

Manchester School District

Beech Elementary School Improvement Grant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LEA Application	2
Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Action Plans	4
Schools to Be Served	7
Descriptive Information	7
Beech Timeline to Implement Requested Transformation Activities	11
Budget	15
Beech Three-Year School Budget Plan	17
Beech One-Year Detailed School Budget Narrative 2014-2015	21
Assurances	23
Manchester School District Educator Evaluation System	26
MSD Appendix C: Beech Baseline School Data Profile	27
MSD Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric.....	38
MSD Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form	40
MSD Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form	41
MSD Appendix G: Application Scoring Rubrics	43

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014-2015

LEA Application

SAU#: 37 District Name: Manchester School District

Superintendent: Debra Livingston

Address: 195 McGregor Street, Suite 201

City: Manchester Zip: 03102 Tel: 603-624-6300

E-mail: dlivingston@mansd.org Fax: 603-624-6337

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Coordinator (if different from Superintendent):

Name: Patricia Snow

Address: 195 McGregor Street, Suite 201

City: Manchester Zip: 03102 Tel: 603-624-6300 x149

E-mail: psnow@mansd.org Fax: 603-623-5283

Beech Elementary School Improvement Committee Members	
Name	Group representing (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Debra Livingston	MSD superintendent
Karen Burkush	MSD assistant superintendent
David Ryan	MSD assistant superintendent
Polly Golden	MSD federal projects director
Pat Snow	MSD executive director— innovation zone
Jeff DeLangie	IT director
Donna Crook	MSD data analyst

Ginny Mahan	MSD grant writer
Christine Brennan	Beech principal (hired January 2014)
Michele Smith	Beech Title I
Danielle Longo	Beech social work
Abby St. Pierre	Beech Title I
Susan Crockett	Beech Kindergarten teacher
Lindsay Smart	Beech grade 5 teacher
Kim Warren	Beech librarian
Jacqueline (Jacqui) Berrios	Beech parent

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Action Plans

(Please complete one per school)

School name: Beech Elementary School

Goal	Provide a specific, measurable goal citing intended changes in teaching and learning tied to improvement in student achievement.					
	To review models and implementations of smaller learning community transformations in elementary schools across the country while participating in teambuilding professional development opportunities necessary to implement the academy model to determine if implementing a smaller learning community at Beech is plausible and to determine if doing so will offer benefits for Beech students and their families.					
Strategy	Implement leadership strategies for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring through the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround model <input type="checkbox"/> Restart model <input type="checkbox"/> School closure model <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transformation model					
Proposed Activities for 2014-2015	Resources	Timeline	Oversight	Monitoring (Implementation)	Monitoring (Effectiveness)	Title I School Improvement Funds
<i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve the desired outcome. Provide sufficient detail so that reviewers will understand the purpose and proposed implementation of each activity.</i>	<i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	<i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	<i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation? How often and by whom?</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often and by whom?</i>	<i>Include amount allocated to this activity if applicable. Provide the requested detail on the Budget Narrative Form.</i>
Team building professional development to build, maintain, and strengthen communication and trust among school staff members	Team building contracted services, stipends	August 2014- June 2015	Principal, Ex Dir – Innovation Zone, Classroom Teachers, Specialists	Log sheets of attendees of team building events, reports by members of what they learned with regard to challenges that must be overcome to implement the academy model	Increased communication and understanding among Beech educators as a foundation to implement the academy model and improve teaching and learning results	\$59,000 (contracted services, stipends, substitutes)
Team members visits to other K-5 schools that have restructured their schools to	Travel, stipend, substitutes	August 2014-	Principal, Ex Dir – Innovation Zone, Classroom	Trip reports by teams describing what they saw, challenges overcome,	Trip reports by teams describing what they saw, challenges	\$40,000 (travel, stipends, substitutes)

implement the academy model	days	June 2015	Teachers, Specialists, Parents	challenges remaining, recommendations for Beech	overcome, challenges remaining, recommendations for Beech	
Parent workshops to build, maintain, and strengthen communication and trust between parents and school	Contracted services for parent workshops, stipends, books	August 2014- June 2015	Principal, Ex Dir – Innovation Zone, Title I Reading and Math Specialists	Parent surveys of their satisfaction with workshop? What did they like? What didn't they like? What would they like to see more of?	Increased communication and understanding among Beech educators and Beech parents	\$22,000 (contracted services, books, supplies, stipends)
Six supplemental certified instructors to support the academy redesign	Part-time salaries, benefits	August 2014- June 2015	Principal, Ex Dir – Innovation Zone, Classroom teachers	Increase one-on-one tutoring	Are students receiving services making academic improvements?	\$107,840
Community building branding and incentives for the academies	Supplies, equipment	August 2014- June 2015	Principal, Ex Dir – Innovation Zone, Classroom teachers	Log sheets with the supplies and equipment purchased	Increase in school spirit, increase in positive behaviors to building support and enthusiasm	\$14,500 (supplies, equipment)
To extend parent nights to the school day to include more scheduled meetings with parents	Substitutes	September 2014- June 2015	Principal, Ex Dir – Innovation Zone, Classroom teachers	Log sheets with the names and times of scheduled meeting times with parents	Improved parental understanding of the school mission in general and for their children	\$4,000 (substitutes)

Schools to Be Served

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

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

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY ONLY)			
						turnaround	restart	closure	transformation
Beech	330459000241								✓
Wilson	330459000263								✓

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

Descriptive Information

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or **each priority school**, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.

INTRODUCTION

The Manchester School District (MSD) is New Hampshire's largest and most racially diverse (64.8% white, non-Hispanic) school district. The most recent data on English Learners (ELs) on the NH Department of Education website (2013-14 Title III allocations) shows that Manchester has 1,966 or 41.9% of the state's 4,690 ELs. Manchester also has one of the highest free and reduced lunch eligibility rates (51%) in the state. **Beech has the highest free and reduced lunch eligibility rate in the MSD with 89.6%** and with the exception of a one-student charter school and the eight-student North Country Class, Beech has **the highest free and reduced lunch eligibility rate of any school in New Hampshire**. Beech offers full-day Kindergarten. Kindergarten data is not part of the NH DoE's published (official October 1, 2013) free and reduced lunch rate. Beech has large numbers of ELs with 205 (34.2%) students eligible for EL services. Furthermore, the New Hampshire Department of Education has identified Beech as a Priority School.

BEECH ELEMENTARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Members of the Beech Elementary School Improvement Committee conducted a needs analysis of Beech Elementary. Team members looked at the school's data — academic, discipline, truancy, student attendance, teacher attendance, and overall school climate. They shared ideas as to why there are performance issues at Beech.

Beech has a very large English Learner population, on any given day between one third and one half of the students. Beech students come from 19 countries and speak 23 languages. The population is transient. From the period beginning in June 2013 through October 15, 2013, 153 Beech students have left, and 261 are new registrations or transfers, which was 64% of our population; 96% of our students receive free and reduced lunch; 33% are ELs; 9% are homeless; 13% are Special Education Students. Beech is a school wide Title I school. More than 200 students attend the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Afterschool Program; another 80 Beech students attend the YMCA afterschool program.

Ethnicity: 14 Native Americans; 221 Hispanic; 50 Asian; 125 Black; 194 White.

Beech students come from Albania, all parts of Africa, Bhutan, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Guatemala Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Jordan, Nepal, Pakistan, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Russia, Vietnam, and the United States of America.

Beech students speak the following languages: Albanian, Arabic, Bantu, Bosnian, Croatian, Dinka, English, French, Krio, Lao, MaayMaay, Nepali, Portuguese, Russian, Rwanda, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Turkish, Ukranian, Urdu, Vietnamese, and Yoruba.

