grade level in core academic subjects, are not responding to classroom-based differentiated instruction, and are in need of a "response to intervention" approach to accelerate learning.

The CAST program has been demonstrated to be effective in turning around many of our schools that struggle with large percentages of low performing students. It is upon this base that our proposed SIG program model will flourish in the EGUSD. With the significant new resources provided through SIG funding, the lessons learned through the CAST model will be sufficiently resourced so that this collaborative approach can be fully implemented among our Tier III schools that are in program improvement status. Because collaborative approaches designed to close achievement gaps and increase student achievement are the norm in Elk Grove, the EGUSD faces no barriers or limitations that preclude us from fully implementing the plans proposed in our SIG application.

iv. Recruitment, Screening, and Selection of External Providers

Response:

The EGUSD does not intend to use external providers to implement our School Improvement plan.

v. Alignment of Other Resources with the Selected Intervention Models

Response:

In our efforts to exit program improvement, the Elk Grove Unified School District has committed over $3.1 million in Title I and ARRA Professional Development Set-aside and over $3.6 million in regular Title I and ARRA funds for the purpose of increasing of student academic achievement. This is being done through class size reduction in grades K - 3, the hiring of nine Program Improvement coaches, the assignment of 28.5 Program Administrators to assist sites with the execution of our Program Improvement Plan, and site allocations to maintain other program improvement initiatives. Instructional coaching will be the main strategy the district will use to implement our interventions. This scientifically-based research strategy (Elmore, 2002; Joyce & Showers, 1988; Garmston, et al, 1993; Guskey, 1988) will assist and support schools with implementation of core adopted curricula; utilization of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of ALL students; design and execution of intervention programs for at-risk students; administration of common assessments to drive instruction and provide reteaching opportunities; and support to site leaders and instructional Program Administrators with instructional program designs. In addition, the LEA will continue to provide professional learning (DuFour, 2007; Guskey, 1986; 1988) to teachers and site/District leaders in the areas of differentiated instruction (Tomlinson, 1999; 2003) implementation of common assessments (Marzano, 2006; DuFour, 2007) and leadership development (Glickman, 2001; Blase, 2000). These Program Improvement initiatives, which have been adopted by our Board of Education, align directly with the services that would be provided under the SIG program.

The integration of current funding and programs with SIG funds will be overseen by the Site Support Teams in collaboration with the School Site Council. Each school in program improvement has been provided a Site Support Team by the District. This team consists of site administration, District

Associate Superintendents, Directors, Program Specialists, Curriculum Coaches and site teaching staff. These teams meet a minimum of once each month to review student academic progress and effectiveness of implemented programs, as well as review, adjust and monitor the site's Accountability Plan. Our Learning Support Services department will also be overseeing the appropriate usage of all funds.

vi. Alignment of Proposed SIG Activities with Current DAIT Process (if applicable)

Response

The EGUSD is not currently receiving District Assistance and Intervention Team services.

vii. Modification of LEA Practices or Policies

Response:

Because there are no Tier I or Tier II schools in the EGUSD, the interventions planned on behalf of our Tier III participating schools do not require revision or amendment to existing District practices or policies. If funded, the EGUSD will amend its LEA Plan for each funded school.

viii. Sustainment of the Reforms after the Funding Period Ends

Response:

Once the funding period concludes, EGUSD is committed to sustaining reforms in the following ways:

- Continuing to focus on the five identified areas in the current District Program Improvement Plan: Differentiated Instruction, Intervention Programs, Common Assessments, Leadership Development, and Grade Level and Course Alike Meetings.
- Determining funding sources to provide high quality instructional support through the use of the coaching model. Coaches will be used to build capacity and understanding at the site level, to increase the effectiveness of the supervision and evaluation process, and to improve instruction.
- Effectively analyze and use assessment results to inform and improve instruction. This will be accomplished through the use of SISWeb (the District's student information system), District-wide assessment protocols (MYPAS, CSRE and FAST), standardized testing results and site/curriculum-based assessment. A primary focus for the District will be to decrease the time between testing and dissemination of the results so that teachers can use real-time data to make adjustments in their instruction.
- Human Resources, Special Education, Curriculum and Professional Learning, and Technology Services will continue to ensure all teachers, including special education teachers are Highly Qualified to teach the classes in which they are placed.
- Site Support Teams, consisting of District Administration, Site Administration, teachers, and coaches, will continue to identify strengths, areas of improvement and ways the District and sites can work collaboratively to ensure improvement.
- Professional development in core and intervention curricula, research-based instructional and differentiated strategies, analyzing common assessments, and facilitating grade level and course alike meetings will continue as a focus. Professional development will be designed by District and site administration, coaches and site staff. Professional development will also emphasize improvement for current and future administrators in the district.

ix. Establishment of Challenging LEA Annual School Goals for Student Achievement

Response:

The Elk Grove Unified School District will establish challenging annual goals for student achievement for the schools that the district will support with SIG funds. These annual goals will be in harmony with state and federal accountability targets for improvement.

