School Improvement Grants

Local Education Agency Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Fiscal Year 2013
CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: New Hampshire LEA Grant Application

Intent to Apply Due: Friday, May 5, 2014

Applications Due: Monday, June 2, 2014
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2016
Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Numb1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

NH LEA Application Table of Contents:

Cover Page ..... **LEA 1**
NH LEA Application Table of Contents ..... **LEA 2**
General Grant Information ..... **LEA 3-4**
SIG LEA Application Process ..... **LEA 5-8**
School Eligibility ..... **LEA 9-12**
Intent to Apply/Planning Grant Application ..... **LEA 13 -15**
LEA Application Cover Page ..... **LEA 16**
Pre-Implementation Guidance ..... **LEA 16**
Action Plan Template. ..... **LEA 17**
Criteria Outline ..... **LEA 18-19**
Section A: Schools to be Served ..... **LEA 19**
Section B: Descriptive Information/Evidence of Commitment ..... **LEA 19-20**
Section C: Budget ..... **LEA 21-22**
Three Year Budget Plan Template ..... **LEA -23**
One Year School Budget Narrative Template ..... **LEA -24**
Section D: Assurances ..... **LEA 25**
Signature Assurances ..... **LEA 26-27**
Section E: Waivers ..... **LEA 28**
Intent to Implement Waiver ..... **LEA 28**

LEA Appendix A: **Process to Determine School Eligibility for SIG** ..... **LEA 29**
LEA Appendix B: **NH's Priority Schools Definition** ..... **LEA 29**
LEA Appendix C: **Baseline School Data Profile** ..... **LEA 29-30**
LEA Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric **LEA-31**
LEA Appendix E: **Professional Dev. & Contracted Service Justification Form** ... **LEA 32**
LEA Appendix F: **Equipment Justification Form** ..... **LEA 33**
LEA Appendix G: **Application Scoring Rubric** ..... **LEA 34-38**

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided $506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2017.

State and LEA Allocations

The NH DOE has applied and been approved to receive a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG). The NH DOE must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements. The NH DOE may retain an amount not to exceed five percent for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

School Improvement Grant Guidance

In order to receive a SIG each participating LEA must:

- receive Title I, Part A funds and has one or more schools that qualify under the NH DOE's definition of a priority school;
- serve each priority school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each priority school, in which case the LEA must indicate the priority school(s) that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a priority school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements.
- budget for each priority school it commits to serve must be of sufficient size and scope to ensure that the LEA can implement one of the rigorous interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements. The LEA's budget must cover the period of availability of the school improvement funds, taking into account any waivers extending the period of availability received by the SEA or LEA;
- commit to serve one or more priority schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds must ensure that each such school it serves receives all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the school improvement funds;
- meet the requirements with respect to adequate yearly progress in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA; and
- if implementing a restart model, must hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for meeting the final requirements.

Additional grant requirements and guidance can be found at the following US ED website links:

School Improvement Fund Overview: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html

Final Requirements/Guidance and Addendums: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/faq.html

US ED School Improvement Grant PowerPoint:
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html#ppts

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

School Improvement Grant LEA Application Process

The NH DOE has developed an LEA application form that will be used to make sub grants of Title I 1003(g) SIG funds to eligible LEAs. The NH SIG LEA application review and approval process will include the following three steps:

Stage 1: Initial Review:

The first stage of the review process involves an initial review team. This team is comprised of NH DOE staff, external reviewers and educational consultants knowledgeable about school improvement/reform. All participants sign assurances regarding any conflicts of interest. Reviewers are given the applications to read individually, using the Application Scoring Rubric (*LEA Appendix G*) to determine both compliance with the Title I 1003(g) SIG guidance and whether or not the application shows sufficient promise of success. The reviewers then meet as a group and discuss each item of the Scoring Rubric, sharing their notes and providing final points for each section.

The points on the scoring rubric are used to distinguish between areas that are satisfactory and areas that need further development in the next stage of the review process. There is no set cut-off score established, due to the fact that all components of the application must reflect that the LEA meets the standards or has presented an appropriate plan to meet the standards during the period of the grant. For instance, an LEA may receive a high overall score, but low points in capacity. Since capacity is an issue, the reviewers will recommend that the area of capacity be addressed in the next stage of review and not automatically promote the applicant based on the overall high score or disqualify them due to the initial view of capacity being rated as low. The applications will be scored at the LEA level, but each school within the application will be viewed individually as well to ensure that all schools meet the requirements.

The notes from each reviewer and the reviewer group discussion are then compiled and shared with the second level reviewers and LEA during the second stage of the review.

Stage 2: Application Clarification Meetings:

The second stage of the review process involves meetings with each applicant. These meetings are comprised of LEA SIG team members and NH DOE staff. At this meeting the initial reviewers notes are shared with the group and the grant components are discussed. During this meeting any issues of concern and possible resolutions are discussed. The selected reform model outline is referenced during the meeting to ensure that all required components are addressed in the LEA plan. The budget is then reviewed and discussed as well, noting any possible changes due to the discussion. If, for any reason, an individual school is determined as not having the ability to implement the SIG, a discussion will be held as to the inclusion or elimination of this school in the LEA's application.

After the stage two meeting, the NH DOE sends to the LEA a list of decision points generated during the meeting that would reflect needed changes to the application and any remaining areas of concern, if any. Based on this feedback, the LEA must revise their application and resubmit as a final version to the NH DOE.

The goal of this stage in the review is to work with applicants to strengthen their plans and determine if the areas of concern that can be improved to a satisfactory level.

Stage 3: Awarding of Grants:
The third stage of review includes a review of the final application submitted by each LEA. If there is any need for further clarification or modifications to an application during this stage, the reviewers will contact the LEAs. All applications considered for funding must demonstrate consistent strength throughout their entire application. The final review team will then recommend to the NH Commissioner of Education which LEAs can be funded based on their reviews. If the requests for funding exceed the funds available, priority in awarding of funds will be given to Tier I, Tier II and or lowest priority schools as noted in the final regulations for the grant by the US Department of Education.

LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

April 25, 2014	**LEA intent to apply and planning grant request due to the NH DOE**
April 30, 2014	**NH DOE review and approval of LEA planning grants**
May 30, 2014	**Complete LEA application due to the NH DOE**
June 2 – June 13, 2014	**Three step application review**
July 1, 2014	**LEA grants awarded by the NH DOE**

Application Submission Information

Paperwork Required:

LEAs submitting with priority schools

- Submit an intent to apply (page LEA-11), a planning grant template (page LEA-12) and the required budget information in the Online Grant Management System by May 5, 2014..
- Submit a complete application electronically to Paula.Delisi@doe.nh.gov and one hard copy to the NH DOE office (address below)
- Use the forms provided in this document to provide requested information.
- Type all information requested (except for signatures), using a font size no

smaller than size 10 font.

- Number all pages
- Spell out the name of a selected program or strategy once before using abbreviations or acronyms, to assist reviewers in understanding the plan.

Due Dates:

- Intent to apply/planning grant applications must be received at the NH DOE by 4:00 pm no later than May 5, 2014.
- Complete grant applications must be received at the NH DOE by 4:00 pm no later than June 2, 2014.

Intent to apply/planning grant and complete applications must be mailed or delivered to:

Additionally, electronic copies should be sent to: Paula.Delisi@doe.nh.gov

New Hampshire Department of Education
Attn: Paula DeLisi
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301

Eligible LEAs/Schools

New Hampshire was awarded the ESEA Flexibility Waiver on June 26, 2013. Therefore, it will be using the priority school definition and list.

http://education.nh.gov/accountability-system/index.htm

Eligibility for the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grants does not impact or eliminate eligibility for Title I 1003(a) School Improvement Grants (if available-based on funding). The grants described within this document are additional grants awarded through a competitive process. If an LEA chooses not to participate in this Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grants, the decision will not impact their eligibility for regular Title I, Part A funding.

Required Intervention Models for priority schools

Priority schools **must** implement one of the following four models outlined by the US ED:

1) Turnaround Model

A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must:

- Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
    - Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students
- Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent and select new staff
- Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
- Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or NH DOE, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or NH DOE to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
- Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the US ED SIG guidance);
- Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as:

- Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model or a new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

2) Restart Model

A restart model is one in which an LEA must:

- Convert a school or close and reopen a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.)
- Enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

3) School Closure Model

School closure model is one in which the LEA must:

- Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

4) Transformation Model

A transformation model is inclusive of the following four sections which the LEA must address:

i) *Develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness* section:

- Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
- Use a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that:
    - Takes into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
- Use the guidelines from the NHDOE Teacher/Leader Effectiveness Plan to improve instruction by strengthening current evaluation systems.
- Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
- Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

- An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness according to the NHDOE suggested model such as:
    - Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
    - Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
    - Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

ii) *Comprehensive instructional reform strategies* section:

- Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
- Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.
- An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as:
    - Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
    - Implementing a school wide "response-to-intervention" model;
    - Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
    - Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and

    In secondary schools—

    - Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
    - Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
    - Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
    - Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

iii) *Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools* section:

- Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the US ED SIG guidance); and
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

- An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as:
    - Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;
    - Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
    - Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
    - Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

iv) *Providing operational flexibility and sustained support* section:

- Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
- Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).
- An LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as:
    - Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
    - Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Incorporate the Seven Turnaround principles as meaningful interventions to improve the academic achievement of students.

