

New Hampshire Department of Education



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
**American Recovery
and Reinvestment Act**



School Improvement Grant
Local Education Agency 2011 Application

Title I, Part A Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Intent to Apply Due: April 1, 2011
Full Application Due: May 12, 2011

***New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire, 03301
Attn: Kristine Braman***

NH LEA Application Table of Contents:

Cover Page LEA -1
NH LEA Application Table of Contents.....LEA -2
General Grant InformationLEA -3-4
SIG LEA Application ProcessLEA -4-6
School Eligibility LEA -7
SIG School Model Description.....LEA -7-10
Intent to Apply/Planning Grant Application.....LEA -11-12
LEA Application Cover Page LEA -13
Section A: Schools to be Served..... LEA -14
Section B: Descriptive Information/Evidence of CommitmentLEA -14-16
 Action Plan Template LEA -17
Section C: Budget..... LEA -18
 Three Year Budget Plan Template..... LEA -19
 One Year School Budget Narrative Template..... LEA -20
Section D: Assurances LEA -21-22
Section E: Waivers..... LEA -23
LEA Appendix A: Process to Determine School Eligibility for SIG .LEA -24-36
LEA Appendix B: NH's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools Definition LEA-37-38
LEA Appendix C: Baseline School Data ProfileLEA -39-40
LEA Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric.....LEA -41
LEA Appendix E: Professional Dev. & Contracted Service Justification Form LEA -
42
LEA Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form LEA -43
LEA Appendix G: Application Scoring RubricLEA -44-55

Purpose of the School Improvement Grant

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring 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 their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible 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. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("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.

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 Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school;
- serve each Tier I school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity (which may be due, in part, to serving Tier II schools) to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each Tier I school, in which case the LEA must indicate the Tier I schools that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a Tier I or Tier II school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements.
- budget for each Tier I and Tier II 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 Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III 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;
- be an LEA in which one or more Tier I schools are located and that does not apply to serve at least one of these schools may not apply for a grant to serve only Tier III schools.
- 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>

School Improvement Grant LEA Application Process

The NH DOE has developed an LEA application form that will be used to make subgrants 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 and II schools, as noted in the final regulations for the grant by the US Department of Education.

LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

April 1 DOE	LEA intent to apply and planning grant request due to the NH
April 8	NH DOE review and approval of LEA planning grants
May 12	Complete LEA application due to the NH DOE
May 16-June 10 by June 15	Three step application review LEA grants awarded by the NH DOE

Application Submission Information

Paperwork Required:

LEAs submitting with Tier I and Tier II 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 April 1st
- Submit a complete application electronically to kbraman@ed.state.nh.us and one hard copy to the NH DOE office (address below)

LEAs submitting with Tier III school only-

- Submit an intent to apply (page LEA-11) by April 1st.
- Submit a complete application electronically to kbraman@ed.state.nh.us and one hard copy to the NH DOE office (address below)

Format:

- 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 April 1, 2011.
- Complete grant applications must be received at the NH DOE by 4:00 pm no later than May 12, 2011.

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

***New Hampshire Department of Education
Attn: Kristine Braman
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301***

Additionally, electronic copies should be sent to: kbraman@ed.state.nh.us

Eligible LEAs/Schools

The US ED guidance required NH DOE to identify the NH “persistently lowest-achieving schools”, based on results over time on each school’s assessment results in Reading and Math combined for the “All Students” group. In accordance with the US ED SIG guidance, each NH school’s annual Reading and Math index score for the “All Students” group was combined, with a cumulative score produced for each year of available data (assessment years 2006-2009 for elementary /middle schools, assessment years 2007-2009 for high schools). See *LEA Appendix A* for an overview of the school selection process.

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 Tier I and Tier II Schools

Tier I and Tier II 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;
- 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, 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 schoolwide "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.

Questions

Questions may be directed to:

Kathryn "Joey" Nichol at knichol@ed.state.nh.us or 603-271-6087

Stephanie Lafreniere at stephanie.lafreniere@ed.state.nh.us or 603-271-5062.

**Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2011 Intent to Apply & Planning Grant
Application**

LEA/District: Manchester School District

SAU#: 37

Superintendent Name: Thomas J. Brennan, Jr., Ed.D.

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	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	Planning to Apply
Middle School at Parkside	√			√

District Mailing Address: 195 McGregor Street, Manchester, NH 03102

**Phone: 603-624-6300 Fax: 603-624-6337 E-Mail: tbrennan@mansd.org
x113**

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

Mailing Address (if different from above):

**Phone: 603-624-6300 Fax: 603-623-5283 E-Mail: lwitte@mansd.org
x164**

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	Group representing (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Tom Brennan	Manchester School District
Michael Tursi	Manchester School District Curriculum and Instruction
Lisa Witte	Manchester School District Federal Projects
Heidi Boyle	Manchester School District Middle School Math Integration
Ginny Mahan	Manchester School District Grant Writer
Andrea Somoza-Norton	Parkside Principal
Peter Adamakos	Parkside Math Teacher
Maureen Barber	Parkside Science Teacher
Nick Coler	Parkside Special Education Teacher
Patricia Cornell	Parkside Guidance Teacher
Jennifer Harrises	Parkside Special Education Teacher
James Malone	Parkside Unified Arts Teacher
Alisha Proulx	Parkside Language Arts Teacher
Robin Tafe	Parkside Media Specialist
Tim Brockway	Parkside Parent Teacher Group President

**Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2011
Planning Grant Template**

Planning funds (\$3,000) are available for any LEA that has at least one Tier I or Tier II eligible 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
Interview Parkside school community stakeholders to determine readiness to implement a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant	<i>Lisa Witte</i>	Determine whether Parkside school community is ready to apply for and implement a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant	April 1, 2011	April 8, 2011	\$3,000 for stipends and corresponding benefits for interviewers and refreshments for interviewees

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2011

LEA Application

SAU#:37 District Name: Manchester

Superintendent: Thomas J. Brennan, Jr., Ed.D.

Address: 195 McGregor Street

City: Manchester Zip: 03102 Tel: 603-624-6300 x113

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

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

Name: Lisa Witte

Address: 195 McGregor Street

City: Manchester Zip: 03102 Tel: 603-624-6300 x164

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

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	Group representing (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Tom Brennan	Manchester School District
Michael Tursi	Manchester School District Curriculum and Instruction
Lisa Witte	Manchester School District Federal Projects
Heidi Boyle	Manchester School District Middle School Math Integration
Ginny Mahan	Manchester School District Grant Writer
Andrea Somoza-Norton	Parkside Principal
Peter Adamakos	Parkside Math Teacher
Maureen Barber	Parkside Science Teacher
Nick Coler	Parkside Special Education Teacher
Patricia Cornell	Parkside Guidance Teacher
Jennifer Harris	Parkside Special Education Teacher
James Malone	Parkside Unified Arts Teacher
Alisha Proulx	Parkside Language Arts Teacher
Robin Tafe	Parkside Media Specialist
Tim Brockway	Parkside Parent Teacher Group President