Consistent with federal AYP safe harbor provisions, EGUSD will set SIG school goals for English Language Arts and Math to reduce the percentage of students who are non-proficient by 10 percent from the year prior. As the targets are dependent on the preceding year's achievement levels, each fall the safe harbor proficiency percentages will be calculated for each school and its significant subgroups and set as the SIG schools' goals (see Attachment I).

In addition, to align with California's accountability system requirements for year to year growth, SIG schools also will be expected to meet annual growth targets set through the state's Academic Performance Index (API) program. SIG schools that fall short of the state determined 800 API target are required to improve 5 percent of the difference between each school's schoolwide and subgroup API and 800, with a 5 point minimum growth required.

x. Inclusion of Tier III Schools (if applicable)

Response:

Because there are no EGUSD schools that fall within Tier I or Tier II, our SIG application includes only Tier III schools that are in program improvement status. As such, the description of the services proposed for each school site have already been described in Section II above and in the Form 11. Our student achievement goals have been described in Section IX, and the targets are presented in Attachment I.

xi. Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders

Response:

The EGUSD has a history of inclusivity that incorporates the input of students, parents, teachers and community members. The District currently has processes and structures in place to present the community with information, as well as receive their invaluable input. These District structures include:

- Superintendent's Parent Advisory Committee
- Superintendent's Student Advisory Committee
- District Categorical Advisory Committee
- District English Learner Advisory Committee
- Elementary Certificated Advisory Committee
- Indian Education Parent Advisory Committee

SIG Form 4a–LEA Projected Budget

LEA Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of LEA: Elk Grove Unified School District	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$3,965,196	$3,965,196	$3,965,196
2000–2999	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
3000–3999	Employee Benefits	$1,221,240	$1,290,149	$1,359,060
4000–4999	Books and Supplies	1,941,200	$1,113,200	$1,113,200
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–6999	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
7310 & 7350	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$406,988	$363,644	$367,579
7370 & 7380	Transfers of Direct Support Costs	$0	$0	$0
Total Amount Budgeted		$7,534,624	$6,732,189	$6,805,035

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of School: Anna Kirchgater	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$660,866	$660,866	$660,866
1999				
2000–	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
2999				
3000–	Employee Benefits	$203,540	$215,024	$226,511
3999				
4000–	Books and Supplies	$322,200	$184,200	$184,200
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$67,756	$60,532	$61,187
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted		$1,254,362	$1,120,622	$1,132,764

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of School: Charles Mack	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$660,866	$660,866	$660,866
1999				
2000–	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
2999				
3000–	Employee Benefits	$203,540	$215,025	$226,510
3999				
4000–	Books and Supplies	$321,800	$183,800	$183,800
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$67,732	$60,508	$61,164
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted		$1,253,938	$1,120,199	$1,132,340

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of School: David Reese	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$660,866	$660,866	$660,866
2000–2999	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
3000–3999	Employee Benefits	$203,540	$215,025	$226,510
4000–4999	Books and Supplies	$332,800	$194,800	$194,800
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–6999	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
7370 & 7380	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$68,360	$61,136	$61,792
Total Amount Budgeted		$1,265,566	$1,131,827	$1,143,968

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of School: Herman Leimbach	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$660,866	$660,866	$660,866
2000–2999	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
3000–3999	Employee Benefits	$203,540	$215,025	$226,510
4000–4999	Books and Supplies	$301,600	$163,600	$163,600
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–6999	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
7370 & 7380	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$66,579	$59,355	$60,011
Total Amount Budgeted		$1,232,585	$1,098,846	$1,110,987

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of School: Prairie	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$660,866	$660,866	$660,866
1999				
2000–	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
2999				
3000–	Employee Benefits	$203,540	$215,025	$226,510
3999				
4000–	Books and Supplies	$344,200	$206,200	$206,200
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$69,011	$61,787	$62,443
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted		$1,277,617	$1,143,878	$1,156,019