100% of BEECH CHILDREN HAVE POTENTIAL TO SUCCEED.

The Beech school building is bursting at the seams. In fact, the children's playground is populated with four portable classrooms. The children cross a very busy Beech Street when they go out for recess. When coupled with the very tight living quarters, which is home for many Beech children, it is no surprise that behavioral issues are on the rise.

Beech is a large school with many students. Enrollment is 599, which includes full-day Kindergarten. Almost half of the students are English language learners. The official (NH DoE, March 7, 2014) free and reduced lunch rate is 90%. Almost half of the students are English learners. The neighborhoods of Beech students are densely packed. Many Beech families move often. Very little is stable in the life of many Beech students. For these reasons, many committee members expressed the need to create smaller learning communities. By doing so, they feel they will be better positioned to build trust with parents, and build trust among educators at the school and provide their students with some stability. Over the past year, the Beech School Improvement Team have been researching "90/90/90 schools," which originally were schools that had at least 90% of students who were impoverished, at least 90% of students belonged to minority groups, and at least 90% of students met the state academic standards in reading or another area. However, 90/90/90 schools now describe thriving academic performance in schools with high percentages of free and reduced-price lunch participation and

minority students.

As Beech School Improvement teams have done many times before, members of the Beech School Improvement Committee reviewed data — academic, discipline, truancy, student attendance, teacher attendance, and overall school climate, and shared ideas for why there were performance issues. Over the years, Beech has implemented many reform efforts with little success, as too many Beech students continue to struggle academically. Committee members are excited about the opportunity that this School Improvement Grant offers and want to use it to make real and lasting reform that will truly transform the lives of Beech students and their families.

BEECH ELEMENTARY PLAN AND ACTIVITIES

The Beech Committee would like to transform Beech from one very large school to five smaller academies where parents, teachers, and students get to build and strengthen relationship over time. Each academy would have a K-2 pod and a 3-5 pod. Each academy will include a special education teacher, an EL teacher, a certified instructor, and a paraprofessional. The rationale for the academy approach is to provide a more stable environment for parents and students, and a safe environment that will not only improve school climate but will provide the foundation necessary for academic growth. As they progress through Beech, students will remain in the same academy. They will know who their teachers are going to be. They will get to build relationships with fellow students in their academy. Families will attend the same academy. Parents will get to know the staff in their children's academy. We expect this decentralized approach will help to improve communication and provide other benefits.

As this would be a radical transformation of the school, the Beech team requests funding to use the first year of the SIG to review models and implementations of smaller learning community transformations in other elementary schools across the country while participating in teambuilding professional development opportunities necessary to implement the academy model. The committee members will visit implementations of the academy model and share findings of successes and failures in overcoming challenges with their peers. The goal would be to study successful transformations in similar environments to gain a solid understand of what such a transformation would mean to the Beech community and determine whether there is broad support for this reform effort. If it is determined that this plan is plausible at Beech, academies, pods, teacher and student distributions will be determined.

This innovative plan includes all Seven Turnaround Principles:

1. Supports strong leadership by providing the principal with the operational flexibility to make this change happen.
2. Improves instruction, by building trust within the faculty and among parents, while trying to reduce the educator-to-student ratio. There will be more understanding between the school and the students, and the school and the parents better. Relationships will grow and be strengthened over time. The same special education and the same English Learner teacher belong the same academy. Families will be assigned to the same academies. Families, teachers, and other staff members in the academy will build relationships over time. These

relationships will support improved and efficient communication. Stability is another benefit of this model. There is very little stability in many Beech students' lives.

3. Redesigns the school infrastructure around teacher collaboration. To be successful, teachers, families, and the community must work together to make this change happen. By involving stakeholder representatives in the design of this proposed change, we expect to build and strengthen community relationships as the design is developed and implemented. All stakeholders are invested in its success.
4. Strengthens the school instructional program by aligning instruction to student needs. Educators, students, and their families in the academies will get to know one another and understand their instructional and learning styles over time, which will create an environment where academic growth flourishes.
5. Uses data to inform instruction. Beech students will take the NWEA assessments thrice yearly. Beech educators will work together to analyze results, which will inform instruction.
6. Supports an environment that improves school community (safety) and build relationships. By having mixed grade levels at lunch and recess, we expect to decrease behavioral incidents, which improves overall school community.
7. Provides ongoing mechanism for family and community engagement by providing more communication with parents and more opportunities for parents to interact with school educators and other staff members. Families will become familiar with their children's academy staff members.

(2) The Manchester School District has taken, or will:

- Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected; LEA's will complete the capacity rubric found in LEA appendix D – located on page LEA 35. **Beech School Improvement Committee completed this task.**
- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model; After selecting one of the four intervention models the LEA will use their self-assessment tool to set goals and objectives which would be found in the action plan located on LEA 20. **Manchester School District will be consistent with the transformation model.**
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality; The LEA will follow guidelines outlined in Toolkit on External Provider by the SEA as found in the LEA Application Technical Assistance Workshop – October 31, 2013.
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; The LEA will sign assurances that speak to operational flexibility. This assurance will be found in Section D – LEA 25.
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. The LEA will align other resources with the interventions this includes other local, state or federal funds including 1003(a). Title I, Part A; Title II; Title III and IDEA funds. Modify practices to more fully and effectively implement interventions by

revisiting union and board agreements, hiring and staffing practices and flexibility in budgeting, time/schedules, and curriculum. Building staff capacity, repurposing staff and resource allocation will also be monitored.

- (3) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II School, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.

Beech Timeline to Implement Requested Transformation Activities

Date	Task
July 2014	<p>Notification of Beech School Improvement Grant Award</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicate award to all Beech stakeholders (school web page on district’s web site and letter to parents; contact District community relations coordinator to notify the press) ▪ Invite all stakeholders (students, parents, staff, district administrators, and other community) to a pre-implementation celebration ▪ Identify implementation subcommittees
July-August 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Celebrate SIG award with Beech community. Explain what it means for Beech students, parents, teachers, and the greater community. ▪ Recruit stakeholders (teachers, parents, community members, district administrators, school board) to make one-year commitments (renewable) to a quarterly advisory board to guide this project implementation. ▪ Identify vendors for team building professional development and formalize contracts with them ▪ Identify schools that have successfully implemented an academy model. ▪ Order equipment ▪ Adopt monitoring procedures for transformation strategies (establish common feedback tools (Indistar, collaborative web spaces, etc.) ▪ Recruit, interview, and hire supplemental certified instructors to support the academy implementation. ▪ Recruit and interview stakeholders (parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, potential funders) to participate in team building PD necessary for the academy model ▪ Recruit and interview stakeholders (parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, potential funders) of the Beech community to visit schools that have successfully implemented an academy model ▪ Work with stakeholders to create schedules for this year’s professional development ▪ Submit purchase orders for supplies, equipment
September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The District’s Educator Evaluation System will be introduced to Beech educators and will be implemented ▪ Establish regular two-way communication about SIG project activities with staff, administration, parents, and other stakeholders and community members ▪ Meet with all stakeholders to update them on academy plan. Request input. ▪ Publish dates of supplemental in-school parent conference visits ▪ Identify stakeholders for collecting participant feedback, evaluation of professional development team building activities ▪ Publish a monthly communiqué on school’s webpage of district website and in letter to parents.
September 2014– May 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue monthly communication with stakeholders and community ▪ Continue calendar of professional development team building activities. ▪ Establish times to meet and review reports from stakeholder teams that made school visits ▪ Consider strategies to avoid mistakes made by schools that have implemented the academy model