Questions Call Mary Earick at Mary.Earick@doe.nh.gov or 271-6052
Kathryn "Joey" Nichol at Kathryn.Nichol@doe.nh.gov or 603-271-6087

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant FY 2013 for school year 2014-2015
Intent to Apply & Planning Grant Application

LEA/District: Nashua School District **SAU#: 42**

Superintendent Name: Mark Conrad

This document is an official notification that the above LEA/district intends to apply for a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant.

Superintendent's Signature: Mark Conrad **Date:** 5/5/14

In the grid below list the schools your LEA is committing to serve with a School Improvement Grant.

ELIGIBLE SCHOOL NAME				Planning to Apply
Fairgrounds Elementary School				Yes

District Mailing Address: 141 Ledge St, Nashua, NH 03060

Phone: (603)-966-1000 **Fax: (603)-594-4350** **E-Mail: Conradm@nashua.edu**

Name Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Coordinator (if different from above): Michael Harrington

Mailing Address (if different from above):
Fairgrounds Elementary School
37 Blanchard St.
Nashua, NH 03060
Work Phone: (603)-594-4381 **Fax: 603)-594-4318** **E-Mail: harringtonm@nashua.edu**

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	**Group representing**
Michael Harrington	School Staff (Principal)
Karen Crebase	District Staff (Asst. Superintendent)
Cherrie Fulton	District Staff (Title I Director)
Richard LaSalle	Outside Expert (SERESC)
Maryclare Heffernan	Outside Facilitator (SERESC)
Tracey Cassady	School Staff (Asst. Principal)

Michael Plourde	**School Staff (Guidance)**
~~**Brenda Lemon**~~	~~**School Staff (Teacher)**~~
Jason Cucolo	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Kelly Lakanen	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Mary Johnson	**School Staff (Special Educator)**
Elisabeth Giannakopoulos	**School Staff (ELL Teacher)**
Jeanne Doody	**School Staff (Title I Teacher)**
Maria Roger	**School Staff (Reading Specialist)**
Stacie Plourde	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Laurie Muccioli	**School Staff (Para-educator)**
Penelope Solomon	**School Staff (Specialist Teacher)**
Angel Demanche	**Parent**
	(School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014
Planning Grant Template

Planning grants of $3,000 funded by Title I 1003(a) are available for any LEA that has at least one eligible priority school and plans to submit a complete Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant application. These budget items must also be entered into the NH Online Grant Management System.

Activity	Person Responsible	Benchmark/Evidence of Accomplishment	Start Date	Completion Date	Expenditures or Required Resources
Grant Writing Facilitation	Richard LaSalle/ Michael Harrington	Completed Application	May, 2014	June 2, 2014	$1,500
Stipends for select planning members	Michael Harrington	Completed Application	May, 2014	June 2, 2014	$1,250 5 Writers @$25/hour x 10 hrs= $1,250
Substitute Teachers	Michael Harrington	Completed Application	May, 2014	June 2, 2014	$65 per substitute for teacher planning members 3@$65=$195
Material	Michael Harrington	Completed Application	May, 2014	June 2, 2014	$55 for chart paper, writing utensils, notebooks

LEA/District: Nashua School District **SAU#: 42**

Superintendent Name: Mark Conrad

This document is an official notification that the above LEA/district intends to apply for a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant.

Superintendent's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

In the grid below list the schools your LEA is committing to serve with a School Improvement Grant.

ELIGIBLE SCHOOL NAME				Planning to Apply
Fairgrounds Elementary School				

District Mailing Address:

141 Ledge Street,
Nashua, NH 03060

Phone: 603-966-1000 **Fax: 603-594-4350** **E-Mail: conradm@nashua.edu**

Name Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Coordinator (if different from above):TBD

Mailing Address (if different from above): 37 Blanchard Street, Nashua, NH 03060

Work Phone: 603-594-4318
Fax:603-594-4348 **E-Mail:harringtonm@nashua.edu**

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	**Group representing**
	(School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Michael Harrington	**School Staff (Principal)**
Karen Crebase	**District Staff (Asst. Superintendent)**
Cherrie Fulton	**District Staff (Title I Director)**
Richard LaSalle	**Outside Expert (SERESC)**
Maryclare Heffernan	**Outside Facilitator (SERESC)**
Tracey Cassady	**School Staff (Asst. Principal)**
Michael Plourde	**School Staff (Guidance)**

Brenda Lemon	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Jason Cucolo	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Kelly Lakanen	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Mary Johnson	**School Staff (Special Educator)**
Elisabeth Giannakopoulos	**School Staff (ELL Teacher)**
Jeanne Doody	**School Staff (Title I Teacher)**
Maria Roger	**School Staff (Reading Specialist)**
Stacie Plourde	**School Staff (Teacher)**
Laurie Muccioli	**School Staff (Para-educator)**
Penelope Solomon	**School Staff (Specialist Teacher)**
Angel Demanche	**Parent**

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014

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

LEA Application

SAU#:42 District Name: Nashua

Superintendent: Mark Conrad

Address: 141 Ledge Street

City: Nashua Zip:03060 Tel: 603-966-1000

E-mail: conradm@nashua.edu Fax: 603-594-4348

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

Name: Michael Harrington

Address: 37 Blanchard St.

City: Nashua Zip: 03060Tel: 603-594-4318

E-mail:lemonb@nashua.edu Fax: 603-594-4348

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	**Group representing** (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Michael Harrington	School Principal
Karen Crebase	District Staff (Asst. Superintendent)
Cherrie Fulton	District Staff (Title I Director)
Richard LaSalle	Outside Expert (SERESC)
Maryclare Heffernan	Outside Facilitator (SERESC)
Tracey Cassady	School Staff (Assistant Principal)
Michael Plourde	School Staff (Guidance Counselor)
Brenda Lemon	School Staff (Teacher)
Kelly Lakanen	School Staff (Teacher)
Mary Johnson	School Staff (Special Educator)

Elisabeth Giannakopoulos	School Staff (ELL Teacher)
Jeanne Doody	School Staff (ELL Teacher)
Maria Roger	School Staff (Reading Specialist)
Stacie Plourde	School Staff (Teacher)
Laurie Mucciolli	School Staff (Para-educator)
Penelope Solomon	School Staff (Specialist Teacher)
Angel Demanche	Parent

Pre-Implementation Guidance:

In the following first year Action Plan and Budget Narratives, the LEA must include any planned pre-implementation activities and expenses that are aligned with the chosen model. Approvable activities include the following:

Family and Community Engagement: Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.

Rigorous Review of External Providers: Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity; or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.

Staffing: Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff

Instructional Programs: Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

Professional Development and Support: Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.

☐ **Preparation for Accountability Measures: Develop and pilot a data system for use in**

SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools. As discussed in F-4, in general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities.

- ☐ **Minor Remodeling of Facilities to Enable Technology: Pay for the costs of minor remodeling that is necessary to support technology if the costs are directly attributable to the implementation of a school intervention model and are reasonable and necessary.**
- ☐ **Other: Other activities that are appropriate and aligned with the successful implementation of the selected intervention model.**

Descriptive Information/Evidence of Commitment

Fairgrounds Elementary School was identified a as a Priority School by the New Hampshire Department of Education beginning the 2013-2014 school year. This identification was based on combined NECAP Reading and Math data from a three-year span from 2010-2012. The lowest performing 5% of all NH Title I schools receive this identification, for a total of 12 schools. The first year as a Priority School is designed to be a planning year in which schools work to find root problems and solutions in order to make deep sustainable change in their buildings as opposed to surface quick fix solutions. This current school year we have been implementing small changes, but more importantly, researching and learning how to make significant changes aligned to a vision for our school to promote deep cultural change that is sustainable.

A new leadership team was formed at the end of the 2012-2013 school year that began their work by attending the New Hampshire Department of Education's Summer Summit in Keene, NH. During this time, the team began work that continued during bi-weekly Leadership meetings throughout this school year. The team currently consists of representation from all stakeholders in our building, from teachers to parents to community liaisons. The team focused first on building understanding of what structural, procedural, and cultural change is and how to design a vision to promote cultural change that allows all structural and procedural changes to be aligned with our vision of cultural change. In his book, Leading School Change: Nine Strategies to Bring Everyone on Board, Todd Whitaker writes that "cultural change involves *how we do things* in an organization…When we change the culture, we change the very soul and spirit of the group" (Whitaker, 2010, p. 11)

As this year has progressed, we have worked on learning about highly performing schools and stories of *Turnaround Schools*. We have identified talented partners to help us on our journey and pursued professional development opportunities aligned with our goals and shared our findings with our whole staff. Specifically, we have done the following to improve our knowledge:

- Visit to Community Day Charter School in Lawrence Massachusetts
- Participation in National Association of School Principals 360 degree assessment and Principals' Leadership Network
- Principal Coaching from Richard LaSalle: former Superintendent and current Executive Director of SERESC.