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2009–10

Name of School: Samuel Kennedy	
County/District (CD) Code: 34-67314	
County: Sacramento	
LEA Contact: Mark Vigario	Telephone Number: 916-686-7712
E-Mail: mvigario@egusd.net	Fax Number: 916-686-5095
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–	Certificated Personnel Salaries	$660,866	$660,866	$660,866
1999				
2000–	Classified Personnel Salaries	$0	$0	$0
2999				
3000–	Employee Benefits	$203,540	$215,025	$226,510
3999				
4000–	Books and Supplies	$318,600	$180,600	$180,600
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
6000–	Capital Outlay	$0	$0	$0
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Indirect Costs	$67,550	$60,326	$60,981
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted		$1,250,556	$1,116,817	$1,128,957

SIG Form 5a–LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the LEA budget. The LEA budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include LEA budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity) *Year 1 Only*	Object Code
Certificated Personnel Salaries Instructional Coach: Position costs are budgeted at $82,031 per FTE x 2 positions per school = $164,062 annually x 6 schools =	$ 984,372	1100
Intervention Teacher: Position costs are budgeted at $70,972 per position x 7 positions per school - $496,804 annually x 6 schools=	$2,980,824	1100
Benefits Benefits costs are based on the position classification and include the following: retirement, Medicare, unemployment insurance, workers compensation and life insurance.		3000
Instructional Coach: $23,769 annually x 2 positions per school = $47,538 in Year 1 x 6 schools = $285,228. These costs are adjusted annually to reflect increases in health care costs. In Year 2 benefits are $25,045 per FTE x 2 positions per school = $50,090 x 6 schools = $300,540. In Year 3 benefits are $26,321 per FTE x 2 positions per school - $52,642 x 6 schools = $315,852.	$285,228	3000
Intervention Teacher: $22,286 annually x 7 positions per school= $156,002 in Year 1 x 6 schools = $936,012. These costs are adjusted annually to reflect increases in health care costs. In Year 2 benefits are $23,562 per FTE x 7 positions per school = $164,935 x 6 schools = 989,610. In Year 3 benefits are $24,838 per FTE x 7 positions per school - $173,867 x 6 schools = $1,043,202.	$936,012	3000
Books and Supplies Instructional materials: $200 per student per year x 2008/09 enrollment:		4100
Anna Kirchgater – 921 x $200 = $184,200	$ 184,200	
Charles Mack – 919 x $200 = $183,800	$ 183,800	
David Reese – 974 x $200 = $194,800	$ 194,800	
Herman Leimbach – 818 x $200 = $163,600	$ 163,600	
Prairie – 1,031 x $200 = $206,200	$ 206,200	
Samuel Kennedy – 903 x $200 = $180,600	$ 180,600	
	$1,113,200	

Computer equipment: 1 laptop cart per grade level @ $23,000 each x 6 grade levels = $138,000 per school in Year 1 x 6 schools = $828,000.	$828,000	4400
Indirect Costs @ 5.71% of direct costs = $406,988 in Year 1; $363,644 in Year 2 and $367,579 in Year 3.	$406,988	7300
Total Budget:	$7,534,624	
Year 2 - $6,732,189 Year 3 - $6,805,033		

SIG Form 5b–School Budget Narrative

School Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

School Name:

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity) *Year 1 Only*	Object Code
Certificated Personnel Salaries Instructional Coach: Position costs are budgeted at $82,031 per FTE x 2 positions per school = $164,062 annually.	$164,062	1100
Intervention Teacher: Position costs are budgeted at $70,972 per position x 7 positions per school - $496,804 annually.	$496,804	1100
Benefits Benefits costs are based on the position classification and include the following: retirement, Medicare, unemployment insurance, workers compensation and life insurance.		3000
Instructional Coach: $23,769 annually x 2 positions per school = $47,538 in Year 1. These costs are adjusted annually to reflect increases in health care costs. In Year 2 benefits are $25,045 per FTE x 2 positions per school = $50,090. In Year 3 benefits are $26,321 per FTE x 2 positions per school - $52,642.	$ 47,538	3000
Intervention Teacher: $22,286 annually x 7 positions per school= $156,002 in Year 1. These costs are adjusted annually to reflect increases in health care costs. In Year 2 benefits are $23,562 per FTE x 7 positions per school = $164,935. In Year 3 benefits are $24,838 per FTE x 7 positions per school - $173,867.	$156,002	3000
Books and Supplies Instructional materials: $200 per student per year x 2008/09 enrollment:		4100
Anna Kirchgater – 921 x $200 = $184,200	$184,200	
Charles Mack – 919 x $200 = $183,800	$183,800	
David Reese – 974 x $200 = $194,800	$194,800	
Herman Leimbach – 818 x $200 = $163,600	$163,600	
Prairie – 1,031 x $200 = $206,200	$206,200	
Samuel Kennedy – 903 x $200 = $180,600	$180,600	