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publish reports of visits, professional development, and recommendations with the Beech stakeholder community and request input ▪ Select contracted service to do community surveys ▪ Conduct quarterly evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Track attendance on field trip and supplemental snack days ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required (SIG coordinator) ▪ Take time out to recognize and celebrate success with all stakeholders!
May 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit annual progress report to NH DoE of Ed (SIG coordinator)
June 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare progress reports for school and community ▪ Conduct analysis of feedback and evidence of impact; revise project plans accordingly ▪ Prepare for implementing the academy model in September 2015 ▪ Initiate discussions of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers, and potential funders
YEAR 2	
July / August 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SIG coordinator, school leadership team reviews participant feedback, progress, outcomes achieved for the first year ▪ Engage educators and parents in planned summer professional development activities (team building) ▪ Update project plans, analyze Year 1 feedback, revise outcomes, objectives and activities coming year
September 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School leadership team will work with stakeholders to update schedules for this year's professional development and family/community engagement activities. ▪ Communicate 2015-16 SIG plans with all stakeholders
September 2015 – May 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement the academy model ▪ Continue monthly communication with stakeholders and community. This is especially important for this implementation year ▪ Continue calendar of professional development team building activities. ▪ Continue to meet and review reports from stakeholder teams that made school visits ▪ Work closely with SIG coordinator to monitor academy implementation ▪ Publish reports of visits, professional development, and recommendations with the Beech stakeholder community and request input ▪ Select contracted service to do community surveys ▪ Conduct quarterly evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Track attendance on field trip and supplemental snack days ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required (SIG coordinator) ▪ Take time out to recognize and celebrate success with all stakeholders!
May 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit annual progress report to NH DOE of Ed (SIG coordinator) ▪
June 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare progress reports for school and community ▪ Conduct analysis of feedback and evidence of impact; revise implementation plans accordingly ▪ Continue discussions of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers, and potential funders
YEAR 3	
July / August 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SIG coordinator, school leadership team reviews participant feedback, progress, outcomes achieved for the second year ▪ Update project plans, analyze Year 2 feedback (but first year of academy implementation), revise outcomes, objectives and activities ▪ Review findings of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers, and potential funders
September 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School leadership team will work with stakeholders to update schedules for this year's professional development and school visits.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicate year's plans with all stakeholders
September 2016– May 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue monthly communication with stakeholders and community ▪ Continue team building professional development activities, making adjustments from feedback (these are winding down) ▪ Continue with implementation of District's Educator Evaluation System ▪ Continue to work with contracted service to survey Beech community ▪ Beech will continue to extend parent visits to the school day ▪ Continue regular collection of evidence of impact of professional development and the academy model implementation ▪ Conduct quarterly evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required (SIG coordinator) ▪ Continue periodic evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders and community organizations to support maintaining these activities ▪ Take time out to recognize and celebrate success with all stakeholders!
May 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit final progress report to NH DoE (SIG coordinator) ▪ Continue discussions of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers, and potential funders
June 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare final report for school and community ▪ Conduct analysis of feedback and evidence of impact; revise project plans accordingly ▪ Publish findings of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers and potential funders

- (4) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
- Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; The LEA will submit annual updated action plans based also on their collection and analysis of beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of the year data.
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements. **The Manchester School District will submit the leading indicators through the INDISTAR system.**
- (5) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
N/A
- (6) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
N/A
- (7) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools or in its priority schools, as applicable. The LEA will sign an assurance that consultation with relevant stakeholders takes place. LEA's will complete the chart on LEA 16 – listing members of the Improvement Committee Page. The LEA will also keep notes including dates of relevant stakeholders meetings. These will be viewed annually by the NHDOE monitoring staff.

A Beech parent representative who does not work at Beech was invited to the May 13th meeting. However, she did not attend. The Beech social worker has been sharing information with parent representatives and the SIG team. In addition, Beech teacher representatives, the recently hired (January 2014) Beech principal, the Beech social worker, Beech Title I representatives, and administrators from the Manchester School District met on May 8, May 14, 2014 and on May 20

to discuss this School Improvement Grant. The Beech parent participated in the May 20 meeting. Information was also shared via Internet. Telephone and email conversations continued throughout the process of developing this application. Information was also shared through email or by printing documents and making them available to all Beech School Improvement Committee representatives.

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

Budget

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

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

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

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

Page LEA-23 requires an outline of expenses over the next three school years. These budgets are to be completed for each school and the total of all should equal the LEA budget. LEA-24 requires a detailed school budget for the first year. If your LEA is awarded funding, a progress report that is reviewed through the steps in the action plan will need to be submitted each year. As part of the first progress report (due May 31, 2015), the LEA will be required to answer questions regarding the first year of implementation, update the three year budget overview if needed and provide a detailed budget narrative for year two. The progress report and included budgets will have to be approved by the NHDOE in order to maintain grant participation and implement the plan in the LEA for year two. The same process will occur at the end of year two to process approval for implementation in year three.

Using the example below, please complete the LEA Overview Budget grid below, providing the LEA and school level budget information.

Example:

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

Complete the Overview Budget grid below, providing LEA and school level budget information:

Manchester School District
\$1,203,561.87
Budget

School Name	Year I Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Beech Elementary		288,587.68	\$193,906.02	\$174,488.02	656,981.72
LEA-level Activities					
Total Budget					656,981.72

Beech Three-Year School Budget Plan

Account Category	Year 1 Pre-Implementation Budget Description	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.</i>	100 stipend hours	1,000 stipend hours to support teachers beyond the contract @\$25/hr in PD and teambuilding, parent workshops	800 stipend hours to support teachers beyond the contract @\$25/hr in PD and teambuilding, parent workshops	800 stipend hours to support teachers beyond the contract @\$25/hr in PD and teambuilding, parent workshops	30,827.50	24,662.00	24,662.00
		six Cis to supplement the academies (34 weeks * 29 hours * \$16/hr * 6 Cis) + FICA + WC	six Cis to supplement the academies (34 weeks * 29 hours * \$16/hr * 6 Cis) + FICA + WC	six Cis to supplement the academies (34 weeks * 29 hours * \$16/hr * 6 Cis) + FICA + WC	103,317.02	103,317.02	103,317.02
		180 substitute days to cover classrooms while teachers are doing PD and meeting with parents@70/day + FICA + WC	180 substitute days to cover classrooms while teachers are doing PD and meeting with parents@70/day + FICA + WC	180 substitute days to cover classrooms while teachers are doing PD and meeting with parents@70/day + FICA + WC	13,752.90	13,752.90	13,752.90

Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (LEA Appendix E) must be completed</i>	Determine vendors for team building PD	Team building PD to support the academy model	Team building PD to support the academy model	Team building PD to support the academy model	36,000.00	18,000.00	8,000.00
		Consultants to assist Beech educators in strengthening relationships with parents and other stakeholders	Consultants to assist Beech educators in strengthening relationships with parents and other stakeholders	Consultants to assist Beech educators in strengthening relationships with parents and other stakeholders	3,500.00	3,500.00	3,500.00
		Contracted service to do community surveys	Contracted service to do community surveys	Contracted service to do community surveys	1,500.00	1,500.00	1,500.00
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>							
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Pre-reading books as takeaways for parents and preschoolers who attend family engagement events	Pre-reading books as takeaways for parents and preschoolers who attend family engagement events	Pre-reading books as takeaways for parents and preschoolers who attend family engagement events	Pre-reading books as takeaways for parents and preschoolers who attend family engagement events	10,000.00	7,000.00	5,000.00
Supplies	Community building branding and	Community building branding and incentives for the	Community building branding and	Community building branding and	10,000.00	7,000.00	4,000.00

	incentives for the academies - 1,000 @ \$10	academies - 1,000 @ \$10	incentives for the academies -1,000 @ \$8	incentives for the academies -1,000 @ \$4			
	Supplies, books, and other incentives to support parent workshops and meetings	Supplies, books, and other incentives to support parent workshops and meetings	Supplies, books, and other incentives to support parent workshops and meetings	Supplies, books, and other incentives to support parent workshops and meetings	10,000.00	7,000.00	5,000.00
Equipment <i>Each item must be listed separately along with a justification of why you need it to support your plan. An Equipment Justification Form (LEA Appendix F) must be completed.</i>		2 carts with 30 iPads on each @21,989 for students to become more adept using digital devices to access information, including	N/A	N/A	43,978.00	0.00	0.00
		42" digital signage software and player to communicate to community about the academies' accomplishments , homework assignments, school events, etc. (3 @ \$1,500)	N/A	N/A	4,500.00	0	0
		Presentation stations 5 @ \$600	N/A	N/A	3,000.00	0	0
Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services</i>		Vendor contracted services for team building, travel to visit academy schools, stipends, and substitutes already entered	Vendor contracted services for team building, travel to visit academy schools,	Vendor contracted services for team building, travel to visit academy schools,	0	0	0