- Participation in monthly webinars with New Hampshire DOE and other Focus and Priority Schools
- Participation in Quarterly Focus and Priority School conferences
- Leadership team visioning work with Turnaround Facilitator, Maryclare Heffernan
- Visit to Doran School in Fall River, Massachusetts. A public "Turnaround School" that has moved from a level 4 school to a level 2.
- Leadership Team retreat at SERESC to develop plan with key stakeholders
- Team sent to ASCD National conference to develop plan for summer professional development
- Use of professional publications from various Education journals as appropriate
- Completed the Assessment Continuum for School Improvement to conduct an updated needs assessment with the Leadership Team May 2014.

Using this knowledge and research about best practices and leading change in low performing schools, the Fairgrounds Elementary School Leadership Team has developed the following plan for improvement that addresses and incorporates the 7 Turnaround Principles in two key areas of focus.

1. Providing strong instructional leadership
2. Improving educator effectiveness
3. Redesigning learning time
4. Strengthening a school instructional program
5. Using data to inform instruction
6. Improving the school environment (non-academic factors)
7. Family and community engagement

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Action Plan

(Please complete one per school)

School name: Fairground Elementary School

Goal	Provide a specific, measurable goal citing intended changes in teaching and learning tied to improvement in student achievement. **Present Level**: In the 2013-2014 school year 44% of all Fairgrounds students made more than a year's growth in Reading and 29% in Math as measured by the district's i-Ready assessment. In order to accelerate growth for students who are behind, they will need to make more than one year's growth each year. The NECAP results from 2013-2014 assessment resulted in 56% proficiency in Reading and 39% proficiency in Math for all students tested in grades 3 to 5. **Goal**: By June 2015 the percent of Fairgrounds students making more than a year's growth in Reading and math will increase by 10 percentage points, and will continue to increase by 10 percentage points each year so that by June 2017 74% of students will make more than a year's growth in Reading and 59% of students will make more than a year's growth in Math. **Objectives will include:** 1. Establishment of an effective school-wide Response to Instruction (RTI) Framework in ELA and Math and in Social/Emotional and Behavioral areas. 2. Support from the newly hired ELA and Math Instructional Leaders to strengthen and improve Core instruction and teacher effectiveness through an embedded professional development and coaching model. 3. Development of a school-wide system of specific targeted feedback to teachers, staff, and students will be utilized to improve teaching and learning. 4. Development of a comprehensive student support component for addressing social/emotional and behavioral barriers to learning.
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:** ☐ **Turnaround model** ☐ **Restart model** ☐ **School closure model** X **Transformation model**

Proposed Activities for 2014-2015	Resources	Timeline	Oversight	Monitoring (Implementation)	Monitoring (Effectiveness)	Title I School Improvement Funds
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.	*What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?*	*When will this activity begin and end?*	*Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?*	*What evidence will be collected to document implementation?* *How often and by whom?*	*What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness?* *How often and by whom?*	*Include amount allocated to this activity if applicable. Provide the requested detail on the Budget Narrative Form.*

A1. Through the establishment of a "Mathematician in Residence" provide core instructional support to staff and the Math Instructional Leader.	District instructional units that have been aligned to common core standards; math Instructional Leader, Balanced math, use of Ongoing Assessment Project (OGAP) to inform decisions	Sept. 2014 to June 2015	Principal, Math Instructional Leader	Contract with math consultant (i.e. Mahesh Sharma) to provide ongoing building level PD and support. Monthly from Sept. 2014 to June 2015	Use of i-Ready screening/diagnostic scores 3 times/year, i-Ready progress monitoring as determined necessary for individual students to measure accelerated growth indicators.	Contracted Service Rate of $2500per day plus $250 travel expenses per visit =$2750 times 10 visits = **$27,500**
A2. Through establishment of ongoing professional development and coaching in ELA provide ongoing professional development in effective core instructional strategies to staff and the ELA Instructional Leader	District initiatives and units aligned to the Common Core Standards; ELA Instructional Leader; Life Long Literacy; i-	Sept. 2014 to June 2015	Principal, ELA Instructional Leader	Contract with established ELA training consultant(s). (E.g. Shannon Harken, SERESC) to provide ongoing PD and support. Quarterly from Sept. 2014 to June 2015	Teacher observations – instructional strategies being utilized; i-Ready assessments; principal and ELA Instructional Leader feedback	Costs associated with travel, lodging, and registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional leader, and selected teachers or staff. **$6,000**

	Ready assessment tools; book studies					Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 3 days=**$3000**
A3. Provide training and support in the use of formative assessment and feedback practices to inform instructional decisions and to all instructional staff.	Common formative assessments by classroom teachers and grade level teams; collaboration meetings; Professional Development and coaching	Oct. 2014 – June 2015	ELA Instructional Leader, Principal	Contract with established Formative Assessment specialist (E.g. WestEd, SERESC) to provide ongoing PD and support. Quarterly from Sept. 2014 –June 2015	Data from assessments collected weekly by teachers and shared weekly during grade level team collaboration meeting.	Costs associated with travel, lodging, and registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$5,000** Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 10 days= **$10,000**

A4. To support the use of blending learning strategies in the classroom through grade level selection, evaluation and shared results of technology resources (E.g. Raz Kids, Dreambox, i-Ready Instructional model).	i-Ready instructional model; Read Naturally, Pearson-Successnet	Sept. 2014 – June 2015	ELA Instructional Leader, Principal	Identify blended learning resources and professional development; RAZ Kids i-Ready Instructional model Dreambox	Formative assessments weekly; i-Ready diagnostic scores 3 times/year	i-Ready Instructional Model $26 per student for math and $26 per student for reading. Approximately 550 students = **$28,600** $400 per teacher to invest in blended learning resources to enhance student engagement in classroom as approved by Leadership Team Overview Committee. 27 teachers @$400= **$10,800**
A5. Increase access to curriculum for all students through the acquisition and integration of technology in all learning areas. Acquisition of	Apple TVs, Grade level iPads, document cameras, wireless	Sept. 2014 – June 2017	In house teacher trainer; technology integration specialists; District	Over 3 years: First year – 12 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors with Document Camera	Observation by Principal and Instructional leaders.	12 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors @1799=$21,588

additional document cameras and set-ups	access, netbooks Mimeo trained teacher on campus		Technology Coach, Teacher Team Facilitator; Principal	Second year – Add 10 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors with Document Camera Third year – Add 5 set Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors with Document Camera		Installation=$6000 Document Cameras: 12@$651=$7,812 **$35,400**
A6. Hire Social Worker	Salary and Benefits	August 2014-June 2017	Principal	Logs maintained of students assisted; results of student contacts; overall school climate through survey results	SIG coordinator, quarterly	School Social Worker Estimated Salary: $48,000 FICA: $3,672 NH Retirement: $6,796.80 Family HMO Plan: $18,360 Dental: $1,915.44 Life Insurance: $250 Total: **$79,994.24**

A7. Provide professional development to all instructional staff to enhance teacher capacity for addressing problems and fostering social/emotional, intellectual and behavioral development.	2/3 day per week of counseling within school from Greater Nashua Mental Health Center; 1.2 Guidance Counselor; School Psychologist 2 days/week; Home school coordinator for 15 hours/week; In school Recovery room; Behavior para-educator; School nurse; Catie's Closet; Food pantry; End 68 Hours	Sept. 2014 – June 2015	Guidance Counselor, Principal	Social Worker, Guidance Counselor and Greater Nashua Mental Health Center organizations	Attendance data, Recovery room data, Data of community resources used. Teacher observations and parent requests.	Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development to enhance teacher capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development. Estimated cost of **$5,000**

	of Hunger program.					
A8. Develop a formalized model to actively plan for and support transitions of students (transient population of highly mobile students) during multiple transition points. (E.g. school vacations, summer, school-to-school moves, etc.). The model will create a system of supports for students during periods where stressors increase	Responsive classroom; Love and Logic, Wellness Team	Sept. 2014 – June 2015	Principal, Guidance Counselor, Social worker	Hire school Social worker to facilitate and support the implementation.	Attendance data, Recovery room data, Data of resources used.	School-wide book study: Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind: Practical Strategies for Raising Achievement, by Eric Jensen 70 copies @$23.00= **$1,610**
A9. Instructional Rounds with Lee Teitel and SERESC To look closely at instructional practices in our school's classrooms and to work together systematically to provide high quality teaching and learning for all our children.	Leadership Team and coaches	Sept. 2014-June 2015	Principal, SIG Coordinator	Minutes and recorded findings	Identification of a problem of practice and plan of implementation to address it.	All-inclusive cost of program **$10,000**

Timeline of Activities

Year One – 2014-2015

July 7- 31, 2014

- ELA and Math Instructional Leaders hired.
- Summer Learning Camp – Extended learning time for approximately 75 students ages Pre-K through grade 4 with academic learning needs.
- Technology acquisition, ordering completed.
- Apply to participate in the Instructional Rounds in NH Schools in partnership with SERESC, Harvard University and NHDOE to support school improvement through a school based instructional rounds network.

August 4 – 8, 2014 -

- Summer Institute for all Fairgrounds Elementary teacher development in academic and social/emotional and behavioral strategies. Areas of focus will include: Curriculum alignment; Responsive Classroom, Teaching with Poverty in Mind (Jensen, 2009) and Mindset (Dweck, 2007) book studies.
- Social Worker - hiring completed.