Computer equipment: 1 laptop cart per grade level @ $23,000 each x 6 grade levels = $138,000 per school in Year 1.				$138,000	4400
Indirect Costs @ 5.71% of direct costs:					7300
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3		
Anna Kirchgater	$67,756	$60,532	$61,187	$ 76,756	
Charles Mack	$67,732	$60,508	$61,164	$ 76,732	
David Reese	$68,360	$61,136	$61,792	$ 68,360	
Herman Leimbach	$66,579	$59,355	$60,011	$ 66,579	
Prairie	$69,011	$61,787	$62,443	$ 69,011	
Samuel Kennedy	$67,550	$60,326	$60,981	$ 67,550	
Total School Budget:	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**		
Anna Kirchgater	$1,254,362	$1,120,622	$1,132,764	$1,254,362	
Charles Mack	$1,253,938	$1,120,199	$1,132,340	$1,253,938	
David Reese	$1,265,556	$1,131,827	$1,143,968	$1,265,556	
Herman Leimbach	$1,232,585	$1,098,846	$1,110,987	$1,232,585	
Prairie	$1,277,617	$1,143,878	$1,156,019	$1,277,617	
Samuel Kennedy	$1,250,556	$1,116,817	$1,128,957	$1,250,556	

Drug-Free Workplace

Certification regarding state and federal drug-free workplace requirements.

Note: Any entity, whether an agency or an individual, must complete, sign, and return this certification with its grant application to the California Department of Education.

Grantees Other Than Individuals

As required by Section 8355 of the *California Government Code* and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* (*CFR*) Part 84, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Sections 84.105 and 84.110

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:
   a. Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition
   b. Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:
      1. The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace
      2. The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace
      3. Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs
      4. The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace
   c. Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a)
   d. Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
      1. Abide by the terms of the statement
      2. Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction
   e. Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant officer or other designee. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.
   f. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:
      1. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
      2. Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a federal, state, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency
   g. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (street address. city, county, state, zip code)

Six elementary school sites within the Elk Grove Unified School District

9510 Elk Grove-Florin Road (District Office)

Elk Grove, CA 95624

Check [✓] if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Grantees Who Are Individuals

As required by Section 8355 of the *California Government Code* and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Sections 84.105 and 84.110

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction to every grant officer or designee, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

Name of Applicant: Elk Grove Unified School District

Name of Program: School Improvement Grant

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: Rich Fagan, Fiscal Services Director

Signature: Rich F Date: 5/26/10

Lobbying

Certification regarding lobbying for federal grants in excess of $100,000.

Applicants must review the requirements for certification regarding lobbying included in the regulations cited below before completing this form. Applicants must sign this form to comply with the certification requirements under 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* (*CFR*) Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying." This certification is a material representation of fact upon which the Department of Education relies when it makes a grant or enters into a cooperative agreement.

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the *U.S. Code*, and implemented at 34 *CFR* Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

a. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

b. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," (revised Jul-1997) in accordance with its instructions;

c. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

Name of Applicant: Elk Grove Unified School District

Name of Program: School Improvement Grant

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: Rich Fagan, Fiscal Services Director

Signature: Rich F Date: 5/26/10

ED 80-0013 (Revised Jun-2004) - U. S. Department of Education

Debarment and Suspension

Certification regarding debarment, suspension, ineligibility and voluntary exclusion--lower tier covered transactions.

This certification is required by the U. S. Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 85, for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.110.

Instructions for Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," " person," "primary covered transaction," " principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled A Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Name of Applicant: Elk Grove Unified School District

Name of Program: School Improvement Grant

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: Rich Fagan, Fiscal Services Director

Signature: Rich Fagan Date: 5/26/10

ED 80-0014 (Revised Sep-1990) - U. S. Department of Education

Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances

As a condition of the receipt of funds under this sub-grant program, the applicant agrees to comply with the following Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances:

1. Use its SIG 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 of SIG;
2. Establish challenging annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds;
3. If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
4. Report to the CDE the school-level data as described in this RFA.
5. The applicant will ensure that the identified strategies and related activities are incorporated in the revised LEA Plan and Single Plan for Student Achievement.
6. The applicant will follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the CDE.
7. The applicant will participate in a statewide evaluation process as determined by the SEA and provide all required information on a timely basis.
8. The applicant will respond to any additional surveys or other methods of data collection that may be required for the full sub-grant period.
9. The applicant will use funds only for allowable costs during the sub-grant period.
10. The application will include all required forms signed by the LEA Superintendent or designee.
11. The applicant will use fiscal control and fund accountability procedures to ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid under the sub-grant, including the use of the federal funds to supplement, and not supplant, state and local funds, and maintenance of effort (20 USC § 8891).