**SCHO
OLS
TO BE
SERV
ED**

Compl
ete the
grid
below
for
each
school
your

LEA is committing to serve with a School Improvement Grant and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	Transformation
Middle School at Parkside	21525	√						√

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

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION/EVIDENCE OF COMMITMENT:

- 1) a. Describe the results of the needs assessment conducted for each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA proposes to serve, and the relationship of those results to the selection of the Intervention Model indicated above. Make sure to complete and submit the Baseline School Data Profile form in *LEA Appendix C*

Parkside’s leadership team has been meeting monthly since September 2010. They have identified a number of needs:

1. Parkside shares an SAP counselor with Hillside. She can’t meet the current needs. The school would greatly benefit from another social worker or SAP counselor to work with high-risk students.
2. There are a number of at-risk students who have difficulty focusing and learning, which results in disruptive behavior especially lower-level classes, taking learning time away from other students. Previously, the school had an alternative learning program that provided an alternative learning environment for those students, , providing all teachers and students with more learning time, and giving the high-risk students the academic and social help needed to help them so they were able to return to the mainstream classes and succeed.
3. Parkside has a highly transient population. It is not uncommon for a student to transfer out of Parkside, wait a month, transfer into another middle school, and then return. Those students need the social support of a social worker and the academic interventions to support their success.
4. Raw resources to address the following needs:
 - There are students with reading levels below Grade 3. Need interventions (tutoring, online) for reading basics (decoding [some don’t know phonemes], comprehension).
 - Math support. The Everyday Math curriculum in Manchester ends after Grade 5. Some math teachers need additional support to be more effective in the classroom. A new middle school math curriculum (Holt McDougal) was implemented in the district in 2010-11. More professional development is needed. Need more manipulatives.
 - Old computers with many different operating systems and versions. Need updated computers and related technology.

- Space. If teachers or other staff members want to work with a small group, there might not be a room or closet available. However, not all classrooms are used all the time.
 - Class sizes: many lower-level classes are large while higher-level classes are smaller.
5. Parent involvement. The most involved parents are those in Grade 6, after that it drops off considerably. Need to keep parents engaged. How do you reach those parents of the most at-risk students? A sixth grade parents harvest dinner is planned for the fall. Overall, parental involvement is lacking.
6. Transportation so students can stay after school Because Parkside serves not only a large geographic area, but also many immigrant and refugees families. The free- and reduced lunch rate is almost 70 (May 6, 2011). Consequently, many students rely on the school bus to get home and cannot participate in afterschool activities. By providing that transportation, more students will be able to participate in academic, athletics, and enrichment activities after school.

Transformation Model

Parkside Middle School will be using the Transformation Model and is addressing the required components as shown on the following table:

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
I. Develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness:		
A. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.		<p>Current principal assumed leadership position in 2010 and has been leading a school-wide reform effort. Her experience includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Doctoral Student--Dissertation Process (Ed.D in Leadership in Schooling) * Bilingual: English-Spanish (other languages: Portuguese and Italian). * Data analysis, budgeting, scheduling, grant and request for proposal (RFPs) writing experience. * Research and implementation of professional development programs such as differentiated instruction, educational technology (A+ Hardware, computer applications, database design and web-design, online gradebook

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
		<p>programs) and classroom management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Attended numerous workshops and conferences related to teaching, learning, curriculum and instruction, professional learning communities, supervision and school leadership. * Mentor for new teachers (S.T.A.R.T Program- Support, Train and Retain Teachers). * International Baccalaureate (IB) Teacher, Advanced Placement (AP) Teacher. * Knowledge of Baldrige System for Performance Excellence and Response to Intervention (RTI) programs. * NH World Languages Committee Member- Committee wrote the current WL standards for the state of NH. * Attended The Future of Learning- Harvard Project Zero Summer Institute (Dr. Howard Gardner & Dr. David Perkins) * NEASC Committee member visit in MA. * Understand and utilize Cohesive, Adaptive and Transformational Leadership approaches. <p>She has been using evidence checklists to conduct classroom walkthroughs and is a member of a district committee to review these practices. She will be retained in her position to work with staff to design and implement a transformation plan that addresses Parkside's needs.</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
<p>B. Use a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that:</p>	<p>Teacher evaluation defined in the current contractual agreement.</p> <p>New evaluation procedures under development by state as part of the Race to the Top planning; MSD is a participant in those planning efforts.</p> <p>Need to share findings with all stakeholders to get their buy-in for a pilot implementation.</p> <p>Need efforts to correspond and overlap with the state conversation; that is, our representatives will participate in statewide and local evaluation and compensation teams.</p>	<p>Send Parkside teacher representatives to take part in district and state teacher evaluation committees to:</p> <p>(a) research alternative models (team is especially interested in piloting Charlotte Danielson);</p> <p>(b) Pilot the Danielson model at Parkside to determine if it is appropriate for NH and Manchester context; and</p> <p>The three-year goal will be to work with current district teams meeting to revise evaluation and compensation while piloting Danielson model. A new model will be incorporated into the next bargaining agreement.</p> <p>Plan in Year 1; pilot Year 2; revise and continue with implementation in Year 3.</p>
<p>1. 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.</p>	<p>New reward options being considered</p>	<p>As new teacher evaluation system will be developed and piloted, need to develop and pilot a reward system that aligns to the evaluation.</p> <p>Because current pd workshops and tuition reimbursement programs are limited in terms of funding, when school-wide expectations are met or exceeded, all staff will have opportunities to exceed limits of current system to participate in conferences, workshops, and PD that aligns to school's transformation implementation goals.</p>
<p>2. Are designed and developed with teacher and</p>	<p>Need to consider evaluation as an</p>	<p>Develop principal evaluation and teacher evaluation simultaneously with</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
principal involvement.	opportunity to improve performance.	representation of all stakeholders.
C. 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.	Limited district funding for tuition reimbursement, workshops, and other training	Set aside funds to reward Parkside staff for increases in achievement in Year 2 and Year 3. Rewards will be additional funding for Parkside staff to participate in college courses, workshops, conferences aligned with the goals of this school improvement grant.
D. 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.	<p>Students learning English and those with disabilities may not be receiving the same academic program as general education students.</p> <p>Need more time for professional learning.</p> <p>Unruly students disrupting classrooms</p>	<p>Offer PD on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * SIOP (sheltered instruction observation protocol) for mainstream teachers to secure strategies for teaching to ELs * Motivational incentives for urban low socio-economic areas. * AIMSweb and other assessment tools * LIPS training for multisensory reading * Understanding by Design (UbD), a design tool for curriculum, alignment, and lesson planning * PBIS for classroom management * Response to Intervention * Differentiated Learning (Tomlinson) <p>Develop new Parkside teacher orientation package to be used by Parkside teacher mentor with new</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
		Parkside teachers.
E. 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.	Currently, not an option	<p>As new teacher evaluation system is developed and piloted, we need to develop and pilot a reward system that aligns to the evaluation</p> <p>Because current pd workshops and tuition reimbursement programs are limited in terms of funding, when school-wide expectations are met or exceeded, all staff will have opportunities to exceed limits of current system to participate in conferences, workshops, and PD that aligns to school's transformation implementation goals.</p>
F. Implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as:		
1. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.	Currently, not an option	<p>Parkside staff members participate in new Parkside staff interview to make sure new Parkside staff candidates are familiar with and want to work in a school implementing the Transformation Model.</p> <p>Schoolwide (students, parents, staff) celebrations for achieving benchmarks toward goal.</p>
2. Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.	Currently, not an option	<p>Possibly build into teacher evaluation. "What professional development have you participated in and how has it affected (measurable changes) your instructional practices?"</p> <p>Build this info into data collection, analysis for Teacher Evaluation and</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
		Teacher CEJI (Claim Evidence Judgment Impact)
3. 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.	Currently, not an option	Develop new Parkside teacher orientation package. This package would be used by a Parkside mentor teacher and an assigned new teacher, whether the teacher transferred from another MSD school or is new to district and to Parkside. Both teachers will take a day or two outside the academic calendar to review the transformation model and Parkside's approach to implementation.
II. Comprehensive instructional reform strategies:		
A. 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.		Content teachers will meet monthly for vertical alignment. Grade-level teachers will meet monthly for horizontal alignment. School is in first year of implementing new Math curriculum
B. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.		Currently, AIMSweb is only used by Special Ed teachers for their students. Secure AIMSweb licenses for all staff and train staff to assess, monitor, and evaluate student performance. Also, AIMSweb would be under the Rtl umbrella. Piggyback on the work done by Manchester's other SIG schools.
C. Implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as:		