September 2014 –

- Establish the Mathematician in Residence. Begin monthly consultation to classroom teacher resulting in a change in mathematics instruction to ensure the implementation of Common Core standards K through grade 5. Demonstrate skills for mastery of mathematics.
  Activities include: Professional development, classroom rounds, work to structure of model lessons and system of ongoing feedback.
- Establish ELA consultation and support quarterly professional learning and coaching provided.
- Implement first round of technology plan including additional enhanced technology access to 12 classrooms.
- Begin support of use of technology in classrooms (blended learning) through district's Technology Integrators and Coaches.
- Establish and implement protocols, process and organizational details for Fairgrounds Elementary School's Whole Child Wrap Around model.

October 2014 –

- Begin work with RTI and Formative Assessment consultant to provide training and support to Instructional Leaders, Teacher Team Facilitator, and all instructional staff.

November 2014

- Responsive Classroom training provided to all staff during district in-service day

February 2014

- Responsive Classroom training provided to all staff during district in-service day

Year Two – 2015 -2016

August –

- Leader in Me – Training provided to instructional staff in the whole school transformation model using Covey's 7 Habit's of Effective People to create student leaders and improve teacher effectiveness, student engagement and academic achievement.

- Implement second round of planned technology to provide enhanced technology access to 10 additional classrooms.

Year Three – 2016-2017

- Implement second round of planned technology to provide enhanced technology access to 10 additional classrooms.

NH DOE will use the criteria outlined below to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of priority school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

Upon US Department of Education (US ED) approval of the NH School Improvement Grant (SIG), the NH DOE will post on the NH DOE website and disseminate to all NH Superintendents and Title I Project Managers the list of NH SIG eligible schools, grant information and further information regarding needs assessment tools available.

The NH DOE will then hold statewide conference calls/webinars for all eligible schools, describing the grant details, application process, needs assessment tools and answer questions. The NH DOE will also hold additional technical assistance sessions and will meet with LEAs as needed to support the NH SIG application process.

LEAs submitting an application for a priority will be asked to submit an intent to apply to the NH DOE. Each of these LEAs will be offered a $3,000 planning grant to assist the district/school with required needs assessment for their final application, funded by Title I, Part A 1003(a) and/or 1003(g).

As part of the application, LEAs will be required to submit the following baseline data collected by LEAs on the form found in *SEA Appendix F (LEA Appendix C):*

- **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:**
    - **a. longer school day**
    - **b. before or after school**
    - **c. summer school**
    - **d. weekend school**
    - **e. 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.**

Updated information will be required of each grantee in annual progress reports.

The NH SIG application will require each LEA to conduct a needs assessment of the eligible schools within their LEA. The NH DOE has offered the following needs assessment tools:

- **Center for Innovation and Improvement's (CII) Rapid Improvement process**
- **Assessment Continuum of School-wide Improvement Outcomes**

Webinars will be held by the NH DOE to discuss the components that must be included in the needs assessment, tips shared as to best ways to facilitate the process and a checklist will be provided that outlines the components that will be checked by reviewers.
In the application, the LEA must also clearly articulate the results of their needs assessment and the goals they have selected to best meet their identified needs. All applications will be reviewed using the Needs Assessment Rubric Feedback Form (*SEA Appendix B*). Based on the results of the review, NH DOE leadership will discuss any further needs assessment information required, in order to ensure that all areas of concern are identified and addressed. LEAs will be required to determine their priority issues that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement. The LEA application will also require an intervention model to be identified and how it was chosen as the best match to the improvement goals for the particular school.

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
Fairgrounds Elementary School		X							X

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

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

(1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, 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.

LEA Needs Assessment

Using the principles of the Response to Instruction (RTI) framework, there are three tiers of instruction. Tier I is core instruction and curriculum that occurs in the classroom. "RTI research historically has set the expectation that approximately 80% of students will be successful when quality instruction has been provided within a strong core curriculum" (O'Meara, p. 14, 2011). In examining the root problems at Fairgrounds Elementary School through examination of historical NECAP data, it has been determined that we have not yet provided students with the core instruction needed in order to implement further interventions. This finding is further supported by examining i–Ready achievement data that shows more than 50% of our students below grade level in both reading and math. If you think of Tier I as the foundation of a house, you cannot start framing and building up when only 40% of the foundation has been poured and dried, or it will collapse. Similarly, we must improve our core instruction and curriculum, before we can provide further interventions for our students. Think of the following:

> If 80% of students are not successful, it is the instruction that needs to be examined rather than the student learning. If, after identifying that a lesson has been implemented through quality curriculum and instruction, and 80% of students are not successful, re-teaching or a different approach to teaching needs to be implemented (O'Meara, p. 14, 2011).

With only 39% of our students proficient in Math on the most recent NECAP testing and 55% proficient in reading, the foundation, or core instruction, is the target of our improvement plan.

Assessment Continuum of School-wide Outcomes

The Fairgrounds Elementary School Leadership Team completed the Assessment Continuum of School-wide Outcomes on May 28, 2014 to perform an updated needs assessment. The results indicate that while there are relative strengths developing in the areas of Leadership and Governance, the use of data-based accountability and evaluation, Standards-based instruction and assessment practices, as well as Structural Reform strategies there are perceived areas of focus and need in the area of External Support and Resources,

Standards-Based curriculum and Extended Learning Activities. The SIG planning process has addressed these areas in need of support through two key components:

1. Establishing an effective core instructional model for all students through intentional focus on building strong, consistent and research-based curriculum, instruction and assessment practices to accelerate learning for all students, but particularly for those who are behind.

2. Designing a system of specific Social/Emotional and Behavioral structures and supports for students in partnership with the community Mental Health Center, parents and other partners. The plan will address barriers to children's learning through the institution of a whole child wrap-around model for helping to engage families by meeting some of their social/emotional and health needs.

Survey Results - Assessment Continuum of School-wide Outcomes

1A. Standards-Based Curriculum	3.3
1B. Standards-Based Instruction	3.8
1C. Standards-Based Assessment	3.8
2. Data-Based Accountability and Evaluation	3.95
3. Structural Reform Strategies	3.8
4. Leadership and Governance	4.2
5. Professional Development	3.6
6. Culture and Climate	3.64
7. External Support and Resources	3.1
8. Parental and Community Involvement	3.63
9. Extended Learning Activities	3.5

Student Achievement Data

Analysis of the Nashua School District's i-Ready baseline data for the Fairgrounds Elementary School follows. The school's measurable student achievement goal is tied to the growth expectations for students to make more than one year's growth. This assessment tool will be used to measure accelerated student learning growth in ELA and Math in the next three years. The Fairground Elementary School's 2014 baseline data shows that 44% of all students tested made more than one year's growth in Reading and 29% of all students tested made more than one year's growth in Math.

NECAP data for 2013-2014 school year shows that 55% of all students were proficient in Reading and 39% of all students are proficient in Math.

Accelerating student growth in Reading and Math to more than a year's growth annually is necessary to improve results for all of Fairground Elementary School's students, but particularly for those who are behind.

Reading

Fairgrounds Elementary School

Nashua, New Hampshire

iReady - Expected Growth Kindergarten - Reading	
Year's Growth	42 to 48
Plus Year's Growth	49 to 83
1 ½ Year's Growth	84
2 Year's Growth	101
2 ½ Year's Growth	122

Number of Students	Number Accessed	Percent of Accessed Students	Blanks
102	84		18
BELOW Expected Range Growth	55	65%	
Expected Range Growth	7	8%	
Greater than Expected Range Growth	22	26%	
Totals =	84	100%	

ADVANCED OR CHECK-UP GROWTH		
Plus Year's Growth	20	24%
1 ½ Year's Growth	1	1%
2 Year's Growth	1	1%
2 ½ Year's Growth	0	0%
Totals =	22	26%

Kindergarten		
Reading		
Projected Check-up Growth		
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

iReady - Expected Growth Grade 1 - Reading	
Year's Growth	40 to 50
Plus Year's Growth	51 to 79
1 ½ Year's Growth	80
2 Year's Growth	100
2 ½ Year's Growth	120

Number of Students	Number Accessed	Percent of Accessed Students	Blanks
97	96		1
BELOW Expected Range Growth	32	33%	
Expected Range Growth	10	10%	
Greater than Expected Range Growth	54	56%	
Totals =	96	100%	

ADVANCED OR CHECK-UP GROWTH		
Plus Year's Growth	36	38%
1 ½ Year's Growth	10	10%
2 Year's Growth	5	5%
2 ½ Year's Growth	3	3%
Totals =	54	56%

Grade 1		
Reading		
Projected Check-up Growth		
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

iReady - Expected Growth Grade 2 - Reading	
Year's Growth	32 to 39
Plus Year's Growth	40 to 63

Number of Students	Number Accessed	Percent of Accessed Students	Blanks
102	93		9
BELOW Expected Range Growth	41	44%	
Expected Range Growth	6	6%	

1 ½ Year's Growth	64
2 Year's Growth	80
2 ½ Year's Growth	96

Greater than Expected Range Growth	46	49%
Totals =	**93**	**100%**

ADVANCED OR CHECK-UP GROWTH		
Plus Year's Growth	27	29%
1 ½ Year's Growth	12	13%
2 Year's Growth	5	5%
2 ½ Year's Growth	2	2%
Totals =	**46**	**49%**