<i>Justification Form LEA (Appendix E) must be completed</i>		are the Beech PD activities	stipends, and substitutes already entered are the Beech PD activities	stipends, and substitutes already entered are the Beech PD activities			
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>		Team (admin, teacher, parents) visits to K-5 schools that have adopted the academy model	Team (admin, teacher, parents) visits to K-5 schools that have adopted the academy model	Team (admin, teacher, parents) visits to K-5 schools that have adopted the academy model	12,000.00	4,000.00	2,000.00
Administration					0	0	0
Indirect Costs		@ 2.2%	@ 2.2%	@ 2.2%	6,212.26	\$4,174.10	\$3,756.10
Total					288,587.68	\$193,906.02	\$174,488.02

Beech One-Year Detailed School Budget Narrative 2014-2015

Use this form to provide sufficient detail regarding proposed expenditure for the 2014-2015 project period, including pre-implementation expenses. Complete all appropriate justification forms (Appendix E and F, pages LEA 42-43). These must be linked to the action plan created for school improvement.

School Name: Beech Elementary School

Account Category	Budget Detail		
	Narrative	Pre-Implementation Costs	Total Costs
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.</i>	Six Cis to supplement the academies (34 weeks * 29 hours * \$16/hr * 6 Cis) + FICA and WC		103,317.02
	1,000 stipend hours to support teachers beyond the contract @\$25/hr in PD and teambuilding, parent workshops	3,082.75	30,827.50
	180 substitute days to cover classrooms while teachers are doing PD and meeting with parents@70/day		13,752.90
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (LEA Appendix E) must be completed</i>	Team building PD (we'll determine vendor(s) in June and July		36,000.00
	Consultants to assist Beech educators in strengthening relationships with parents and other stakeholders		3,500.00
	Contracted service to do community surveys		1,500.00
Books	Take-aways (pre-reading books) for parents and their preschoolers who attend family engagement events	1,000.00	10,000.00

Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Community building branding and incentives for the academies -1,000 @ \$10	1,000.00	10,000.00
	Supplies, books, and other incentives to support parent workshops and meetings	0	10,000.00
Equipment <i>Each item must be listed separately along with a justification of why you need it to support your plan. An Equipment Justification Form (LEA Appendix F) must be completed.</i>	2 carts with 30 iPads on each @21,989 for students to become more adept using digital devices to access information, including e-books	43,978.00	43,978.00
	42" digital signage software and player to communicate to community about the academies' accomplishments, homework assignments, school events, etc. (3 @ \$1,500)	4,500.00	4,500.00
	Presentation stations 5 @ \$600	3,000.00	3,000.00
Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form LEA (Appendix E) must be completed</i>	Vendor contracted services for team building, travel to visit academy schools, stipends, and substitutes already entered are the Beech PD activities	0	0
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>	Team (admin, teacher, parents) visits to K-5 schools that have adopted the academy model		12,000.00
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>			
Indirect Costs	@2.2%		6,212.26
Total			288,587.68

Assurances

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

ASSURANCES:

By signing below, the Local Educational Agency (LEA), **Manchester School District**, is agreeing to the following Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) assurances with the New Hampshire Department of Education (NH DOE) and the United States Department of Education (US ED):

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each priority school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements (US ED requirement);
- The program and services provided with Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will be operated so as not to discriminate on the basis of age, gender, race, national origin, ancestry, religion, pregnancy, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, handicapping conditions, or physical, mental, emotional, or learning disabilities (NHDOE requirement);
- Administration of the program, activities, and services covered within the attached application(s) will be in accordance with all applicable federal, state, regulations (NHDOE requirement);
- Design and implementation of the interventions will be consistent with the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant final requirements (NHDOE requirement);
- The funds received under this grant will be used to address the goals set forth in the attached application (NHDOE requirement);
- Fiscally related information will be provided with the timeliness established for the program(s) (NHDOE requirement);
- The specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements will be reported for all schools within the LEA that are participating in the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant through quarterly meetings, evaluations, progress reports, or on-site visitations, including the following data (US ED requirement):
 - **Number of minutes within the school year that all students were required to be at school and any additional learning time (e.g. before or after school, weekend school, summer school) for which all students had the opportunity to participate.**
 - **Does the school provide any of the following in order to offer increased learning time:**
 - longer school day
 - before or after school
 - summer school
 - weekend school
 - Other
 - **The number of school days during the school year (plus summer, if applicable, if part of implementing the restart, transformation or turnaround model) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students could have attended school during the regular school year;**
 - **The number of students who completed advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics);**
 - **The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;**
 - **The number of students who complete advance coursework AND complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;**
 - **The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days;**

- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
 - Dropout rate;
 - Student attendance rate;
 - Discipline incidents;
 - Truants;
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system (when available); and
 - Teacher attendance rate.
- All schools within the LEA that are participating in the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will submit to the NH DOE a written Annual Progress Report/Evaluation Report which documents activities and address both the implementation of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant plan and student achievement results (NHDOE requirement);
 - Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will be used to supplement, not supplant Federal, state, and local funds that a school would otherwise receive (NHDOE requirement);
 - The LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement 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 priority school that our LEA serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its priority schools that receive school improvement funds (US ED requirement);
 - If the LEA implements a restart model in a priority school, the LEA will 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 (US ED requirement);
 - Assign a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Coordinator that will participate in regular NH DOE Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant meetings and have a LEA Improvement Planning/Implementation Committee that meets regularly (NHDOE requirement);
 - Recruitment, screening, and selection of external providers, if applicable, will be conducted in a manner that ensures a high level of quality of service (NHDOE requirement);
 - Additional resources will be aligned with the interventions (NHDOE requirement);
 - LEA's practices or policies will be modified, if necessary, to enable the LEA to implement the interventions fully and effectively (NHDOE requirement); and
 - The reforms will be sustained after the funding period ends (NHDOE requirement).



 Superintendent's signature


 School Board Chair

5/28/14

 Date signed
 5/29/14

 Date signed

Manchester School District Educator Evaluation System

MSD Design Team - Guiding Principles

The original MSD Design Team identified five Guiding Principles for the development of the Educator Evaluation Plan.

The process with which the Manchester School District evaluates educator effectiveness...

- Must be focused on student growth and the collection, analysis, and response to evidence of student growth
- Must maintain high expectations of all educators
- Must blend self-reflective and collaborative processes
- Must be equitable and fair to all educators
- Must recognize distinguished teaching, provide support for basic and proficient teaching, and provide remedies for unsatisfactory teaching

“educator evaluation has sometimes been a meaningless exercise, endured by both educators and administrators. As the education reform movement focuses on educator quality, however, schools and districts have discovered that they can shape an evaluation system so that it contributes substantially to the quality of teaching. Evaluation systems should merge the requirements of quality assurance and professional development. Good systems differentiate evaluation for educators at different career stages...”