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
1. 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.		<p>Classroom walkthroughs by experts.</p> <p>Implement Instructional Rounds Model (Harvard University), practitioners working together to improve practices.</p> <p>Book: Instructional Rounds in Education</p>
2. Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model.	There are many versions of Rtl in the school. Need to select one model for all staff to implement	Contract with district Rtl expert to provide PD to staff.
3. Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals 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.	<p>Support for increased academic achievement (tutoring)</p> <p>Parkside shares a social worker, actually an SAP counselor, with Hillside. She can't meet the current needs of students. Too many needs for one less-than part-time person.</p> <p>Support for increased instructional effectiveness of teachers</p>	<p>Provide extra help (tutoring, other interventions) for students who are below grade level. This can be offered after school and during study periods.</p> <p>Hire a full-time social worker to work with students to help them address their social problems that are barriers to their academic and social success.</p> <p>Implement PD offerings to address individual and school-wide teacher deficiencies.</p> <p>Research, evaluate, and select a model to implement, such as SIOP (sheltered instruction observation protocol) to address EL' achievement gaps. Begin with Language Arts and Math, and then on to Science and Social Studies.</p>
4. Using and integrating technology-based supports		Secure interactive touch-screen devices

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
and interventions as part of the instructional program.		<p>and software licenses for the following:</p> <p>Study Island to help students master the content specified in the NH Grade Level Expectations (also aligned with NECAP)</p> <p>Study Island will also be used as an afterschool online learning program.</p> <p>Research and evaluate online reading interventions, including Read180 and Reading Plus to address Parkside’s Reading and Language Arts gaps.</p>
In secondary schools—		
<p>5. 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</p>	<p>Because Parkside serves such a large geographic area, many students rely on the school bus to get home and cannot participate in afterschool activities.</p>	<p>Invite high school teachers to teach ninth grade courses after school.</p> <p>Make interactive touch-screen devices available so students can participate in VLACS (Virtual Learning Academy Charter School) courses.</p> <p>Tutor students so they have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to participate in rigorous programs.</p> <p>Provide transportation so ALL students can stay after school. By providing that transportation, more students will be able to participate in academic, athletic, and enrichment activities after school.</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
programs and coursework;		
6. Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies.	<p>A new school makes many students anxious.</p> <p>Middle school and elementary school are different</p>	
7. 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.	<p>There are a number of unruly students who disrupt classrooms, especially lower-level classes, taking learning time away from other students.</p>	<p>Make computers available so students can participate in VLACS opportunities. (Provide tutoring for any student who does not have the reading skills to participate in VLACS.)</p> <p>Pilot high school courses taught by high school teachers (after school) for dual credit opportunities.</p>
8. Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.		<p>Use the data systems to identify at-risk students. Present opportunities to students: tutoring, afterschool online, self-paced programs so they can reconnect and return to grade level.</p>
III. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools section:		
A. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the US ED SIG guidance).	<p>Split classes are problematic and create too many distractions.</p> <p>There are students with reading levels below Grade 3.</p>	<p>Possible strategies to address need:</p> <p>1.) Schedule enrichment at alternative times per grade, could be videotaped, for example if the PTG is introducing a fundraiser.</p> <p>2.) Eliminate split classes</p> <p>Provide one-on-one tutoring, and possibly online interventions, such as Read 180 or ReadingPlus) to help students secure the knowledge and skills for reading basics (decoding [some don't</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
	<p>Only three students attained proficiency in Writing on the 2010 NECAP.</p> <p>The National Writers Project (through Plymouth State University) ends in June 2011.</p>	<p>know phonemes], comprehension).</p> <p>Contract with Plymouth to continue with the National Writers Project.</p> <p>After school opportunities (Study Island, high school courses, VLACS)</p> <p>Provide transportation so ALL students can stay after school. By providing that transportation, more students will be able to participate in academic, athletic, and enrichment activities after school.</p>
<p>B. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.</p>	<p>Parent involvement. Generally, the most involved parents are those in Grade 6, after that parent involvement drops off considerably. Need to keep parents engaged. Need to reach and positively involve parents of the most at-risk students.</p>	<p>Contract with NH PIRC to find ways to reach out and involve parents. Possibly to assist in planning and scheduling new events and training for parents. Other district SIG schools are implementing Solid Foundations.</p> <p>A sixth grade parents harvest dinner is planned for the fall.</p> <p>Offer classes (academic, parenting, etc) for parents at night.</p> <p>Possibly involve GMPDC to offer its noncredit courses to Parkside.</p>
<p>C. Implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as:</p>		
<p>1. Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local</p>	<p>Unruly students</p> <p>Many students (and teachers and parents) cannot agree on what is</p>	<p>Contract with NH PIRC to implement Solid Foundations Program.</p>

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs.	acceptable behavior. For example, what is the correct way to walk in the halls.	Work with Solid Foundations to reach out to parents and community. Enlist Solid Foundations' help in strengthening community partnerships, especially with Catholic Medical Center (CMC), to bring health education and health clinic to school for parents and students. This strategy is likely to be effective in bringing parents into the school as school, parents, and community work together to meet the social, emotional, and health needs of the students' and their parents.
2. 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.		In 2010-11, Implemented Enrichment/Rtl, similar to a high school Advisory, takes place each day from 12:50 to 1:15. In this schoolwide period, current events, character development, and other topics are discussed.
3. 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.	Unruly students	Contract with NH CEBIS to implement PBIS
4. Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.	N/A	N/A
IV. Providing operational flexibility and sustained support section:		

Transformation Model Requirement	Identified Need that it address	Strategy
A. 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.		Building principal and teams have operational flexibility to use the consultants and the PD that this SIG funds to close gaps in student achievement, for all groups.
B. 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).		Contract with the district's SIG coordinator to add additional hours to support Parkside's implementation
C. Implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as:		Contract with qualified vendors to provide instructional coaching services under the guidance of the District Curriculum Specialist (to ensure coherence with the selected core instructional programs). Coaching services will be differentiated according to teacher and student needs, and be offered with sufficient frequency (at least one day per month per grade level) to ensure rapid, transformative improvement in student achievement.

b. Describe the LEA's capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Intervention Model selected for each school. The LEA must demonstrate its capacity through the results of their completed LEA Capacity Rubric self

assessment located in *LEA Appendix D*.