12. The applicant hereby expresses its full understanding that not meeting all SIG requirements will result in the termination of SIG funding.

13. The applicant will ensure that funds are spent as indicated in the sub-grant proposal and agree that funds will be used **only** in the school(s) identified in the LEA's AO-400 sub-grant award letter.

14. All audits of financial statements will be conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) and with policies, procedures, and guidelines established by the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), Single Audit Act Amendments, and OMB Circular A-133.

15. The applicant will ensure that expenditures are consistent with the federal Education Department Guidelines Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) under Title 34 Education. http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html (Outside Source)

16. The applicant agrees that the SEA has the right to intervene, renegotiate the sub-grant, and/or cancel the sub-grant if the sub-grant recipient fails to comply with sub-grant requirements.

17. The applicant will cooperate with any site visitations conducted by representatives of the state or regional consortia for the purpose of monitoring sub-grant implementation and expenditures, and will provide all requested documentation to the SEA personnel in a timely manner.

18. The applicant will repay any funds which have been determined through a federal or state audit resolution process to have been misspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for, and further agrees to pay any collection fees that may subsequently be imposed by the federal and/or state government.

19. The applicant will administer the activities funded by this sub-grant in such a manner so as to be consistent with California's adopted academic content standards.

20. The applicant will obligate all sub-grant funds by the end date of the sub-grant award period or re-pay any funding received, but not obligated, as well as any interest earned over one-hundred dollars on the funds.

21. The applicant will maintain fiscal procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of the funds from the CDE and disbursement.

22. The applicant will comply with the reporting requirements and submit any required report forms by the due dates specified.

I hereby certify that the agency identified below will comply with all sub-grant conditions and assurances described in items 1 through 22 above.

Agency Name:	Elk Grove Unified School District
Authorized Executive:	Steven M. Ladd, Ed.D., Superintendent
Signature of Authorized Executive	

SIG Form 8–Waivers Requested

Waivers Requested

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement (see page 24 for additional information). If the LEA does not intend to implement a waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which school(s) it will implement the waiver on:

☒ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

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

> **Note**: If the SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs receiving SIG funds.

☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to allow its Tier I and Tier II schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. (**Note**: This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the poverty threshold. (**Note**: This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

SIG Form 9–Schools to Be Served

SCHOOL NAME	CDS Code	NCES Code	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)				WAIVER(S) TO BE IMPLEMENTED		PROJECTED COST
						Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation	Start Over	Implement SWP	
Anna Kirchgater Elementary	6032981	061233001403			✓							
Charles Mack Elementary	6033005	061233001405			✓							
David Reese Elementary	6033021	061233001410			✓							
Herman Leimbach Elementary	6077291	061233001404			✓							
Prairie Elementary	6098450	061233001411			✓							
Samuel Kennedy Elementary	6033104	061233001401			✓							

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Anna Kirchgater Elementary School**

Intervention Model: ☐ Turnaround ☐ Restart ☐ Closure ☐ Transformation

☒ Other EGUSD Program Improvement Model

Rationale:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This

model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal and/or closing the school is not realistic given the timeline of the opening of the 2010-11 school year in August, 2010. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

Total FTE required: _____LEA __**46**___ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs **School**	**LEA**	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Hire two instructional coaches to support primary and intermediate teachers, one FTE per segment	July, 2010		$211,600		LEA
Hire seven intervention teachers, one per grade level, to assist and support students performing below grade level	July, 2010		$652,806		School
Provide additional funding per pupil for instructional materials to support student achievement ($200/pupil)	July, 2010		$184,200		LEA School
Provide technology support and laptop computers, one class set per grade level	September, 2010		$138,000		School

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Charles Mack Elementary School**

Intervention Model: ☐ Turnaround ☐ Restart ☐ Closure ☐ Transformation

☒ Other EGUSD Program Improvement Model

Rationale:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This

model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal and/or closing the school is not realistic given the timeline of the opening of the 2010-11 school year in August, 2010. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