-- Charlotte Danielson

“Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world.” Nelson Mandela.

MSD Appendix C: Beech Baseline School Data Profile

School: Beech Elementary	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Number of minutes within the school year that all students were required to be at school and any additional learning time (e.g. before or after school, weekend school, summer school) for which all students had the opportunity to participate	(Number of minutes in a day — 8:35-2:30) 355 minutes * 180 (days) = 63,900 minutes	(Number of minutes in a day — 8:20-2:50) 390 minutes * 169 (days) = 65,910 minutes	
Does the school provide any of the following in order to offer increased learning time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> longer school day before or after school summer school weekend school Other	No	Yes	No
The number of school days during the school year (plus summer, if applicable, if part of implementing the restart, transformation or turnaround model) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students could have attended school during the regular school year	180/180	169/169	SIG coordinator will update
Student dropout rate (annual/four-year cumulative)	<i>Official data not yet available</i>	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
Student attendance rate	94.3%	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
The number of students who completed advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics)	489	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution	489	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
The number of students who complete advance coursework AND complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution	N/A	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
Number of discipline incidents	10	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
Number of truant students (Truancy as defined by 10 or more half days of unexcused absences Enrollment: October 1, 2012)	133 of 571 enrolled = 23.29%	SIG coordinator will update	SIG coordinator will update
The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days	<i>MSD database cannot provide historical data.</i>	SIG coordinator will send request to Payroll (B. Baril) after school year is complete and	SIG coordinator will request to Payroll (B. Baril) after school year is complete and

School: Beech Elementary	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
		before June 30.	before June 30.
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup	See Beech NECAP data on pages that follow this table		
Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system	N/A	N/A	First year of implementation
Teacher attendance rate	answer coming from Joey		



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 3 NECAP Tests Grade 3 Students in 2013-2014 Disaggregated Reading Results

School: Beech Street School
District: Manchester
State: New Hampshire
Code: 037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School													District						State						
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	
All Students	93	5	0	88	1	1	32	36	20	23	35	40	334	1,087	8	48	23	21	341	13,390	21	56	14	9	348	
Gender																										
Male	44	3	0	41	0	0	16	39	12	29	13	32	336	556	7	47	24	22	341	6,898	18	56	15	11	347	
Female	49	2	0	47	1	2	16	34	8	17	22	47	333	531	9	49	22	19	342	6,492	24	55	13	7	350	
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0						
Race/Ethnicity																										
Hispanic or Latino	39	1	0	38	0	0	10	26	8	21	20	53	331	227	2	38	26	34	336	742	8	52	21	20	342	
Not Hispanic or Latino																										
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										3						52	12	52	21	15	344	
Asian	2	0	0	2										48	8	56	21	15	344	446	26	55	13	7	351	
Black or African American	17	1	0	16	0	0	5	31	3	19	8	50	334	93	4	40	26	30	338	248	8	47	25	20	342	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0	0	1										1						8						
White	29	3	0	26	1	4	14	54	7	27	4	15	340	660	10	52	23	15	343	11,558	22	56	14	8	349	
Two or more races	5	0	0	5										55	16	49	20	15	344	336	22	57	12	9	349	
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0						
LEP Status																										
Current LEP student	45	5	0	40	0	0	7	18	11	28	22	55	330	199	2	36	26	37	335	536	4	46	25	25	339	
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	1	0	0	1										6						32	28	72	0	0	356	
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	0	0	0	0										0						3						
All Other Students	47	0	0	47	1	2	24	51	9	19	13	28	338	882	10	50	23	17	343	12,819	21	56	14	8	349	
IEP																										
Students with an IEP	15	0	0	15	0	0	5	33	2	13	8	53	329	149	1	22	23	53	330	1,756	3	33	28	36	335	
All Other Students	78	5	0	73	1	1	27	37	18	25	27	37	336	938	9	52	23	15	343	11,634	23	59	12	5	350	
SES																										
Economically Disadvantaged Students	78	0	0	78	1	1	28	36	19	24	30	38	335	592	4	41	27	28	338	3,896	10	50	21	18	343	
All Other Students	15	5	0	10	0	0	4	40	1	10	5	50	334	495	13	56	19	12	345	9,494	25	58	12	5	350	
Migrant																										
Migrant Students	1	0	0	1										4						4						
All Other Students	92	5	0	87	1	1	32	37	20	23	34	39	335	1,083	8	48	23	20	341	13,386	21	56	14	9	348	
Title I																										
Students Receiving Title I Services	87	2	0	85	1	1	32	38	20	24	32	38	335	592	5	43	26	26	339	3,336	10	50	23	17	343	
All Other Students	6	3	0	3										495	12	54	20	15	344	10,054	24	58	12	6	350	

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 3 NECAP Tests Grade 3 Students in 2013-2014 Disaggregated Mathematics Results

School: Beech Street School
District: Manchester
State: New Hampshire
Code: 037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School													District					State						
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N
All Students	93	0	0	93	7	8	11	12	24	26	51	55	331	1,097	10	38	25	27	339	13,418	24	46	18	12	345
Gender																									
Male	44	0	0	44	4	9	7	16	13	30	20	45	333	561	11	39	24	27	339	6,914	25	46	17	12	346
Female	49	0	0	49	3	6	4	8	11	22	31	63	329	536	10	37	25	28	338	6,504	23	46	18	13	345
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
Race/Ethnicity																									
Hispanic or Latino	39	0	0	39	1	3	4	10	8	21	26	67	329	229	4	27	28	41	335	754	11	37	25	27	339
Not Hispanic or Latino																									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										3						52	8	48	27	17	340
Asian	2	0	0	2										51	10	33	31	25	338	459	39	36	14	10	348
Black or African American	17	0	0	17	1	6	3	18	3	18	10	59	328	94	2	35	26	37	334	251	8	37	27	29	338
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0	0	1										1						8					
White	29	0	0	29	2	7	4	14	11	38	12	41	333	664	13	43	23	22	341	11,559	25	47	17	11	346
Two or more races	5	0	0	5										55	25	27	20	27	341	335	25	41	19	14	345
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
LEP Status																									
Current LEP student	45	0	0	45	0	0	3	7	12	27	30	67	327	210	2	23	30	45	333	576	7	33	26	34	337
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	1	0	0	1										6						32	47	53	0	0	352
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	0	0	0	0										0						3					
All Other Students	47	0	0	47	6	13	8	17	12	26	21	45	334	881	12	41	23	23	340	12,807	25	46	17	11	346
IEP																									
Students with an IEP	15	0	0	15	1	7	0	0	6	40	8	53	329	149	3	19	28	50	331	1,753	6	30	27	37	336
All Other Students	78	0	0	78	6	8	11	14	18	23	43	55	331	948	12	41	24	24	340	11,665	27	48	16	8	347
SES																									
Economically Disadvantaged Students	78	0	0	78	6	8	9	12	22	28	41	53	331	593	6	31	27	35	336	3,890	12	41	24	22	340
All Other Students	15	0	0	15	1	7	2	13	2	13	10	67	328	504	16	45	21	18	342	9,528	29	48	15	8	347
Migrant																									
Migrant Students	1	0	0	1										4						4					
All Other Students	92	0	0	92	7	8	11	12	24	26	50	54	331	1,093	11	38	25	27	339	13,414	24	46	18	12	345
Title I																									
Students Receiving Title I Services	87	0	0	87	7	8	11	13	24	28	45	52	332	596	6	33	28	33	337	3,031	13	39	26	23	340
All Other Students	6	0	0	6										501	15	43	21	21	341	10,387	28	48	15	9	347