For any eligible Tier I school the LEA has elected to NOT include in its application, explain the LEA's decision that it lacks the capacity to serve such school(s).

Manchester School District has a history of providing high quality academic programs to its students and professional development to its teachers to ensure students have the social, emotional and intellectual foundation to succeed in school and beyond. The opportunity offered by the SIG grant enables the District to provide the resources that will enable effective practices to become standard operating practices. The SIG grant will provide opportunities for teachers and leaders to employ best practices under the guidance of experts in instruction and leadership.

The district has made a concentrated effort to provide professional development to middle school teachers.

The capacity rubric shows the district's capacity in terms of governance and decision-making. MSD is structured in a method that allows for district level decision-making authority in regard to reform initiatives and, with this grant application, we are moving toward a methodology that allows for district and school level decision making authority in regard to reform initiatives, allowing for operational flexibility at the school level.

The Parkside principal and the principals in the current three SIG schools will have operational flexibility to set up classroom schedules to accommodate grade level professional development and teacher needs. They will also have the operational flexibility to use the consultants and the PD that this SIG funds to close gaps in student achievement, especially for the ELL and Special Ed subgroups.

We have a history of Title I schools. Our Title I audit reports revealed no findings in the fiscal area. We have 23 schools in our district. Our school improvement plans and our school-in-need-of-improvement plans have been approved by the NH Department of Education with revisions.

Although professional learning communities (PLCs) are somewhat new to our district, they are strong at all Title I schools. Through its participation in the National Writing Project (NWP) with Plymouth State University, which focuses the knowledge, expertise, and leadership of teacher' sustained efforts to improve writing and learning for all learners, Parkside teachers have been introduced to professional learning communities (PLCs). Our middle schools have PLCs for math and literacy. Our district middle school math curriculum specialist leads the Math PLCs.

MSD has a district leadership team. The team is tasked with implementing the DINI plan.

We have used Title IV funding to bring City Year New Hampshire corps members to one of our middle schools in a pilot program. Because of that pilot program's success, and because City Year NH sees the great need in Manchester, City Year NH's focus is now concentrated on five

low performing elementary schools in Manchester (2010-11). This program is funded by district funds, City of Manchester funds, and a number of other funders.

Rationale for Not Applying for All Tier I Schools

2) For any eligible Tier I school the LEA has elected to NOT include in its application, explain the LEA's decision that it lacks the capacity to serve such school(s).

Based on the need assessment done at the eligible schools, Parkside has the greatest likelihood of implementing the Transformation Model with fidelity. By focusing on Parkside Middle School, along with Southside (2010-11), we can build a proof of concept model and build on our successes and address remaining challenges before scaling up to serve the remaining Tier I schools. The current Parkside principal is in her first year. She is implementing a number of reforms consistent with the Transformation Model.

The rationale for not including all six Manchester eligible Tier I schools under the 2012 SIG program follows:

- a. Bakersville. District leaders chose not to request funding for this school because progress is being made there, evidenced through local assessment data and other measures. The district chose to give the leader and her staff an opportunity to be part of the progress for which they have been setting the foundation. Secretary Duncan made a special visit to Bakersville last summer to acknowledge the efforts of staff and the progress being made there by students, teachers, and administrators.
- b. Beech Elementary Staff are in the process of completing a restructuring planning year, and have been implementing their restructuring plan this year (2010-11). District leaders chose not to require the staff and leaders at Beech to redirect their attention to a different intervention model than what they have been working diligently to design as part of their restructuring efforts.
- c. McDonough Elementary. District leaders chose not to request funding for this school because progress is being made there, as evidenced through local assessment data and other measures. The district chose to give the leader and his staff an opportunity to be part of the progress for which they have been setting the foundation.
- d. Wilson Elementary staff are in the process of completing a restructuring planning year, and have been implementing their restructuring plan this year (2010-11). District leaders chose not to require the staff and leaders at Wilson to redirect their attention to a different intervention model than what they have been working diligently to design as part of their restructuring efforts.
- e. McLaughlin Middle School. District leaders chose not to request funding for this school because progress is being made there, as evidenced through local assessment data and other measures. The district chose to give the leader and his staff an opportunity to be part of the team that realizes the progress for which they have been setting the foundation.

While the addition of a new Assistant Superintendent has supplemented District capacity, the demands of the SIG program are substantial. The decision to add Parkside to the external SIG Coordinator contract will help to coordinate, monitor and

evaluate intervention activities for the duration of the grant period and will supplement existing District capacity, without creating a potentially unsustainable burden on district resources.

Please note: If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the NH DOE will evaluate the validity of the LEA's claim. If the NH DOE determines that an LEA has more capacity to implement an intervention model in Tier I or Tier II school than the LEA demonstrates to implement an intervention model in a given school, the NH DOE will discuss the capacity issues with the Superintendent and factor the information into the approval of the LEA application. This may lead to requiring the LEA to implement a model in the given school in order to receive approval for other schools within the LEA or rejecting an LEA application completely.

3) For each school the LEA is committed to serve, provide a brief summary that describes actions the LEA has taken, or will take to:

Parkside Middle School

- **Design and implement interventions consistent with the final SIG requirements;**

A new principal was hired for the 2010-11 school year. She has demonstrated that she has the transformation leadership skills. She has already implemented changes consistent with the Transformation model. In September 2010, she announced the formation of a school improvement team. Interested teachers completed an application form and were then interviewed. This team has been looking at gaps and analyzing their causes. There are many gaps, and many causes, but the team feels the addition of a social worker would promote the most help for students, as many have social needs that must be addressed before they can begin to tackle their academic needs.

Parkside teachers, with help from the district math integration specialist, and Plymouth State University, are using local and state assessments to identify students who need more targeted assistance to meet academic standards. SIG supplemental funds will provide more intensive PD to improve instructional practices and strengthen PLCs, which have just begun to meet over the past two years. The strategies designed to meet the identified needs are consistent with the Transformation Model as cited in the Needs Table.

According to the Fall 2010 NECAP results, only 44% of Parkside students scored proficient or higher in Reading; only 42% of Parkside students scored proficient or higher in Math; only 34% of Parkside students scored proficient or higher in Writing.

Parkside students and teachers need significant assistance in Reading. Parkside students with Reading scores below grade level will be invited to stay after school for Reading tutoring. Initially, tutoring will be conducted by district Reading teachers and Reading tutors. We will also recruit student volunteers from local colleges and universities to assist with the Reading tutoring.