Total FTE required: _____LEA __**45**__ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs **School**	**LEA**	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Hire two instructional coaches to support primary and intermediate teachers, one FTE per segment	July, 2010		$211,600		LEA
Hire seven intervention teachers, one per grade level, to assist and support students performing below grade level	July, 2010		$652,806		School
Provide additional funding per pupil for instructional materials to support student achievement ($200/pupil)	July, 2010		$183,800		LEA School
Provide technology support and laptop computers, one class set per grade level	September, 2010		$138,000		School

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **David Reese Elementary School**

Intervention Model: ☐ Turnaround ☐ Restart ☐ Closure ☐ Transformation

☒ Other EGUSD Program Improvement Model

Rationale:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This

model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal is not realistic given that the current principal of this school was just assigned during the 2009-10 school year. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

Total FTE required: _____LEA __**49**__ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs **School**	**LEA**	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Hire two instructional coaches to support primary and intermediate teachers, one FTE per segment	July, 2010		$211,600		LEA
Hire seven intervention teachers, one per grade level, to assist and support students performing below grade level	July, 2010		$652,806		School
Provide additional funding per pupil for instructional materials to support student achievement ($200/pupil)	July, 2010		$194,800		LEA School
Provide technology support and laptop computers, one class set per grade level	September, 2010		$138,000		School

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Herman Leimbach Elementary School**

Intervention Model: ☐ Turnaround ☐ Restart ☐ Closure ☐ Transformation

☒ Other EGUSD Program Improvement Model

Rationale:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This

model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal and/or closing the school is not realistic given the timeline of the opening of the 2010-11 school year in August, 2010. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

Total FTE required: _____LEA __**37**___ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs **School**	**LEA**	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Hire two instructional coaches to support primary and intermediate teachers, one FTE per segment	July, 2010		$211,600		LEA
Hire seven intervention teachers, one per grade level, to assist and support students performing below grade level	July, 2010		$652,806		School
Provide additional funding per pupil for instructional materials to support student achievement ($200/pupil)	July, 2010		$163,600		LEA School
Provide technology support and laptop computers, one class set per grade level	September, 2010		$138,000		School

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Prairie Elementary School**

Intervention Model: ☐ Turnaround ☐ Restart ☐ Closure ☐ Transformation

☒ Other EGUSD Program Improvement Model

Rationale:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This

model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal and/or closing the school is not realistic given the timeline of the opening of the 2010-11 school year in August, 2010. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

Total FTE required: _____LEA __**51**__ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs		Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
		School	**LEA**		
Hire two instructional coaches to support primary and intermediate teachers, one FTE per segment	July, 2010		$211,600		LEA
Hire seven intervention teachers, one per grade level, to assist and support students performing below grade level	July, 2010		$652,806		School
Provide additional funding per pupil for instructional materials to support student achievement ($200/pupil)	July, 2010		$206,200		LEA School
Provide technology support and laptop computers, one class set per grade level	September, 2010		$138,000		School

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: **Samuel Kennedy Elementary School**

Intervention Model: ☐ Turnaround ☐ Restart ☐ Closure ☐ Transformation

☒ Other EGUSD Program Improvement Model

Rationale:

The basis for selecting the EGUSD Program Improvement model as the approach for school improvement is that it is based upon data gathered from the District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the Academic Performance Survey (APS). District and school personnel, including site administrators and teachers, were involved with determining the areas of focus and need for support based upon the survey results. As such, five Program Improvement initiatives emerged and will be addressed for improving student achievement at this school. Those initiatives include regularly scheduled grade level meetings focused on student data and instructional practices; leadership development for site and grade level leaders; intervention program design and implementation; administration of common assessments; and support with differentiated instruction. The process used for determining this appropriate intervention model included analyzing school achievement data and the professional learning needs of the administrative and teaching staff. Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional learning that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, and designed in collaboration with the school staff, will be provided by two instructional coaches assigned to the school. These highly-qualified coaches, who are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning, will also assist the principal and school staff with the implementation of the five program improvement initiatives to ensure school improvement. Teachers at this site have demonstrated the capacity to successfully implement the school reform strategies that will be required of them under the guidance of the program improvement initiatives.