Grade 2

Reading

Projected Check-up Growth

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

iReady - Expected Growth Grade 3 - Reading	
Year's Growth	29 to 36
Plus Year's Growth	37 to 57
1 ½ Year's Growth	58
2 Year's Growth	72
2 ½ Year's Growth	86

Number of Students	Number Accessed	Percent of Accessed Students	Blanks
93	86		7

BELOW Expected Range Growth	39	45%
Expected Range Growth	4	5%
Greater than Expected Range Growth	43	50%
Totals =	**86**	**100%**

ADVANCED OR CHECK-UP GROWTH		
Plus Year's Growth	25	29%
1 ½ Year's Growth	14	16%
2 Year's Growth	2	2%
2 ½ Year's Growth	2	2%
Totals =	**43**	**50%**

Grade 3

Reading

Projected Check-up Growth

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

iReady - Expected Growth Grade 4 - Reading	
Year's Growth	23 to 33
Plus Year's Growth	34 to 45
1 ½ Year's Growth	46
2 Year's Growth	58
2 ½ Year's Growth	70

Number of Students	Number Accessed	Percent of Accessed Students	Blanks
113	86		27

BELOW Expected Range Growth	33	38%
Expected Range Growth	15	17%
Greater than Expected Range Growth	38	44%
Totals =	**86**	**100%**

ADVANCED OR CHECK-UP GROWTH		
Plus Year's Growth	7	8%
1 ½ Year's Growth	9	10%
2 Year's Growth	12	14%
2 ½ Year's Growth	10	12%
Totals =	**38**	**44%**

Grade 4

Reading

Projected Check-up Growth

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

iReady - Expected Growth Grade 5 - Reading	
Year's Growth	16 to 23
Plus Year's Growth	24 to 31
1 ½ Year's Growth	32
2 Year's Growth	40
2 ½ Year's Growth	48

Number of Students	Number Accessed	Percent of Accessed Students	Blanks
112	87		25
BELOW Expected Range Growth	33	38%	
Expected Range Growth	16	18%	
Greater than Expected Range Growth	38	44%	
Totals =	**87**	**100%**	

ADVANCED OR CHECK-UP GROWTH		
Plus Year's Growth	11	13%
1 ½ Year's Growth	8	9%
2 Year's Growth	6	7%
2 ½ Year's Growth	13	15%
Totals =	**38**	**44%**

Grade 5 Reading Projected Check-up Growth		
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

Community Engagement and Partnership

There has been an intentional focus on developing parent, guardian and community partnership. Fairgrounds Elementary School has a high rate of students who transfer in and out of the school throughout the year, creating a greater than normal need for structures and community to welcome and seamlessly transition students into the learning process. The number of students who have left Fairgrounds Elementary since July 1, 2013 is 68. The number of students who have entered since July 1, 2013 is 64 with a transient rate of 24.9%. Additionally 69.9% of Fairgrounds students qualify for free or reduced lunch, and roughly 30% are non-native speakers or English Language Learners (ELL).

Through the addition of a school food pantry and adoption of the **End 68 Hours of Hunger** initiative as well as **Catie's Closet**, (a non-profit entity that provides high quality donated clothing to a clothing closet for parents to select items for their children), the school has worked to create a sense of welcome and community.

Additionally the school's PTO has worked in partnership with the school staff and have designed the school's June 2014 "Celebration of Learning" to celebrate student learning and communicate the SIG **Priority Plan for Success** to the parent/guardian community. The school's Leadership Team has included and will continue to include parent representation. The school currently offers Love and Logic parenting classes. Currently there is an evening cohort that meets once per month and a late morning cohort that meets every other Friday in the conference room.

Current Reality

Curriculum: We are in the process of rolling out District curriculum units in all four Core subject areas. These units are aligned to the Common Core State Standards and provide students with the high quality learning opportunities needed.

Challenge: How do we provide teachers with resources and professional development needed to implement these units with fidelity when we are already lagging behind in our core instruction?

Response to Instruction: We have shifted our focus away from multiple pull out groups of intervention and focused on pushing resources into the classroom to improve the core instruction for all students. We currently have seven Title I intervention teachers that have switched from providing small group instruction outside the classroom to pushing into the classroom and meeting with small groups as part of their English Language Arts teaching block.

Challenge: This plan has helped improve our core instruction in reading, but does not address math. How can we work with teachers to accelerate their understanding and implementation of curriculum units and improve core instruction in the classroom?

Behavioral Challenges: With training from Love and Logic to develop a school-wide discipline plan and train teachers on effective strategies to work with our students, we have seen improved behavior in our building and classrooms. However, there is still major work to be done in this area if we are going to have classrooms that are able to deliver high quality core instruction.

Challenge: How do we find time and provide all staff with skills that will help to make our school a more positive learning environment?

Collaboration: We have established protected time to collaborate with grade level teams with a facilitator to help lead their meetings. While this has helped immensely in improving our instruction, there is clearly still a lot of work to do in this area.

Challenge: How do we move these meetings to a higher level and use them to create Common Formative Assessments and make 80% of our students successful through core instruction?

Vision

Learning will be data driven and intentional, with embedded feedback and support for students, teachers, and all members of the Fairgrounds Elementary School community.

Focus of Plan

Align all changes in school to accelerate learning by staff and students in order to meet our goals.

Desired Outcomes

1. Increase teacher efficacy in improving academic and social/emotional abilities of students
2. Increase student efficacy
3. Transform instruction in classrooms to meet diverse needs of learners in preparation for Common Core State Standards
4. A culture of continuous growth by staff and students supported by feedback and professional development.
5. Create a respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment where all members feel welcome and valued.

Proposed Changes

Fairgrounds Elementary School proposing a plan of intentional focus on two critical areas: accelerated student achievement for those students who are behind; and support for all students through the design of a student and family social/emotional and behavioral system of support for students and families.

The proposed SIG plan incorporates all of the 7 Turnaround Principles in these two broad areas of focus.

The 7 Turnaround Principles:

1. **Providing Strong Leadership** by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership; or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and had the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget.
2. **Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction** by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs.
3. **Redesigning the school day, week or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration.**
4. **Strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards.**
5. **Using data to inform instruction for continuous improvement, by providing time for collaboration on the use of data.**
6. **Establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs.**
7. **Providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.**

Curriculum Changes

Our focus this year that will continue throughout this plan is to make our classrooms less teacher and activity centered and more student and learning centered. With this in mind, we have made an intentional shift from asking: "What will we be doing today?" to "What will students be learning today" (Reeves, 2011, p.16.)? The following instructional changes below have begun this year and will continue throughout this plan:

- Creation of Mastery Learning Objectives for lessons
- Daily 5 and Daily Café literacy structure implemented in K-5
- Daily 3 Math structure
- Ongoing Assessment Program (OGAP) implemented in grades 3-5
- Lifelong Literacy Project in Grade 1 this year and will expand to kindergarten and grade 2 next year, and to remaining grades thereafter
- Science inquiry tasks conducted in grades 2-5 and will expand to kindergarten and grade 1
- Balanced Mathematics Review and mental math in grades k-5
- Use of Understanding by Design to break down curriculum units using essential questions and enduring understandings in all content areas
- Pilot of Lucy Calkins Units of Study writing in grades 3-5

- Pilot of Fountas an Pinnell Phonics in grade 1 next year

Summer Professional Development

Results from a recent Google Docs survey results show that 97% of staff are willing to attend 3-5 days of professional development in the summer that is aligned with our school improvement goals. We will be holding four or five days of paid professional development in the summer. All staff will receive a copy of Eric Jensen's book, Teaching with Poverty in Mind: What Being Poor Does to Kids' Brains and What Schools Can Do about It and Carol Dweck's book, Mindset: The New Psychology for Success.

We will devote our first day exploring the work of Jensen and Dweck in order to promote the growth mindset in our school and heighten our expectations for student performance.

For the next two days, we will have training in Responsive Classroom for ***all*** teachers and staff. Finally, we will use the last day to develop building expectations for staff and students and then break out into groups by grade level or content area to work on developing curriculum units. This is all subject to change as we will use the remainder of the year to fine tune our plans

FES Priority Summer School Opportunities

In support of the Transformation model that includes increasing learning time, we will hold our own mini-summer school for Fairgrounds students. It will begin this year with a focus on primary grades and non-readers, but will eventually be open for all grades and include enrichment.

Location: Fairgrounds Elementary School

Time: All classes will run four hours per day for four days per week.

Class Offerings:

Pre-Kindergarten Summer Program

Two classrooms of 15 incoming kindergartners. Each classroom will have two teachers and a para-educator. We will give priority to students that have not attended a pre-school prior to coming and/or are identified in need of a boost by our kindergarten screening in May.

Summer Math and Reading Camp

Two classrooms of K-2 Intervention: (Class size limited to 17) These classes will be open to students presently in K, 1, 2. The idea would be to make two classrooms of mixed ages based on ability and teach 120 minutes of reading and 90 minutes of math each day. Students will be identified by classroom teachers and data used will be i-Ready and teacher anecdotal data to develop profiles for targeted instruction. The goal is to make this experience engaging and unique, rather than providing similar instruction that students would receive during the school year.