Parkside students also need considerable assistance in Math. Parkside students with Math

scores below grade level will be invited to stay after school for Math tutoring. Initially, tutoring will be conducted by district Math teachers and Math tutors. We will also recruit student volunteers from local colleges and universities to assist with the Math tutoring.

- **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 record of increased student achievement as a result of proposed interventions;**

Parkside will be using the same SIG coordinator that the other three schools are using. Other interventions, including the technology consultants, the Rtl consultant, and the PBIS and Solid Foundations programs, as well as the school improvement coordinator, are all serving the current SIG schools (Gossler Park, Parker-Varney, and Southside Middle School) have been approved by the Board of School Committee.

-

- **How the LEA will align other resources with the interventions;**

Parkside has a 21st CCLC afterschool program. This program offers a homework club in addition to a number of enrichment opportunities. For many students, transportation is a barrier. Through this grant, we will offer transportation. Students will be identified for tutoring, and the online afterschool program. Parkside has a 21st CCLC afterschool program. The online afterschool program will be an extended learning opportunity for both academic intervention and enrichment. We will work with them to serve more students.

Only 34% of Parkside's eighth grade students scored Proficient or higher on the 2010 Writing NECAP. Parkside students and Language Arts teachers have been fortunate to participate in the National Writing Project (NWP), which focuses the knowledge, expertise, and leadership of teacher' sustained efforts to improve writing and learning for all learners. This program is ending in June 2011. School leaders have requested SIG funding to contract with Plymouth State University to continue progress. , although the NECAP results show

The NWP is a network of sites anchored at colleges and universities that serve teachers across disciplines and at all levels, early childhood through university. Plymouth State University (PSU) is the university working with Southside teachers on this project. The NWP provides professional development, develop resources, generate research, and act on knowledge to improve the teaching of writing and learning in schools and communities. Many Parkside teachers have taken college courses through Plymouth. Plymouth has fostered the PLCs at Southside and will continue to lead this effort. The Manchester School District has paid nothing for this service, as it is funded through a US Dept of Education grant.

We will our partnership with CMC (Catholic Medical Center), Parkside's community partner. All Rtl PD will be aligned with the district's. We will offer an advanced (dual middle and high school credit) course after school. We will use the technology to offer enrichment (Study Island or another self-paced interactive) program after school and learning (tutoring). There will also be a

new Parkside teacher mentoring program so teachers new to Parkside will be able to succeed in implementing the Transformation Model and increasing students' academic and social achievement.

- **How the LEA will modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable the school to implement the interventions fully and effectively;**

Within the past year, the Manchester School District has updated its Student Attendance Policy, Student Attendance Regulations, Student Code of Conduct, and Student (and Staff) Dress Code. Available on the district's website

(<http://www.manchesternh.gov/website/Departments/PublicSchools/Administration/tabid/1705/Default.aspx/>)

The student attendance policy is aligned with RSA 189-a (on Truancy); that is, twenty half days of unexcused absence during a school year shall constitute habitual truancy.

The Student Code of Conduct is clear in communication on school stakeholder responsibilities (students, parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, and Board of School Committee. Topics include safe and orderly educational environment, attendance, dress and grooming, discipline and student conduct, free speech/expression. Pupil safety and violence prevention. The communication is concise and clear. As attendance and discipline are two performance indicators on which we will chart progress, the district's new policies should support. In addition, the district has also revised the DINI Plan and the Professional Development Master Plan. Both plans were revised with a long-term view toward school reform.

- **How the LEA and school will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

This SIG plan is a change management plan. The Transformation Model is a change management plan. With changes in leadership, changes in policies and procedures, strengthening and growing community partnerships, and changes in how instruction is delivered over a three-year period, we can transform the school to a model that has the operational flexibility to adapt to the educational needs of the students and their parents. Adapting practices to the educational and social needs of the students will become the standard operating practice. PBIS will provide the model for a safe school climate where all students can learn. Implementing differentiated instruction strategies and response to intervention strategies will enable staff to adapt instruction to serve the needs of our varied student populations. The Solid Foundation training and support will assist school staff in communicating to parents the need for them to be involved in their children's education. It will also guide parents to be more involved with the children's academic and social needs. All these strategies are self-sustaining.

The professional development that current staff will receive with SIG funds will be self-sustaining as our school's capacity to implement these strategies will be increased. After three years of the training described in this application, we expect current staff to be able to train new staff through a train-the-trainer model.

- 4) **Provide a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA Application.**

Parkside Timeline

Date	Task
June 2011	<p>Announcement of Grant Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicate award to all stakeholders (school web page of district's web site and letter to parents) ▪ Invite all stakeholders (students, parents, staff, district administrators, and other community) to a pre-implementation meeting ▪ Identify implementation subcommittees ▪ Publish requisition for half-time social worker.
July 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recruit stakeholders (teachers, parents, community members, district administrators, school board) to make one-year commitments (renewable) to a quarterly advisory board to guide this project implementation. ▪ Recruit stakeholders (parents, teachers, admin, and community) for extending school day and/or year team. ▪ Recruit teachers to participate in tutoring and online afterschool program ▪ Recruit 4 stakeholders to participate in District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force ▪ Recruit 4 stakeholders to participate in District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group ▪ Review existing SIG contracts with district and Parkside team to determine if Parkside will use the same PD consultant/service, Response to Intervention (Rtl) PD consultant/service, technology integration consultant; if current SIG providers are not an option, publish RFPs for these position. ▪ Update SIG Coordinator's contract to include Parkside. ▪ Formalize contracts with CBIS for PBIS and NH Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC) for Solid Foundation ▪ Adopt monitoring procedures for transformation strategies (establish common feedback tools; create/ adapt online monitoring and reporting options [i.e., Indistar, ning, open source collaborative web spaces, etc.] used by the district SIG schools) ▪ Poll incoming eighth graders about participating in afterschool advanced courses that offer high school credit ▪ Interview and hire half-time social worker ▪ Work with stakeholders to create schedules for this year's professional development ▪ Recruit high school teachers to teach high school courses (minimum 12 students per class)
August— September 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extended school day committee identifies year's goals. ▪ Define action steps for process to review flexibility options for scheduling pd ▪ Interview and contract vendors for Rtl PD, technology integration, and district SIG coordinator ▪ Recruit teachers and parents to participate in Solid Foundation afterschool training. ▪ Adopt monitoring procedures for transformation strategies; establish common feedback tools; create/ adapt online monitoring and reporting options that are used by the district SIG schools)