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 4 NECAP Tests

Grade 4 Students in 2013-2014

Disaggregated Reading Results

School: Beech Street School
District: Manchester
State: New Hampshire
Code: 037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School													District						State					
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N
All Students	102	4	0	98	4	4	31	32	30	31	33	34	435	1,057	12	44	25	20	441	13,775	23	52	17	9	447
Gender																									
Male	43	3	0	40	1	3	10	25	13	33	16	40	432	518	10	40	28	23	439	6,925	19	52	19	11	445
Female	59	1	0	58	3	5	21	36	17	29	17	29	437	539	14	47	23	17	443	6,850	27	52	14	7	449
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
Race/Ethnicity																									
Hispanic or Latino	37	2	0	35	0	0	10	29	12	34	13	37	433	201	3	35	30	31	435	708	9	47	26	17	441
Not Hispanic or Latino																									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										1						46	15	46	24	15	442
Asian	7	2	0	5										56	13	41	32	14	441	439	35	45	13	7	450
Black or African American	18	0	0	18	2	11	5	28	7	39	4	22	439	71	6	44	30	21	438	241	12	50	23	15	442
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0										0						14	43	50	7	0	454
White	36	0	0	36	1	3	13	36	10	28	12	33	436	692	15	46	22	17	443	12,048	24	53	16	8	447
Two or more races	4	0	0	4										36	6	47	28	19	440	279	20	50	18	12	445
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
LEP Status																									
Current LEP student	28	4	0	24	0	0	2	8	11	46	11	46	429	85	1	11	39	49	429	236	4	22	34	39	433
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	16	0	0	16	2	13	8	50	5	31	1	6	443	86	7	43	42	8	441	237	9	52	32	7	443
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	3	0	0	3										11	18	64	9	9	445	36	31	53	14	3	450
All Other Students	55	0	0	55	0	0	20	36	14	25	21	38	434	875	13	47	22	18	442	13,266	24	52	16	8	447
IEP																									
Students with an IEP	20	0	0	20	0	0	3	15	3	15	14	70	425	156	1	12	24	62	427	1,877	4	28	32	36	435
All Other Students	82	4	0	78	4	5	28	36	27	35	19	24	438	901	13	49	25	12	443	11,898	26	56	14	4	449
SES																									
Economically Disadvantaged Students	88	0	0	88	3	3	29	33	26	30	30	34	435	542	5	36	32	26	437	3,874	12	47	25	17	442
All Other Students	14	4	0	10	1	10	2	20	4	40	3	30	436	515	18	51	18	13	445	9,901	27	54	13	5	449
Migrant																									
Migrant Students	1	0	0	1										4						4					
All Other Students	101	4	0	97	4	4	31	32	30	31	32	33	435	1,053	12	44	25	19	441	13,771	23	52	17	9	447
Title I																									
Students Receiving Title I Services	89	1	0	88	3	3	29	33	26	30	30	34	435	524	6	39	31	23	438	3,084	12	47	26	16	442
All Other Students	13	3	0	10	1	10	2	20	4	40	3	30	436	533	17	48	19	16	444	10,691	26	53	14	7	448

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 4 NECAP Tests Grade 4 Students in 2013-2014 Disaggregated Mathematics Results

School:	Beech Street School
District:	Manchester
State:	New Hampshire
Code:	037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School													District					State						
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N
All Students	102	0	0	102	6	6	34	33	19	19	43	42	434	1,064	14	42	21	24	441	13,800	27	46	16	11	447
Gender																									
Male	43	0	0	43	2	5	14	33	6	14	21	49	435	522	13	40	23	24	440	6,935	27	45	16	11	447
Female	59	0	0	59	4	7	20	34	13	22	22	37	434	542	14	43	19	24	441	6,865	27	46	16	11	447
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
Race/Ethnicity																									
Hispanic or Latino	37	0	0	37	0	0	11	30	9	24	17	46	433	204	3	33	25	39	434	719	13	38	25	24	440
Not Hispanic or Latino																									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										1						46	15	48	20	17	443
Asian	7	0	0	7										59	14	42	22	22	441	452	43	38	10	10	451
Black or African American	18	0	0	18	2	11	5	28	1	6	10	56	433	71	7	38	20	35	436	245	9	43	22	27	439
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0										0						14	36	43	21	0	452
White	36	0	0	36	3	8	15	42	6	17	12	33	438	693	18	44	20	18	443	12,046	28	47	16	10	447
Two or more races	4	0	0	4										36	6	47	22	25	440	278	22	43	17	18	445
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
LEP Status																									
Current LEP student	28	0	0	28	0	0	5	18	6	21	17	61	427	93	1	20	26	53	429	267	5	26	25	44	433
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	16	0	0	16	2	13	7	44	4	25	3	19	441	86	5	50	26	20	439	237	10	46	27	16	442
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	3	0	0	3										10	40	50	0	10	449	35	43	46	9	3	451
All Other Students	55	0	0	55	2	4	21	38	9	16	23	42	435	875	15	43	20	21	442	13,261	28	46	16	10	447
IEP																									
Students with an IEP	20	0	0	20	1	5	3	15	2	10	14	70	428	155	4	18	19	59	429	1,872	6	29	26	39	435
All Other Students	82	0	0	82	5	6	31	38	17	21	29	35	436	909	15	46	21	18	443	11,928	30	48	15	7	449
SES																									
Economically Disadvantaged Students	88	0	0	88	5	6	31	35	17	19	35	40	435	543	7	38	24	31	437	3,872	12	43	24	20	441
All Other Students	14	0	0	14	1	7	3	21	2	14	8	57	430	521	21	45	18	17	444	9,928	33	47	13	8	449
Migrant																									
Migrant Students	1	0	0	1										4						4					
All Other Students	101	0	0	101	6	6	34	34	19	19	42	42	434	1,060	14	42	21	24	441	13,796	27	46	16	11	447
Title I																									
Students Receiving Title I Services	88	0	0	88	4	5	31	35	17	19	36	41	434	526	9	40	23	28	439	2,869	13	43	24	21	441
All Other Students	14	0	0	14	2	14	3	21	2	14	7	50	434	538	18	43	19	20	443	10,931	30	47	14	9	448