One class of limited and non-readers: This class will be limited to 10 students and will target those students not reading by grade 3. It will target students in grades 2, 3, or 4 that are either not reading or at risk of not reading by the end of third grade. We are in the process of exploring highly engaging and effective reading interventions that would be most beneficial to these students.

Instructional Leaders

Add two instructional leaders in the areas of English Language Arts and Math. These two leaders will drive curriculum in classrooms. They will spend their entire day in classrooms coaching, monitoring implementation of new curriculum units within the frame of our instructional vision and working with teachers to improve instruction through providing resources and embedded professional development and feedback.

These two positions will work closely with administration and the Leadership Team to move the school forward in this journey to excellence.

Instructional Para-Educators

Add four instructional Para-educators to work under the direction of the instructional leaders and teachers in grades 3-5 in implementing Daily 5 Reading and Daily 3 Math structures.

Social Emotional system of support

As we evolve our turnaround plan to achieve higher standards, expectations, and increased accountability we must include a comprehensive focus on addressing barriers to student learning. This process finds support in an extensive body of research. We aim to make use of the value in schools, families, and communities working together to provide supportive programs and services that enable students to learn and teachers to teach. We hope to improve attendance, fewer behavior problems, improved inter-personal skills, enhanced achievement, and increased bonding at school and at home.

Specific Focus

With far less than 80% of our students proficient, it is time to design a plan for rapid improvement by making cultural changes to "how we do things" at Fairgrounds Elementary School.

Essential Question: How do we make Fairgrounds Elementary a school where students and staff believe our students are on track to be well prepared for college, careers and productive members of society?

The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

The Nashua School District will support the Transformation Plan put forth by the Fairgrounds Leadership team and will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. The Nashua School district 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 monitoring.

LEA's with school(s) receiving SIG funds will sign an assurance that they will commit any State and Local funds to the school(s) and those resources will be aligned to the selected intervention model. This will be monitored through budget checks during onsite visits and through monitoring of the LEA's online grants management system housed at the NHDOE.

(2) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

- Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or 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.
- 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.
- 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.

(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. LEA's 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.

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.

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 multiplie 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:

LEA _____ Budget

School Name	Year I Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Fairgrounds Elementary	$3099	$230,260.08	$234,640.00	$188,413.25	$656,412.25
LEA-level Activities					
Total Budget	**$233,359.08**		**$234,640.00**	**$188,413.25**	**$656,412.25**

See LEA page 23 Three Year Budget Plan Template and LEA page 24 One Year School Budget Template.

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 *Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.*	Stipends for select planning members $1,250 5 Writers @$25/hour x 10 hrs= **$1,250** $65 per substitute for teacher planning members 3@$65= **$195**	A.6 School Social Worker Estimated Salary: $48,000 FICA: $3,672 NH Retirement: $6,796.80 Family HMO Plan: $18,360 Dental: $1,915.44 Life Insurance: $250 Total: **$79,994.24**	School Social Worker Estimated Salary: $48,000 FICA: $3,672 NH Retirement: $6,796.80 Family HMO Plan: $18,360 Dental: $1,915.44 Life Insurance: $250 Total: **$79,994.24**	School Social Worker Estimated Salary: $48,000 FICA: $3,672 NH Retirement: $6,796.80 Family HMO Plan: $18,360 Dental: $1,915.44 Life Insurance: $250 Total: **$79,994.24**	$81,439.24	$79,994.24	$79,994.24
Contracted Services *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*	Maryclare Heffernan: Consultant from SERESC:15 hours @$100per hour Total: **$1500**	A.1 Mathematician in Residence with Mahesh Sharma Once Day per month for a total of 10 days @ $2500 per day= $25,000 Travel/expenses 10 days @250 per trip= $2500	Leader in Me: *The Leader in Me* is a whole-school transformation model based on *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People®*, **$40,000** Mathematician in Residence	Leader in Me: *The Leader in Me* is a whole-school transformation model based on *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People®*, **$10,000** Mathematician in Residence	$47,000	**$66,750**	**$36,750**

		Total Cost for year: **$27,500** A2. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in English Language Arts. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 3 days= **$3000** A3. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in formative assessment and feedback. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 10 days= **$10,000** A7. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development to enhance teacher capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development. Estimated cost of **$5,000**	with Mahesh Sharma Five days @ $2500 per day= $12,500 Travel/expenses 5 days @250 per trip= $1250 Total Cost for year: **$13,750** A2. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in English Language Arts. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 3 days= **$3000** A3. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in formative assessment and feedback. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 5 days= **$5,000** A6. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide	with Mahesh Sharma Five days @ $2500 per day= $12,500 Travel/expenses 5 days @250 per trip= $1250 Total Cost for year: **$13,750** A2. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in English Language Arts. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 3 days= **$3000** A3. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in formative assessment and feedback. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 5 days= **$5,000** A6. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide			

			embedded professional development to enhance teacher capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development. Estimated cost of **$5,000**	embedded professional development to enhance teacher capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development. Estimated cost of **$5,000**			
Supplies and Materials *Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.*	Chart paper, writing utensils, notebooks **$55**	A4. i-Ready Instructional Model $26 per student for math and $26 per student for reading. Approximately 550 students = **$28,600** A4. $400 per teacher to invest in blended learning resources to enhance student engagement in classroom as approved by Leadership Team Overview Committee. 27 teachers @$400= **$10,800**	i-Ready Instructional Model $26 per student for math and $26 per student for reading. Approximately 550 students = **$28,600** A4. $400 per teacher to invest in blended learning resources. 27 teachers @$400= **$10,800**	i-Ready Instructional Model $26 per student for math and $26 per student for reading. Approximately 550 students = **$28,600** A4. $400 per teacher to invest in blended learning resources. 27 teachers @$400= **$10,800**	$39,455	**$39,400**	**$39,400**
Books *Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.*	**N/A**	A8.School-wide Book Study on Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind: Practical Strategies for	Professional literature to be used for book studies aligned to our goals	Professional literature to be used for book studies aligned to our goals	**$1610**	**$500**	**$500**

		Raising Achievement, by Eric Jensen 70 copies @$23.00= **$1,610**	**$500**	**$500**			
Equipment *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.*	N/A	A5. 12 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors 12 @1799= $21,588 Installation= $6000 Document Cameras: 12@$651=$7,812 **Total $35,400** These support plan to enhance core curriculum instruction and student engagement opportunities through blended learning. (See Justification Sheet in Appendix F)	10 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors 10@1799= $17,990 Installation= $5000 Document Cameras: 10@$651= $$6,510 **Total $29,500** These support plan to enhance core curriculum instruction and student engagement opportunities through blended learning. (See Justification Sheet in Appendix F)	5 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors 5@1799= $8,995 Installation= $2500 Document Cameras: 5@$651= $3,255 **Total $14,750** These support plan to enhance core curriculum instruction and student engagement opportunities through blended learning. (See Justification Sheet in Appendix F)	**$35,400**	**$29,500**	**$14,750**
Professional Development Activities *Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.* *A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form*	N/A	A2. Registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional	A2. Registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional	A2. Registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional	**$14,500**	**$4,500**	**$4500**

LEA (Appendix E) must be completed		leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$2,500** A3. Costs associated with registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$2,000** A9 All-inclusive cost of Instructional Rounds program **$10,000**	leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$2,500** A3. Costs associated with registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$2,000**	leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$2,500** A3. Costs associated with registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$2,000**			
Travel *Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.*	N/A	A2. Costs associated with travel, lodging, and for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$3,500** A3. Costs associated with	A2. Costs associated with travel, lodging, and for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$3,500**	A2. Costs associated with travel, lodging, and for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$3,500**	$6,500	**$6,500**	**$6500**

		travel, lodging, and registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$3,000**	A3 Costs associated with travel, lodging, and registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$3,000**	A3 Costs associated with travel, lodging, and registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$3,000**			
Administration *Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.*	N/A	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indirect Costs	**$99**	**$7355.84**	**$7,495.76**	**$6019.01**	**$7454.84**	**$7,495.76**	**$6019.01**
Total	**$3099**	**$230,260.08**	**$234,640.00**	**$188,413.25**	**$233,359.08**	**$234,640.00**	**$188,413.25**

(Complete one per school)

ONE YEAR DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE 2014-2015

(Please complete one per school)

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: _____Fairgrounds Elementary School_____

Account Category	Budget Detail		
	Narrative	**Pre-Implementation Costs**	**Total Costs**
Salaries and Benefits *Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.*	A.6 School Social Worker This position will be crucial in creating a tiered system of social and emotional support for our students. He/she will facilitate weekly Wellness Team meetings and monthly Wrap Around meetings, serve as a liaison between Greater Nashua Community Health Center (and other service providers as identified later) and the school, and work to create protocols to sustain our work for the future. Estimated Salary: School Social Worker Estimated Salary: $48,000 FICA: $3,672 NH Retirement: $6,796.80	Stipends for select planning members $1,250 5 Writers @$25/hour x 10 hrs= **$1,250** $65 per substitute for teacher planning members 3@$65= **$195**	$81,439.24