Date	Task
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish regular communication about SIG project activities with staff, administration, parents, and other stakeholders and community members ▪ Prepare for Year 1 of PBIS ▪ Define stakeholders for collecting participant feedback, evaluation of professional development activities ▪ Work with stakeholders to create schedules for this year's professional development ▪ Publish monthly communiqué on school's webpage of district website and in letter to parents.
September 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify and invite students to participate in afterschool programs (tutoring, Study Island, advanced course) ▪ Recruit Parkside teachers for developing New Parkside Teacher Kit.
September 2011 – May 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue monthly communication with stakeholders and community ▪ Communicate parent offerings (letter to parents and school web page) ▪ Continue calendar of professional development services. School leadership team will work with stakeholders to update schedules for this year's professional development. ▪ Continue work of teacher evaluation task force, culture and climate work group, family and community work group ▪ Continue regular collection of evidence of impact of professional development services ▪ Work with Solid Foundation, teachers, and parents to improve and increase communication. ▪ Publish Solid Foundation and school's plans for parent activities ▪ Conduct quarterly evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required (SIG coordinator) ▪ Form New Parkside Teacher Kit Committee ▪ Implement new Implement Rtl, PBIS, and Solid Foundation PD ▪ Implement Rtl, PBIS strategies from PD work. (Over time more strategies will be implemented with more intensity.)
May 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recruit teachers for summer PD activities ▪ Submit annual progress report to NH Dept of Ed (SIG coordinator) ▪ Extended day team submits pilot school day and/or year extension plan.
June 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare progress reports for school and community ▪ Conduct analysis of feedback and evidence of impact; revise project plans accordingly
YEAR 2	
July / August 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SIG coordinator, school leadership team reviews participant feedback, progress, outcomes achieved for the first year ▪ Engage teachers in planned summer intensive pd activities (Rtl,

Date	Task
	PBIS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force first year's work (SIG coordinator, administration). Then, make recommendations for coming year's work ▪ Review District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group first year's work (SIG coordinator, administration) Then, make recommendations for coming year's pilot implementation. ▪ Update project plans, analyze Year 1 feedback, revise outcomes, objectives and activities for literacy/ reading/ ELA; mathematics; technology integration; RtI; PLCs; PBIS; family and community engagement; extended online programs
September 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School leadership team will work with stakeholders to update schedules for this year's professional development. ▪ Communicate year's plans with all stakeholders ▪ Recruit students for afterschool programs. ▪ Identify 2012 goals for Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force and District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group ▪ Share plans for this year's pilot implementation of the teacher evaluation model with all stakeholders.
September 2012 – May 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue monthly communication with stakeholders and community ▪ Continue RtI, Solid Foundation, and PBIS, professional development activities, making adjustments from feedback ▪ Implement Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force work and District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group ▪ Continue to work with Solid Foundation to increase communication with parents ▪ Implement pilot alternative teacher evaluation model. ▪ Implement pilot extended school day and/or year plan. ▪ Continue implementation of RtI, PBIS strategies from PD work. (Over time more strategies will be implemented with more intensity.) ▪ Continue regular collection of evidence of impact of professional development services ▪ Conduct quarterly evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required (SIG coordinator) ▪ Continue periodic evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required
May 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recruit teachers for summer PD activities ▪ Make changes to pilot programs (teacher evaluation and extended school day) ▪ Submit annual progress report to NH Dept of Ed (SIG coordinator) ▪ Collect feedback on pilot teacher evaluation implementation

Date	Task
June 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare progress reports for school and community ▪ Conduct analysis of feedback and evidence of impact; revise project plans accordingly ▪ Initiate discussions of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers
YEAR 3	
July / August 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SIG coordinator, school leadership team reviews participant feedback, progress, outcomes achieved for the first year ▪ Engage teachers in planned summer intensive pd activities (Rtl, PBIS) ▪ Review District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force pilot implementation. (SIG coordinator, administration). Then, make recommendations for coming year's work ▪ Review District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group first year's work (SIG coordinator, administration) Then, make recommendations for coming year's work ▪ Update project plans, analyze Year 2 feedback, revise outcomes, objectives and activities for literacy/ reading/ ELA; mathematics; technology integration; Rtl; PLCs; PBIS; family and community engagement; extended online programs ▪ Review findings of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers
September 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School leadership team will work with stakeholders to update schedules for this year's professional development. ▪ Communicate year's plans with all stakeholders ▪ Recruit students for afterschool programs. ▪ Identify 2012 goals for Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force and District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group
September 2013– May 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue monthly communication with stakeholders and community ▪ Continue Rtl, Solid Foundation, and PBIS, professional development activities, making adjustments from feedback ▪ Continue Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force work and District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group ▪ Continue to work with Solid Foundation to increase communication with parents ▪ Implement revised teacher evaluation model ▪ Continue implementation of Rtl, PBIS strategies from PD work. (Over time more strategies will be implemented with more intensity.) ▪ Continue regular collection of evidence of impact of professional development services ▪ Conduct quarterly evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders ▪ Report transformation implementation progress to NH DOE as required (SIG coordinator) ▪ Continue periodic evaluations of providers; feedback surveys of stakeholders
May 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recruit teachers for summer PD activities

Date	Task
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit final progress report to NH Dept of Ed (SIG coordinator)
June 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare final report for school and community ▪ Prepare program final report for school and community ▪ Conduct analysis of feedback and evidence of impact; revise project plans accordingly ▪ Publish findings of sustaining practices, external programs with stakeholders, policy makers

5) As part of the LEA’s plan to monitor progress in each Tier I and Tier II school included in this application, provide the LEA’s annual student achievement goals in Reading and Mathematics for each Tier I and Tier II school’s state assessment results.

According to the current SINI, Parkside’s current improvement goal is to increase literacy and numeracy proficiency by 10% annually. With the new SINI plan, this goal will change, as the 10% increase in literacy and numeracy is not based on logic. Parkside is a SINI, and part of the revised DINI Plan requires the district and principals to develop SINI plans that are tangible, realistic, and are aligned to the revised DINI plan.

Parkside Middle School Summary

**2011 NH Adequate Yearly Progress - Status
School Summary Report**
Based on May 2010 NH-Alt and October 2010 NECAP Assessment Data

SAU: 037
District: Manchester
School: Middle School At Parkside
Code: 037-335-21525
Grade: 6-8 SpEd

Whole group meets 90% attendance
rate requirement: Yes

Group	READING					MATHEMATICS					
	Meets Requirements	Meets 95% Participation Rate	Meets Index Target of 91.0	Safe Harbor		Meets Requirements	Meets 95% Participation Rate	Meets Index Target of 88.0	Safe Harbor		
				Meets 10% Rule	Meets 90% Attendance Rate				Meets 10% Rule	Meets 90% Attendance Rate	
Whole School	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes(SH)	Yes	No	Yes(SH)	Yes	
Hispanic/Latino	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	
Non-Hispanic/Latino	American Indian or Alaskan Native	*	**	*	Shaded Cell		*	**	*	Shaded Cell	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	Yes	Yes(3)	Yes	Shaded Cell		Yes(CI)	Yes(3)	Yes(CI)	Shaded Cell	
	Black or African American	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	White	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes(SH)	Yes	No	Yes(SH)	Yes
Economically Disadvantaged	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes(SH)	Yes	No	Yes(SH)	Yes	
Educational Disability	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes(SH)	No	
Non- or Limited-English Proficient	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	

KEY
 Yes Group meets the requirements.
 Yes (2) Group meets participation rate requirement using a two-year cumulative average.
 Yes (3) Group meets participation rate requirement using a three-year cumulative average.
 Yes (CI) Group is within the confidence interval width to meet the index target.
 Yes (SH) Group meets the requirements under Safe Harbor.
 Yes (SH*) Safe Harbor calculation was not performed since there were fewer than 11 students in the group in the last testing cycle.
 N/A Data are not available.