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 5 NECAP Tests

Grade 5 Students in 2013-2014

Disaggregated Reading Results

School: Beech Street School
District: Manchester
State: New Hampshire
Code: 037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School												District					State							
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N
All Students	91	2	1	88	2	2	30	34	29	33	27	31	535	971	9	51	26	14	542	13,765	20	59	17	5	548
Gender																									
Male	53	1	0	52	1	2	17	33	17	33	17	33	535	508	5	49	29	18	540	7,132	13	60	21	7	546
Female	38	1	1	36	1	3	13	36	12	33	10	28	536	463	13	54	22	10	545	6,633	27	58	12	3	551
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
Race/Ethnicity																									
Hispanic or Latino	30	0	0	30	0	0	11	37	11	37	8	27	536	168	3	48	29	20	539	639	8	54	27	11	543
Not Hispanic or Latino																									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										2						40	15	50	28	8	547
Asian	13	0	1	12	0	0	2	17	4	33	6	50	529	51	4	35	35	25	537	446	28	52	15	5	550
Black or African American	13	0	0	13	1	8	3	23	7	54	2	15	535	81	11	35	35	20	540	248	13	48	29	10	544
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0										2						10	10	50	30	10	543
White	29	2	0	27	1	4	13	48	5	19	8	30	538	613	11	56	23	11	544	12,118	20	60	16	5	549
Two or more races	6	0	0	6										54	6	56	30	9	544	264	19	54	21	6	547
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
LEP Status																									
Current LEP student	23	2	0	21	0	0	0	0	7	33	14	67	524	77	0	10	38	52	528	202	1	22	45	33	533
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	9	0	0	9										26	0	50	42	8	541	85	7	48	38	7	543
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	8	0	0	8										61	2	52	34	11	541	188	8	62	26	4	545
All Other Students	51	0	1	50	2	4	20	40	15	30	13	26	537	807	10	55	24	11	544	13,290	20	59	16	5	549
IEP																									
Students with an IEP	8	0	0	8										154	0	25	27	48	531	1,968	2	35	39	24	537
All Other Students	83	2	1	80	2	3	29	36	28	35	21	26	536	817	10	56	26	7	544	11,797	22	63	13	2	550
SES																									
Economically Disadvantaged Students	83	0	0	83	2	2	28	34	27	33	26	31	535	531	5	43	31	21	539	3,741	10	54	26	11	543
All Other Students	8	2	1	5										440	13	61	20	6	546	10,024	23	61	13	3	550
Migrant																									
Migrant Students	0	0	0	0										1						1					
All Other Students	91	2	1	88	2	2	30	34	29	33	27	31	535	970	9	51	26	14	542	13,764	20	59	17	5	548
Title I																									
Students Receiving Title I Services	86	2	0	84	2	2	28	33	28	33	26	31	535	504	5	48	27	20	540	2,839	10	54	26	10	544
All Other Students	5	0	1	4										467	13	55	25	8	545	10,926	22	60	14	4	549

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 5 NECAP Tests Grade 5 Students in 2013-2014 Disaggregated Mathematics Results

School: Beech Street School
District: Manchester
State: New Hampshire
Code: 037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School													District					State						
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N
All Students	91	0	0	91	1	1	24	26	16	18	50	55	533	979	9	41	22	28	540	13,783	21	52	15	12	546
Gender																									
Male	53	0	0	53	1	2	17	32	8	15	27	51	534	510	11	41	20	29	539	7,141	22	51	15	12	546
Female	38	0	0	38	0	0	7	18	8	21	23	61	532	469	7	42	23	27	540	6,642	21	53	15	11	546
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
Race/Ethnicity																									
Hispanic or Latino	30	0	0	30	0	0	9	30	7	23	14	47	534	168	5	33	26	36	536	645	9	43	23	25	540
Not Hispanic or Latino																									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										2						40	18	53	13	18	545
Asian	13	0	0	13	0	0	2	15	2	15	9	69	531	55	9	29	15	47	535	456	37	40	11	12	549
Black or African American	13	0	0	13	1	8	1	8	1	8	10	77	528	82	4	27	16	54	533	249	10	39	21	30	539
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0										2						10	10	40	20	30	539
White	29	0	0	29	0	0	11	38	6	21	12	41	536	616	11	47	22	20	542	12,118	21	53	15	10	546
Two or more races	6	0	0	6										54	6	41	24	30	539	265	17	52	15	15	544
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
LEP Status																									
Current LEP student	23	0	0	23	0	0	1	4	1	4	21	91	523	84	0	7	19	74	526	222	2	23	22	54	532
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	9	0	0	9										26	4	31	31	35	536	85	8	42	29	20	539
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	8	0	0	8										61	5	36	25	34	538	188	12	51	19	18	543
All Other Students	51	0	0	51	1	2	15	29	12	24	23	45	536	808	10	46	21	23	541	13,288	22	53	15	11	546
IEP																									
Students with an IEP	8	0	0	8										154	2	21	17	60	530	1,968	4	34	24	38	536
All Other Students	83	0	0	83	1	1	23	28	15	18	44	53	534	825	10	45	23	22	541	11,815	24	55	14	7	548
SES																									
Economically Disadvantaged Students	83	0	0	83	1	1	22	27	16	19	44	53	534	532	4	33	25	39	536	3,737	9	47	22	22	541
All Other Students	8	0	0	8										447	15	52	18	15	544	10,046	26	54	13	8	548
Migrant																									
Migrant Students	0	0	0	0										1						1					
All Other Students	91	0	0	91	1	1	24	26	16	18	50	55	533	978	9	41	22	28	540	13,782	21	52	15	12	546
Title I																									
Students Receiving Title I Services	85	0	0	85	1	1	22	26	16	19	46	54	533	505	7	34	25	35	537	2,687	11	45	22	22	541
All Other Students	6	0	0	6										474	12	50	18	20	542	11,096	24	54	14	9	547

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.



Fall 2013 - Beginning of Grade 5 NECAP Tests

Grade 5 Students in 2013-2014

Disaggregated Writing Results

School: Beech Street School
District: Manchester
State: New Hampshire
Code: 037-335-21600

REPORTING CATEGORIES	School												District					State							
	Enrolled	NT Approved	NT Other	Tested	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score	Tested	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean Scaled Score
	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N	N	%	%	%	%	N
All Students	91	2	1	88	0	0	18	20	36	41	34	39	529	971	8	34	37	21	537	13,751	16	46	28	10	542
Gender																									
Male	53	1	0	52	0	0	10	19	19	37	23	44	528	508	4	27	40	29	533	7,122	8	42	35	14	539
Female	38	1	1	36	0	0	8	22	17	47	11	31	531	463	13	41	33	13	540	6,629	23	51	20	6	546
Not Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
Race/Ethnicity																									
Hispanic or Latino	30	0	0	30	0	0	4	13	16	53	10	33	528	168	2	26	50	23	534	638	7	41	38	14	538
Not Hispanic or Latino																									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0										2						40	18	48	23	13	543
Asian	13	0	1	12	0	0	1	8	4	33	7	58	525	51	6	29	27	37	533	446	25	46	21	9	546
Black or African American	13	0	0	13	0	0	5	38	5	38	3	23	533	81	6	32	35	27	535	247	9	41	34	16	539
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0										2						10	10	50	30	10	538
White	29	2	0	27	0	0	7	26	9	33	11	41	530	613	11	36	34	19	538	12,105	16	47	28	10	542
Two or more races	6	0	0	6										54	7	39	35	19	537	265	14	44	29	13	541
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	0	0	0	0										0						0					
LEP Status																									
Current LEP student	23	2	0	21	0	0	1	5	5	24	15	71	521	77	0	8	36	56	524	200	1	20	38	42	529
Former LEP student - monitoring year 1	9	0	0	9										26	12	27	38	23	538	85	8	38	39	15	538
Former LEP student - monitoring year 2	8	0	0	8										61	2	31	51	16	536	188	6	49	37	8	540
All Other Students	51	0	1	50	0	0	11	22	23	46	16	32	530	807	10	37	35	18	538	13,278	16	47	28	10	542
IEP																									
Students with an IEP	8	0	0	8										154	0	12	31	58	525	1,964	1	18	42	39	530
All Other Students	83	2	1	80	0	0	18	23	34	43	28	35	530	817	10	38	38	14	539	11,787	18	51	26	6	544
SES																									
Economically Disadvantaged Students	83	0	0	83	0	0	18	22	33	40	32	39	529	531	2	29	40	29	533	3,733	7	38	36	18	537
All Other Students	8	2	1	5										440	15	40	33	13	541	10,018	19	49	25	7	544
Migrant																									
Migrant Students	0	0	0	0										1						1					
All Other Students	91	2	1	88	0	0	18	20	36	41	34	39	529	970	8	34	36	21	537	13,750	16	46	28	10	542
Title I																									
Students Receiving Title I Services	86	2	0	84	0	0	17	20	35	42	32	38	529	504	3	30	41	25	534	2,834	8	39	37	16	538
All Other Students	5	0	1	4										467	14	37	31	17	539	10,917	18	48	26	9	543

Level 4 = Proficient with Distinction; Level 3 = Proficient; Level 2 = Partially Proficient; Level 1 = Substantially Below Proficient

Note: Some numbers may have been left blank because fewer than ten (10) students were tested.