	Family HMO Plan: $18,360 Dental: $1,915.44 Life Insurance: $250 Total: **$79,994.24**		
Contracted Services *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*	A.1 Mathematician in Residence with Mahesh Sharma Once Day per month for a total of 10 days @ $2500 per day= $25,000 Travel/expenses 10 days @250 per trip= $2500 Total Cost for year: **$27,500** A2. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in English Language Arts. Cost estimated at $1000 per day for 3 days= **$3000** A3. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development in formative assessment and feedback. Cost	Maryclare Heffernan: Consultant from SERESC:15 hours @$100per hour Total: **$1500**	$47,000

	estimated at $1000 per day for 10 days= **$10,000** A7. Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development to enhance teacher capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development. Estimated cost of **$5,000**		
Supplies and Materials *Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.*	A4. i-Ready Instructional Model $26 per student for math and $26 per student for reading. Approximately 550 students = **$28,600** A4. $400 per teacher to invest in blended learning resources to enhance student engagement in classroom as approved by Leadership Team Overview Committee. 27 teachers @$400= **$10,800**	Chart paper, writing utensils, notebooks **$55**	$39,455
Books *Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.*	A8. School-wide Book Study on Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind: Practical Strategies for Raising Achievement, by Eric Jensen 70 copies @$23.00= **$1,610**	N/A	$1610.00
Equipment *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.*	12 Epson Bright Link 595wi Interactive Projectors 12 @1799= $21,588	N/A	$35,400

	Installation= $6000 Document Cameras: 12@$651=$7,812 **Total $35,400** These support plan to enhance core curriculum instruction and student engagement opportunities through blended learning. (See Justification Sheet in Appendix F)		
Professional Development Activities *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*	A2. Registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts. **$2,500** A3. Costs associated with registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$2,000** A9 All-inclusive cost of Instructional Rounds program **$10,000**	N/A	$14,500
Travel *Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.*	A2. Costs associated with travel, lodging, and for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Instructional leader, and selected teachers or staff in English Language Arts.	N/A	$6,500

	$3,500 A3 Costs associated with travel, lodging, and registration fees for conferences and workshops to strengthen instructional practices of Teacher Team Facilitator, Instructional coaches, and other teachers and staff selected. **$3,000**		
Administration *Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.*	N/A	N/A	$0
Indirect Costs	**$7355.84**	**$99**	**$7454.84**
Total	**$230,260.08**	**$3099.00**	**$233,359.08**

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), Nashua School District (Fairgrounds Elementary), 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) .

Mark [illegible] — 6/2/2014

Superintendent's signature — **Date signed**

[illegible] — 2 June 2014

School Board Chair — **Date signed**

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

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

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

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

WAIVERS:

The NH DOE has requested that waivers be granted by the US ED regarding requirements to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, please indicate below (by checking the appropriate boxes which of those waivers you intend to implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

☐ Waiver 4: School Improvement timeline waiver -- waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their priority Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014-2015 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

☐ Waiver 5: School wide program waiver – to waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a school wide program in a priority Title I participating school that does not met the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

LEA Appendix A and B: **Process to Determine School Eligibility for the School Improvement Grant**

And

List of Priority Schools

http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/priority-focus/priority-schools.htm

LEA Appendix C: Baseline School Data Profile

School Name:			
	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.	68,190	68,190	
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	• Summer school • Homework Club before school • ELL Homework Club after school	• Summer school • Homework Club before school • ELL Homework Club after school	
The number of school days during the school year (plus summer, if applicable, if part of implementing the restart, transformation		• 180 days for all students	

or turnaround model) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students could have attended school during the regular school year;		• **16 additional summer school days for approx. 65 students in need of additional learning time**	
Student dropout rate	**N/A**	**N/A**	
Student attendance rate	**94.69**	**94.075 (as of May 28, 2014)**	
The number of students who completed advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics);	**N/A**	**N/A**	
The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;	**N/A**	**N/A**	
The number of students who complete advance coursework AND complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;	**N/A**	**N/A**	
Number of discipline incidents	**369**	**93**	
Number of truant students	**59**	**64 as of May 28, 2014**	

The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days;	**Not calculated**	**Not Calculated (Will complete for baseline data)**	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;	**ELA –** 99% - All 100% - IEP 100% - SES 92% - LEP **Math –** 100% - All 100% - IEP 100% - SES 100% LEP	Not calculated at this time.	
Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system	Nashua does not have an overall rating system but is working on one beginning with the 2015-2016 school-year.	Nashua does not have an overall rating system but is working on one beginning with the 2015-2016 school-year	
Teacher attendance rate	**Not calculated** **(will work on this for baseline data)**	**Not calculated (will work on this for baseline data)**	

LEA 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	☐ **Poor** ☐ **Satisfactory** **X 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	☐ **Poor** ☐ **Satisfactory** **X 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	☐ **Poor** ☐ **Satisfactory** ☐ **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.	☐ **Poor** ☐ **Satisfactory** **X 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.	☐ **Poor** ☐ **Satisfactory** **X 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.	☐ **Poor** ☐ **Satisfactory** **X 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.				

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. **Description of Activity**
   Institute a Mathematician in Residence to provide greater access for students to more meaningful mathematics thinking and learning in more relevant and efficient ways resulting in higher achievement and lasting impact.

2. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:**
   The work done will help strengthen and improve Core instruction and teacher effectiveness through an embedded professional development and coaching model. The Mathematician in Residence will not only coach our teachers, but will provide focused coaching to our Math Instructional leader to promote a sustainable coaching model.

   Work will be done to align curriculum and accelerate student growth in mathematics in order to close achievement gaps for our learners.

3. **Name of Contractor**:
   Mahesh Sharma

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

Mahesh Sharma

Mathematics for All

Center for Teaching/Learning of Mathematics

Professor Mahesh Sharma is the founder and President of the Center for Teaching/Learning of Mathematics, Inc., of Wellesley and Framingham, Massachusetts, and Berkshire Mathematics in England. Berkshire Mathematics facilitates his work in the UK and Europe.

He is the former President and Professor of Mathematics Education at Cambridge College, where for more than thirty-five years, he taught mathematics and mathematics education to undergraduate and graduate students.

He is internationally known for his groundbreaking work in helping understand mathematics learning problems and their diagnosis and remediation, particularly dyscalculia and other specific learning disabilities in mathematics. He is an author, teacher and teacher-trainer, researcher, consultant to public and private schools, as well as a public lecturer.

Professor Sharma was the Chief Editor and Publisher of *Focus on Learning Problems in Mathematics*, an international, interdisciplinary research journal with readership in more than 90

countries, and the Editor of *The Math Notebook*, a practical source of information for parents and teachers devoted to improving teaching and learning for all children.

Professor Sharma provides direct services of evaluation and tutoring for students (children as well as adults) who have learning disabilities such as dyscalculia or face difficulties in learning mathematics.

He works with teachers and school administrators in US, Europe and Asia to design strategies to improve mathematics curriculum and instruction for all.

He has been helping many school systems, throughout the USA, to effectively implement the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics (CCSSM).

Contact Information

Mahesh C. Sharma

Mahesh@mathematicsforall.org

508 877 4089 (H) 508 494 4608 (C) 508 788 3600 (F)

Center for Teaching/Learning of Mathematics

754 Old Connecticut Path

Framingham, MA 01701

info@mathematicsforall.org

www.mathematicsforall.org

Budget: (*Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).*

Mathematician in Residence with Mahesh Sharma

Year 1:

Once Day per month for a total of 10 days @ $2500 per day=

$25,000

Travel/expenses

10 days @250 per trip= $2500

Total Cost for year: **$27,500**

Year 2

Five days @ $2500 per day=

$12,500

Travel/expenses

5 days @250 per trip= $1250

Total Cost for year: **$13,750**

Year 3:

Five days @ $2500 per day=

$12,500

Travel/expenses

5 days @250 per trip= $1250

Total Cost for year: **$13,750**

Total: $55,000 over three years

5. **Beginning Date**: August 2014 **Ending Date**: June 2017

6. **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.*)
   There will be three components of this service:
   1. Align Curriculum
   2. Model Lessons
   3. Demonstrate in classrooms
      a. Planning
      b. Lesson Observation
      c. Debrief

Mahesh will deliver workshops, meet with teams, and provide training to our instructional coaches to sustain his work through embedded feedback and support.

7. **Participants:** All coaches, administrators, teachers and instructional staff

8. **Evaluation Process**: *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)*

Student growth goals will be met in mathematics as demonstrated on i-Ready diagnostic testing, observations from principals and instructional leaders will support implementation of new mathematical best practices.

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. **Description of Activity:**

Contract with an established ELA training consultant(s) (E.g. Shannon Harken, SERESC) to provide ongoing PD and support to all instructional staff in implementation of the Common Core State Standards through an RTI framework.

2. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:**
The consultant will work to strengthen the three main objectives below in order to build a sustainable network of best practices with embedded feedback and support within an RTI framework.

   - Development of a school-wide system of specific targeted feedback to teachers, staff, and students will be utilized to improve teaching and learning

   - Support from the newly hired ELA and Math Instructional Leaders to strengthen and improve Core instruction and teacher effectiveness through an embedded professional development and coaching model.