No Group does not meet the requirements.
 No (2) Group was only evaluated with two years of participation data and does not meet the requirement.
 No (3) Group was evaluated with three years of participation data and did not meet the requirement.
 * Group is too small (fewer than 11 students) and therefore is not required to meet the index target for performance.
 ** Group is too small (fewer than 40 students when totaled over three years) and therefore is not required to meet the standard for participation rate.
 *** Group is too small (fewer than 40 students) and therefore is not required to meet the standard for attendance rate.
 Shaded Cell Safe Harbor is not evaluated when the performance target is met.

Spring 2011

AYP Data

The AYP Status Summary Report (shown on the previous page) indicates the following:

- Parkside Middle School—Reading
The only group to make AYP in Reading was the Asian/Pacific Islander. The whole school did not make AYP; the Hispanic/Latino group did not make AYP; the Black or African American group did not make AYP; the White group did not make AYP; the Economically Disadvantaged group; did not make AYP; the Educational Disability group did not make AYP; the Non- or Limited-English Proficient group did not make AYP.
- Parkside Middle School—Mathematics
Made Safe Harbor for whole school; the Hispanic/Latino group did not make AYP; the Asian/Pacific Islander group was within the Confidence Interval; the Black or African American group did not make AYP; the White group made Safe Harbor; the Economically Disadvantaged group made Safe Harbor; the Educational Disability group did not make AYP; the Non- or Limited-English Proficient group did not make AYP.

This information points to a need for tailoring instruction to the needs of specific subgroups. Supplemental professional development for school staff in differentiating instruction and response to intervention is necessary to close that gap. This information indicates the need to identify students who are on the border of attaining proficiency and then to provide them with supplemental instruction to move them into proficiency. Supplemental professional development for school staff in response to intervention should address that that gap. As more students attain proficiency more resources will become available to work with students who need more help in attaining proficiency.

Local assessment data is down twice yearly. It shows more progress toward proficiency. We need to close the gap that existing between state and district assessments. Our district math curriculum specialist is working with PLC to address these issues. The district has been trying to replace the language arts integration specialist who left after the 2009-10 school year. A more intensive look should yield more understanding and more students

6) Describe the intervention model proposed (services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement) for each Tier III school the LEA has committed to serve. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).

N/A

7) Describe the goals the LEA has established (subject to approval by the NH DOE) in order to hold accountable the Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.

N/A

8) Describe how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's Application and implementation of SIG intervention models.

The Manchester School District met with and interviewed the following members of Parkside's school improvement team:

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	Group representing (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Tom Brennan	Manchester School District
Michael Tursi	Manchester School District Curriculum and Instruction
Lisa Witte	Manchester School District Federal Projects
Heidi Boyle	Manchester School District Middle School Math Integration
Ginny Mahan	Manchester School District Grant Writer
Andrea Somoza-Norton	Parkside Principal
Peter Adamakos	Parkside Math Teacher
Maureen Barber	Parkside Science Teacher
Nick Coler	Parkside Special Education Teacher
Patricia Cornell	Parkside Guidance Teacher
Jennifer HARRISES	Parkside Special Education Teacher
James Malone	Parkside Unified Arts Teacher
Alisha Proulx	Parkside Language Arts Teacher
Robin Tafe	Parkside Media Specialist
Tim Brockway	Parkside Parent Teacher Group President

8.) Describe and provide evidence of the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal with a record of measurably increasing student achievement 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.

Parkside's principal, Andrea Somoza-Norton will be in her second year in 2011-12. Since becoming principal in 2010, she has been leading a school-wide reform effort, and has instituted many changes consistent with the Transformation Model and has many of the leadership qualities that the Transformation Model leader requires. She is looking forward to this opportunity. Her experience includes the following:

- Doctoral Student—Dissertation Process (Ed.D in Leadership in Schooling)
- Bilingual: English-Spanish (other languages: Portuguese and Italian).
- Data analysis, budgeting, scheduling, grant and request for proposal (RFPs) writing experience.
- Research and implementation of professional development programs such as differentiated instruction, educational technology (A+ Hardware, computer applications, database design and web-design, online gradebook programs) and classroom management.
- Attended numerous workshops and conferences related to teaching, learning, curriculum and instruction, professional learning communities, supervision and school leadership.
- Mentor for new teachers (S.T.A.R.T Program- Support, Train and Retain Teachers).
- International Baccalaureate (IB) Teacher, Advanced Placement (AP) Teacher.
- Knowledge of Baldrige System for Performance Excellence and Response to Intervention (RTI) programs.
- NH World Languages Committee Member- Committee wrote the current WL standards for the state of NH.
- Attended The Future of Learning-Harvard Project Zero Summer Institute (Dr. Howard Gardner & Dr. David Perkins)

9) Describe and provide evidence of 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.

Manchester has an active DINI (district in need of improvement) team that meets regularly throughout the school year. Team members represent parents, teachers, higher education, schools, and administrators. Several DINI team members were also consulted during the needs assessment and planning of this application for Parkside. Lisa Witte, the federal projects director, shared our intention to submit this application with Board of School Committee Curriculum & Instruction Committee, and they approved. All school board meetings are broadcast on Manchester Community Television Station (MCTV), a local community TV station. Meeting minutes are available

on the district's website (www.mansd.org). The second year principal at Parkside will be sharing information about her school's intention to apply for School Improvement Grant funds on her school web pages. She will conduct a meeting with all stakeholders to get their input prior to implementing this plan. Parkside has a parent-teacher group, which provides two-way communication. In addition, Parkside will have a SIG implementation advisory board made up of stakeholders to guide Parkside's transformation. The full Board of School Committee is required to approve the actual grant once awarded. As mentioned previously, only the C&I Committee has approved the planning grant as of May 13, 2011

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:

X 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.

X 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.

External providers currently used by district SIG schools have already been rigorously reviewed: SIG coordinator, NH-PIRC, CEBIS,

□ 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.

X 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.

Reading, writing, math interventions

□ 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.