In addition, based upon student achievement needs, seven intervention teachers, one assigned per each K-6 grade level, will be provided to assist and support teachers in working with their students in order to lower teacher:student ratios to more effectively meet the needs of ALL students. Intervention teachers will work primarily with students on or above grade level while the classroom teacher focuses instructional efforts on the needs of at-risk students. This

model provides the teacher with the most knowledge about the instructional needs of his/her students to provide additional time and intensive instruction to address those needs to effectively close the achievement gap. Intervention teachers will be hired who possess experience in working with either primary or intermediate grade levels of students in order to best assist students with their learning as well as in planning appropriate lessons based upon the standards and instructional needs of students. Instructional coaches will assist and support both the classroom and intervention teachers with creating the most effective instructional model to meet the needs of students at all grade levels.

The basis for not selecting one of the intervention models noted above is that this school is a Tier III school which does not require the more intensive intervention models that Tier I and II schools require. In addition, the feasibility of replacing the existing principal and/or closing the school is not realistic given the timeline of the opening of the 2010-11 school year in August, 2010. Similarly, using an evaluation system for teachers that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor is not permissible with the current collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' association. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff at this school is also not permissible under the current collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, students enrolled at this school already receive the option of attending other schools within the LEA that are higher achieving.

Total FTE required: _____LEA __**47**___ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs **School**	**LEA**	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Hire two instructional coaches to support primary and intermediate teachers, one FTE per segment	July, 2010		$211,600		LEA
Hire seven intervention teachers, one per grade level, to assist and support students performing below grade level	July, 2010		$652,806		School
Provide additional funding per pupil for instructional materials to support student achievement ($200/pupil)	July, 2010		$180,600		LEA School
Provide technology support and laptop computers, one class set per grade level	September, 2010		$138,000		School

2010 AYP Goals for SIG Schools
Safe Harbor Estimates Based on 2009 AYP Results
Program Improvement Schools

	English Language Arts					Mathematics				
	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor
S. Kennedy										
School-Wide	31.6	68.4	6.84	61.6	38.4	42.1	57.9	5.79	52.1	47.9
African American	20.7	79.3	7.93	71.4	28.6	26.4	73.6	7.36	66.2	33.8
Asian	41.2	58.8	5.88	52.9	47.1	61.3	38.7	3.87	34.8	65.2
Hispanic	28.7	71.3	7.13	64.2	35.8	41.2	58.8	5.88	52.9	47.1
English Learner	28.6	71.4	7.14	64.3	35.7	44.1	55.9	5.59	50.3	49.7
SocioEcon Disadvantaged	31.6	68.4	6.84	61.6	38.4	42.1	57.9	5.79	52.1	47.9

	English Language Arts					Mathematics				
	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor
A. Kirchgater										
School-Wide	39.9	60.1	6.01	54.1	45.9	45.8	54.2	5.42	48.8	51.2
African American	32.6	67.4	6.74	60.7	39.3	31.4	68.6	6.86	61.7	38.3
Asian	43.9	56.1	5.61	50.5	49.5	57.6	42.4	4.24	38.2	61.8
Hispanic	31.8	68.2	6.82	61.4	38.6	42.3	57.7	5.77	51.9	48.1
English Learner	34.4	65.6	6.56	59.0	41.0	48.8	51.2	5.12	46.1	53.9
SocioEcon Disadvantaged	35.1	64.9	6.49	58.4	41.6	42.1	57.9	5.79	52.1	47.9

	English Language Arts					Mathematics				
	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor
H. Leimbach										
School-Wide	38.5	61.5	6.15	55.4	44.7	39.2	60.8	6.08	54.7	45.3
African American	36.0	64.0	6.4	57.6	42.4	29.2	70.8	7.08	63.7	36.3
Asian	48.8	51.2	5.12	46.1	53.9	60.0	40.0	4.0	36.0	64.0
Hispanic	31.8	68.2	6.82	61.4	38.6	38.2	61.8	6.18	55.6	44.4
English Learner	36.4	63.6	6.36	57.2	42.8	41.7	58.3	5.83	52.5	47.5
SocioEcon Disadvantaged	38.5	61.5	6.15	55.4	44.7	39.2	60.8	6.08	54.7	45.3

2010 AYP Goals for SIG Schools
Safe Harbor Estimates Based on 2009 AYP Results
Program Improvement Schools

	English Language Arts					Mathematics				
	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor
C. Mack										
School-Wide	37.8	62.2	6.22	56.0	44.0	45.6	54.4	5.44	49.0	51.0
African American	36.0	64.0	6.4	57.6	42.4	37.7	62.3	6.23	56.1	43.9
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	37.7	62.3	6.23	56.1	43.9	43.7	56.3	5.63	50.7	49.3
English Learner	30.9	69.1	6.91	62.2	37.8	42.2	57.8	5.78	52.0	48.0
SocioEcon Disadvantaged	37.8	62.2	6.22	56.0	44.0	45.6	54.4	5.44	49.0	51.0