MSD Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric

Criteria	Poor	Satisfactory	Strong	LEA Self-Assessment
LEA governance and decision making methods	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for no district or school level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives, with decision power held by the local school board	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for district level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for district and school level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives, allowing for operational flexibility at the school level	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
Title I audit reports	Findings in areas requiring a repayment of funds	Findings in areas noted-repayment of funds not required	No findings in the fiscal area	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong
Approval of the district in need of improvement and/or school in need of improvement plans	Not approved by the SEA	Approved by the SEA with revisions	Approved by the SEA without revisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong
Development of schools as professional learning communities	The school has not yet begun to address the practice of a professional learning community or an effort has been made to address the practice of professional learning communities, but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.	A critical mass of staff has begun to engage in professional learning community practice. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.	The practice of professional learning communities is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
Identification of district leadership team and assignment of responsibilities	No district leadership team nor identified person assigned for monitoring implementation	Lacks specific identification of personnel for the district leadership team and for monitoring implementation.	A specific district leadership team is identified and one or more persons are assigned for monitoring implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong
School Leadership Team	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders Evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been exceeded.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong

This LEA self-assessment will be reviewed in the application review process as a means of understanding the current state of capacity in the LEA. Needs in this area may be identified which may lead to a focus on development of this area in the application. If there are areas of concern, conversations will be held with the LEA to reach a conclusion on capacity.

MSD Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. Description of Activity:

Beech staff members and other stakeholders will identify, interview, and select appropriate team building professional development vendors... vendors tbd

2. Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:

Close working relationships and collaboration are necessary for pods within the academy to succeed. Beech School Improvement Team will identify, interview, and select appropriate team building vendors to work with the entire Beech staff to support developing, maintaining, and strengthening relationships within the pods, the academy, and the Beech community.

3. Name of Contractor:

TBD

4. Qualifications of Contractor: *(Attach a resume in lieu of a narrative):*

tbd

5. Budget: *(Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* We have budgeted \$36,000 for year 1, \$18,000 for year 2, and 8,000 for year 3 for the contracted services portion of this activity. In addition, we expected to use two thirds of our stipend and substitute allocations over the three-year grant period to support this activity.

6. Beginning Date: August 2014

Ending Date: June 2017

7. Services to be Provided: *(Include a description of the services to be provided. Identify any anticipated products that will be developed as a result of the services.)* PD for entire Beech staff and then shared with the Beech community

8. Participants: Beech staff members and Beech community stakeholders

9. Evaluation Process: *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)* Surveys will be distributed during and collected after the PD events.

MSD Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form

<p>Item Description: 2 cart with 30 iPads on each for students to use to become more adept using digital devices to access information, including e-books</p>		
<p>Number to be purchased: 2 carts with 30 iPads one each cart</p>	<p>Approximate cost per item: tablets + insurance \$686; cart \$1400 include per student or per teacher information</p>	<p>Total Cost: 43,978.00</p>
<p>Location: The cart will be located in the Beech library. Students will borrow from the library.</p>		
<p>Purpose: Detail the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will it support the program? Beech students need more experience using digital devices. We want to support personalized and self-directed learning. We want to inspire our students by leveling the playing field. • Who will use it? Beech students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many students/staff will use it? The carts will be available to all Beech students 		
<p>Reasonableness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify the need; Beech students need more experience using digital devices. We want to support personalized and self-directed learning. We want to inspire our students by leveling the playing field. • Explain how it is not otherwise available through the district. 		
<p>Storage: Where will the equipment be located/stored Beech library</p>		
<p>Inventory and Tracking: Identify the person responsible the following:</p> <p>Entering equipment on Title I Equipment Inventory Report Beech Title I supervisor</p> <p>Tracking equipment if moved from above location Beech Title I supervisor</p> <p>Signing equipment in and out if equipment is approved for student use Beech Title I supervisor, Beech librarian</p> <p>Storing equipment over the summer Beech Title I supervisor, Beech librarian; however, we want the equipment to be used over the summer</p>		

<p>Item Description: 42" digital signage software and player to communicate to community about the academies' accomplishments, homework assignments, school events, etc. (3 @ \$1,500)</p>		
<p>Number to be purchased: 3 digital signage players with player signage software</p>	<p>Approximate cost per item: \$500</p>	<p>Total Cost: \$1500</p>
<p>Location: The signs will be used at Beech to communicate with Beech parents after they enter the school</p>		
<p>Purpose: Detail the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will it support the program? We want to get parents involved. We want to use the signs to build school community and spirit and get parents in the habit of entering the school. • Who will use it? Beech teachers will load the software <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many students/staff will use it? Any one who enters the Beech school building 		
<p>Reasonableness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify the need; Parents and the community will be informed of school events. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain how it is not otherwise available through the district. Other schools might have these signs, but they were not purchased with District general funding. 		
<p>Storage: Where will the equipment be located/stored Within the Beech school building</p>		
<p>Inventory and Tracking: Identify the person responsible the following:</p> <p>Entering equipment on Title I Equipment Inventory Report Beech Title I supervisor</p> <p>Tracking equipment if moved from above location Beech Title I supervisor</p> <p>Signing equipment in and out if equipment is approved for student use N/A</p> <p>Storing equipment over the summer: The signs will remain within the school building</p>		

<p>1) The needs assessment adequately addressed all areas on the <i>Needs Assessment Review Feedback Rubric</i> and the <i>Baseline School Data Profile</i> was complete. Described the results of the needs assessment conducted for each priority school the LEA proposes to serve, and the relationship of those results to the selection of the Intervention Model indicated above.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>2) Consider LEA's self-assessment on the LEA Capacity Rubric (SEA application-Appendix D-must receive score of 20 or higher).</p> <p>The LEA also, described the LEA's capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Intervention Model selected for each school.</p> <p>Base rating on measurements from the Intervention & Budget Alignment Rubric in the SEA application-Appendix E .</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>3) Provided an explanation for any eligible Priority LEA has elected to NOT include in its application to support the LEA's decision that it lacks the capacity to serve such school(s).</p>	0	0	0	0	0	

<p>4) For each school the LEA is committed to serve, a brief summary was provided that describes actions the LEA has taken, or will take to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and implement interventions consistent with the final SIG requirements; • If planning to contract with a service provider to assist in implementing an intervention model, how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure their quality; • How the LEA will align other resources with the interventions; • How the LEA will modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable the school to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and • How the LEA and school will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. <p>Base rating on measurements from the Commitment to Assurances Rubric in the SEA application-<i>Appendix F</i></p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>5) Provided a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority school identified in the LEA application.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>6) As part of the LEA's plan to monitor progress in each priority school included in this application, provided the LEA's annual student achievement goals in Reading and Mathematics for each priority school's assessment results.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

<p>10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>Action Plan</p> <p>Year 1 Action Plan is complete including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Resources • Timeline • Oversight • Monitoring of implementation • Monitoring of effectiveness • Funds needed <p>The model chosen is clearly connected to the activities chosen in the Action Plan.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

C – Budget

1) Completed the Overview Budget grid	0	0	0	0	1	
2) Completed the Three Year School Budget Plan (1 per school)	0	0	0	0	1	
3) Completed the One Year (2014-2015) Detail School Budget Narrative and justification forms (if applicable). <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	0	1	

D - Assurances

1) Signed Assurance page	0	0	0	0	1	
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--

E - Waivers

1) Is the LEA applying for any waivers?	0	0	0		0	
---	---	---	---	--	---	--