   - Development of a school-wide system of specific targeted feedback to teachers, staff, and students will be utilized to improve teaching and learning.

3. **Name of Contractor**:
To be determined after further inquiry by the school leadership team.

4. **Qualifications of Contractor**: *(Attach a resume in lieu of a narrative)*:
To be identified after contractor is selected

5. **Budget**: (*Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* Three days @ approximately $1,000=$3,000

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.*) Professional development and coaching in effective core instructional strategies and curriculum alignment in English Language Arts.

8. **Participants:** All instructional staff and administrators

9. **Evaluation Process**: *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)* Growth goals will be met in reading as demonstrated on i-Ready diagnostic testing, observations from principals and instructional leaders will support implementation of new ELA best practices.

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. **Description of Activity:**

Provide training and support in the use of formative assessment and feedback practices to inform instructional decisions. Contract with established Formative Assessment specialist (E.g. WestEd, SERESC, Dr. Greenleaf) to provide ongoing PD and support.

2. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:**
   The consultant will work to strengthen the main objective below in order to build a sustainable network of best practices with embedded feedback and support.

   - Development of a school-wide system of specific targeted feedback to teachers, staff, and students will be utilized to improve teaching and learning.

3. **Name of Contractor**:
   To be determined after further inquiry by the school leadership team.

4. **Qualifications of Contractor**: *(Attach a resume in lieu of a narrative)*:
   To be identified after contractor is selected

5. **Budget**: (*Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* Ten days @ approximately $1,000=$10,000

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*.) Professional development and coaching in effective creation of formative assessment and feedback.

8. **Participants:** All instructional staff and administrators

9. **Evaluation Process**: *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)* Growth goals will be met in reading and mathematics as demonstrated on i-Ready diagnostic testing, observations from principals and instructional leaders will support implementation of formative assessment and feedback practices.

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. **Description of Activity:**
Contracted Services with Consultant to provide embedded professional development to enhance teacher capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development

2. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:**
The consultant will work to strengthen the main objective below in order to build a sustainable network of best practices with embedded feedback and support.

   - Development of a comprehensive student support component for addressing social/emotional and behavioral barriers to learning

3. **Name of Contractor**:
To be determined after further inquiry by the school leadership team.

4. **Qualifications of Contractor**: *(Attach a resume in lieu of a narrative):*
To be identified after contractor is selected

5. **Budget**: (*Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* Estimated cost: $5,000 per year

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.*) Professional development to enhance teacher and staff capacity in fostering social/emotional, intellectual, and behavioral development.

8. **Participants:** All staff and administrators

9. **Evaluation Process**: *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)*
We will meet established goals in reducing discipline referrals and goals set after conducting staff and student surveys.

LEA Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form

Item Description:

Utra-short-throw BrightLink 595Wi is the world's first 3LCD, touch-enabled interactive projector

Number to be purchased:	Approximate cost per item:	Total Cost:
2014-2015: 12 2015-2016:10 2016-2017: 5	$1799 per set up plus installation estimated at $500 per unit	2014-2015: $27,588 2015-2016: $22,990 2016-2017: $11,495

Location:
Where will the equipment be used?
In every classroom in the school

Purpose:
Detail the following:

- **How will it support the program?**

To shift instructional practices to a blended model moving away from textbook and program based instruction to a new model of accessing curriculum and information from a variety of sources to a 21st Century interactive model of learning.

- **Who will use it?**

All teachers, students, and staff

- How many students/staff will use it?
  Every student in the building, or roughly 550

Reasonableness:

- Justify the need

Interactive projectors develop thinking and learning skills that are appropriate for the 21st century. The school, part of whose task is to prepare the younger generation for the future, needs to recognize the world of these young children today and to know what will be required of them as they grow up. Among its responsibilities, the school has to develop in its students the skills that will be required of them in order to succeed to cope with the challenges that await them as they grow up.

Most of our students are not efficient on the computers because they do not have the access to them as much as we would like to give them. Updated technology is much needed to keep the students engaged in the learning process.

Interactive projects will improve learning processes, specifically where the integration between the teacher's instruction style and the Interactive projector's potential enables meaningful instruction. They will enhance motivation to learn, raise the level of concentration, improve behavior, and enhance learning because it is "fun" and innovative.

Students who learn with the interactive projector will be more attentive and engaged in learning, participate more actively in the classroom and interact much more with their teachers, their peers, and even the interactive whiteboard. They serve as significant motivational tools for students, and facilitate students' desire to remain on task.

Learning with an interactive projector will develop autonomy through self-competence. Skilled teachers create knowledge together with students in dynamic process during the lesson as they develop ideas, engage in critical thinking and joint ownership of knowledge. This technology will support collaborative learning which prepares students for future success developing social skills, facilitating information retention, improving the learning experience and enhances creativity.

An interactive projector will enable the immediate collection and analysis of student work in ways not previously possible, contributing to communication skills and cooperation. This modern methodology will allow teachers to bring various perspectives from the outside world into the classroom creating an authentic more relevant connection to their students.

Interactive projectors will support educators to develop strategies and tools that will reach students with unique or diverse learning needs. Student achievement will be significant. It will positively influence the students' ability to understand complex concepts. The presentation will aid students who have difficulty developing mental images of complicated concepts using sight, hearing and touch.

- creating flexible learning environments
- establishing student collaboration
- integrating technology into varied learning spaces
- student achievement
- student absenteeism
- discipline referrals
- teacher effectiveness
- teacher efficiency

- Explain how it is not otherwise available through the district.

The District has stopped awarding internal grants to teachers to enhance their classrooms and has no plans to fund projectors or interactive whiteboards as they are focused solely on making technological infrastructure changes and investments to meet the needs of Smarter Balanced Assessment.

Storage:
Where will the equipment be located/stored

These are mounted to the wall and will be secured in the classrooms.
Inventory and Tracking: Identify the person responsible the following: Entering equipment on Title I Equipment Inventory Report Technology Integrator Tracking equipment if moved from above location Technology Integrator Signing equipment in and out if equipment is approved for student use N/A Storing equipment over the summer N/A

Item Description:

SAM CAM 860 Document Camera

Number to be purchased:	Approximate cost per item:	Total Cost:
2014-2015: 12	$651	2014-2015: $7,812
2015-2016:10		2015-2016: $6,510
2016-2017: 5		2016-2017: $3,255

Location:
Where will the equipment be used?
In every classroom in the school

Purpose:
Detail the following:

- **How will it support the program?**

To shift instructional practices to a blended model moving away from textbook and program based instruction to a new model of accessing curriculum and information from a variety of sources to a 21st Century interactive model of learning. New District curriculum units and the Ongoing Assessment Program (OGAP), strongly recommend the use of document cameras to enhance modeling by teachers and students.

- **Who will use it?**

All teachers, students, and staff

- How many students/staff will use it?
  Every student in the building, or roughly 550

Reasonableness:

- Justify the need

In cooperation with the Interactive Projectors, teachers will be able to display student work, manipulatives, or a variety of materials for real time, authentic learning experiences.

- Explain how it is not otherwise available through the district.

The District has focused technology upgrades on Smarter Balanced Assessment infrastructure and operating budgets cannot afford these valuable tools.

Storage: Where will the equipment be located/stored It will be located in classrooms and locked up each evening.
Inventory and Tracking: Identify the person responsible the following: Entering equipment on Title I Equipment Inventory Report Technology Integrator Tracking equipment if moved from above location Technology Integrator Signing equipment in and out if equipment is approved for student use N/A Storing equipment over the summer: we have a secure area that we lock all computer equipment in for the summer.

LEA Appendix G: **Application Scoring Rubrics**

New Hampshire Department of Education
1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)
District Scoring Rubric
Priority schools only. 2014-2015

SAU#: _____ **District Name:** _____

Total # of Schools Applying: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

District/School Score _____ **DATE** _____

Directions: Circle the appropriate point values and total each column	Information Not Provided	Lacks Sufficient Information	Marginal: requires clarification	Good: clear &complete; all areas addressed	Exemplary: well-conceived &thoroughly developed	Reader Comments
1) LEA has submitted a completed district cover page and listed the names and titles of SIG coordinator and committee members.	0	0	0	1	2	
A - Schools to be served:						
1) The name(s) of all schools in the SAU applying for funds was provided and all fields were completely filled in.	0	0	0	0	0	
B - Descriptive Information – Evidence of each Priority School						

1) The needs assessment adequately addressed all areas on the *Needs Assessment Review Feedback Rubric* and the *Baseline School Data Profile 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.	**0**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**6**	
2) Consider LEA's self-assessment on the LEA Capacity Rubric (SEA application-Appendix D-must receive score of 20 or higher). **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.** **Base rating on measurements from the Intervention & Budget Alignment Rubric in the SEA application-*Appendix E* .**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**6**	
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).	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	

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: • 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. Base rating on measurements from the Commitment to Assurances Rubric in the SEA application-*Appendix F*	0	1	2	4	6	
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.	0	1	2	4	6	
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.	0	1	2	4	6	
9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	

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.	0	1	2	4	6	
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.	0	1	2	4	6	
Action Plan **Year 1 Action Plan is complete including:** • **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** **The model chosen is clearly connected to the activities chosen in the Action Plan.**	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). *Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.*	**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**	