	English Language Arts					Mathematics				
	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor
Prairie										
School-Wide	44.4	55.6	5.56	50.0	50.0	54.6	45.4	4.54	40.9	59.1
African American	39.0	61.0	6.1	54.9	45.1	42.1	57.9	5.79	52.1	47.9
Asian	52.7	47.3	4.73	42.6	57.4	72.3	27.7	2.77	24.9	75.1
Hispanic	38.8	61.2	6.12	55.1	44.9	50.7	49.3	4.93	44.4	55.6
English Learner	40.4	59.6	5.96	53.6	46.4	58.2	41.8	4.18	37.6	62.4
SocioEcon Disadvantaged	44.3	55.7	5.57	50.1	49.9	54.5	45.5	4.55	41.0	59.1

	English Language Arts					Mathematics				
	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor	% Prof. and Adv.	% Non Prof. and Adv.	10% of Non Prof. and Adv.	10% Reduction of Non Prof. and Adv.	Safe Harbor
D. Reese										
School-Wide	35.7	64.3	6.43	57.9	42.1	43.5	56.5	5.65	50.9	49.2
African American	26.3	73.7	7.37	66.3	33.7	30.7	69.3	6.93	62.4	37.6
Asian	38.1	61.9	6.19	55.7	44.3	53.6	46.4	4.64	41.8	58.2
Hispanic	33.9	66.1	6.61	59.5	40.5	39.6	60.4	6.04	54.4	45.6
English Learner	29.8	70.2	7.02	63.2	36.8	41.5	58.5	5.85	52.7	47.4
SocioEcon Disadvantaged	35.7	64.3	6.43	57.9	42.1	43.5	56.5	5.65	50.9	49.2

2009 API Base and 2010 API Growth Targets
Program Improvement Schools

School Name	2009 API Base												2010 Growth Targets											
	District/ Schools	African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More	Socio Econ	English Learners	SWD	District/ Schools	African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More	Socio Econ	English Learners	SWD
Districtwide	785	693	740	827	847	738	766	839	798	728	734	551	B											
Elementary Schools																								
Kennedy (Samuel) Elementary	701			776		693				701	707		5			5		5				5	5	
Kirchgater (Anna) Elementary	727	656		771		694				708	725		5	7		5		5				5	5	
Leimbach (Herman) Elementary	715	681		791		694				715	720		5	6		5		5				5	5	
Mack (Charles) Elementary	716	670				717				716	699		5	7				5				5	5	
Prairie Elementary	769	738		818		758				769	769		5	5		A		5				5	5	
Reese (David) Elementary	698	622		738		684				698	687		5	9		5		6				5	6	

"A" means the school or subgroup scored at or above the statewide performance target of 800 in 2009.
"B" means this is either an LEA or an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) school. Schools participating in the ASAM do not currently receive growth, target information, or statewide or similar schools rankings on this report in recognition of their markedly different educational missions and populations served. ASAM schools are covered under the Alternative Accountability system as required by Education Code Section 52052 and not the API accountability system. However, API information is needed to comply with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Growth, target, and rank information are not applicable to LEAs.
"C" means this is a special education school. Statewide and similar schools ranks and API growth targets are not applicable to special education schools.

SIG Application Checklist

Required Components

The following components must be included as part of the application. Check or initial by each component, and include this form in the application package. These forms can be downloaded at http://.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/sig10rfa.asp. Please compile the application packet in the order provided below.

Include this completed checklist in the application packet

LD Form 1 Application Cover Sheet
(Must be signed in **blue ink** by the LEA Superintendent or Designee)

LD Form 2 Collaborative Signatures
(Must be signed in **blue ink** by the appropriate personnel at each school selected for participation and by the LEA Superintendent or Designee)

LD Form 3 Narrative Response

LD Form 4 Projected Budget

LD Form 5 Budget Narrative

LD Form 6 General Assurances Download, obtain appropriate signature, and retain at the LEA

LD Drug Free Workplace Certification

LD Lobbying Certification

LD Debarment and Suspension Certification

LD Form 7 Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances (three pages)

LD Form 8 Waivers Requested

LD Form 9 Schools to Be Served Chart

N/A Form 10 Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

LD Form 11 Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)