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Action Plan
Parkside Middle School

GM look at dates, activities, costs, and make relevant changes

Goal	<p>To achieve each of the three district wide Annual Measurable Objectives ((1) 90% attendance; (2) 95% participation and (3) all school proficiency targets) by fully implementing the Transformation model as defined by US Dept of Ed and the NH Dept of Ed including strategies to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (ii) implementing comprehensive instructional reform (iii) increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools (iv) providing operational flexibility and sustained support 					
Strategy	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround model <input type="checkbox"/> Restart model <input type="checkbox"/> School closure model <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transformation model <input type="checkbox"/> Tier III proposed model <p align="right">(if not choosing one of the four US ED models)</p>					
<p>Proposed Activities for 2011-2012</p> <p><i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve the desired outcome. Provide sufficient detail so that reviewers will understand the purpose and proposed implementation of each activity.</i></p>	<p>Resources</p> <p><i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i></p>	<p>Timeline</p> <p><i>When will this activity begin and end?</i></p>	<p>Oversight</p> <p><i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i></p>	<p>Monitoring (Implementation)</p> <p><i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation?</i></p> <p><i>How often and by whom?</i></p>	<p>Monitoring (Effectiveness)</p> <p><i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness?</i></p> <p><i>How often and by whom?</i></p>	<p>Title I School Improvement Funds</p> <p><i>Include amount allocated to this activity if applicable. Provide the requested detail on the Budget Narrative Form.</i></p>
<p>Hire half-time social worker</p>	<p>Salary and benefits</p>	<p>July 1, 2011 to June 2014</p>	<p>Principal, SIG coordinator, assistant superintendent</p>	<p>Logs of students assisted; results of student contacts; overall school climate</p>	<p>SIG coordinator, quarterly</p>	<p>40,995.50</p>

Recruit stakeholders to participate in District and State Alternative Teacher Evaluation Task Forces	Stipends for stakeholders	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal	Meeting agendas, minutes	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback	\$3,240
Recruit stakeholders to participate in Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group	Stipends for stakeholders	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal	Meeting agendas, minutes	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback	\$3,240
Recruit stakeholders (teachers, parents, community, admin) for participation in subcommittee to extend school day and/or school year	Stakeholders	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator	Meeting agendas, minutes, reports that are shared with all stakeholders, and in May a pilot implementation plan	SIG coordinator question: does plan address needs of all stakeholders? Is plan realistic?	0
Recruit stakeholders (teachers parents, community members, district administrators, school board) to make one-year commitments (renewable) to participate in a quarterly advisory board that will guide this project implementation	Stakeholders	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator	Meeting agendas, minutes (facilitated by SIG coordinator)	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback	0
Recruit teachers to tutor students in Math and Reading after school	Stipends for stakeholders	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator	Lesson plans, best practices of participating teachers, actual student achievement	Quarterly reports to SIG coordinator	\$11,880

Recruit high school teacher to teach dual middle and high school class after school	Stipends for stakeholders	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator	Lesson plans, best practices of participating teachers, actual student achievement	Quarterly reports to SIG coordinator	\$3,960
Increase capacity to assess and monitor student achievement gaps (AIMSweb)	Substitutes to cover classrooms, student subscription services, books, training fees	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator	Two days of formal training and continuation of learning in PLCs	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback. Are we able to identify students for supplemental learning activities to increase their academic achievement? Has the student monitoring helped to make us more responsive to students' academic needs? Are we sharing best practices? SIG coordinator question: Has student achievement been positively affected by this activity?	\$24,869.20
Increase instructional capacity in Rtl	Stipends, consultant	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator, Rtl consultant	Meeting agendas, lesson plans, best practices, participating teachers	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback	\$22,800
Increase teachers and staff capacity to reach out to parents and involve them in their child's education (Solid	Stipends, Solid Foundation PD, Supplies	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator, Solid Foundation consultant	Meetings, attendance lists	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback Has the school climate improved? Are more parents attending parent and	\$12,325

Foundation)					family events? Are more parents coming to the school during the day? Evidence: sign in sheets	
Increase teachers' understanding and capacity to implement PBIS (performance based instructional supports) to improve school climate	Stipends, NH CEBIS PBIS Consultancy and full service package	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator, PBIS consultant	Agendas, minutes Training session notes Formative feedback	Participant feedback Community surveys	\$104,585
Continue National Writing Project through Plymouth	Contract fees	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, Plymouth contact	Meeting agendas, lesson plans, best practices, participating teachers	Participant feedback Student feedback, student achievement	\$24,400
Increase instructional capacity to deliver math instruction	Use supplemental PLC time for math topics, especially concerning new curriculum	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator,	Meeting agendas, lesson plans, best practices, participating teachers	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback. Are we more effective in modifying instruction to serve the individual needs of different learners? SIG coordinator question: Has student achievement been positively affected by this activity? Evidence: NECAP, ACCESS	(included in PLC time)
Extend and expand teachers capacity to integrate technology into their lesson plans, utilize	Job-embedded PD, consultant, supplement	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Principal, SIG coordinator, Technology Integration consultant	Job-embedded PD, best practices, teacher lesson plans, student artifacts	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback Principal walkthroughs: Are teachers integrating	\$160,438.10

technology to access, analyze, and interpret data, and expand students access to technology during the school day and while extending the school day	al technology equipment				technology into lesson plans? Are early adopters leading the effort? Are lesson plans being shared? Do students have more portfolio artifacts?	
Internet access, equipment maintenance provider	Contracted services Equipment	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Asst. Superintendent Tech Integration Consultant SIG Coordinator	Records of outages, repair needs, resolution	User feedback	\$6,000
Implement student incentive program	Supplies and materials for awards	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Assistant principal	Award programs, participating students,	Twice yearly stakeholder feedback, attendance on NECAP and ACCESS test days	\$5,000
Implement New Parkside Teacher Program	Stipends for participants	July 2011 through June 2014	Principal	Asst. principal interviews with new Parkside teachers		\$1,800
Enlist the assistance of the district's SIG Coordinator to provide project management; facilitate meetings; attend NH Dept of Ed meetings; connect project components at Parkside to existing SIG schools, and best practices, across the three district schools; collect data and stakeholder feedback; write reports, and communicate findings to all stakeholders	Contracted services (30 days at Parkside)	Jun 2011 through June 2014	Superintendent Asst. Superintendent	Performance indicators, benchmarks Monthly Progress reports	School feedback surveys Provider feedback Implementation analyses	\$24,000

BUDGET

Provide budget information on this page as well as pages LEA-19 and LEA-20 that indicates the amount of school improvement funds your LEA will use each year to:

- 1) Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school you commit to serve;
- 2) Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in your LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- 3) Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in your LEA's application.

Please note that, according to US ED SIG guidance, an LEA must allocate no less than \$50,000 per year and no more than \$2,000,000 per year or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Page LEA-19 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-20 requires a detailed school budget for the first year. If your LEA is awarded funding, a progress report will need to be submitted each year. As part of the first progress report (due May 11, 2012), the LEA will be required to answer questions regarding the first year of implementation, update the 3 year budget overview if needed and provide a detailed budget narrative for year 2. The progress report and included budgets will have to be approved by the NH Department of Education 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.

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

LEA (Manchester) \$1,000,000 Budget

Parkside	Year I Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Stipends for pre-implementation training					
Total Budget		\$482,522	306,248	232,606	\$1,021,376

* District activities include the SIG coordinator at \$24,000/year and the Alternative Teacher Evaluation Committee (\$3,240) and the Alternative Teacher Performance Incentive Work Group (\$3,240). Costs are included within.

Parkside School Improvement —Three Year School Budget Plan

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.</i>	A 0.5 FTE social worker to meet the demands of Parkside's high-need students.	A 0.5 FTE social worker to meet the demands of Parkside's high-need students.	A 0.5 FTE social worker to meet the demands of Parkside's high-need students.	40,995.50	42,995	54,000
	Stipends for 50 Parkside teachers to participate in Response to Intervention (Rtl) training for two hours five times during the year.	Stipends for 50 Parkside teachers to participate in Response to Intervention (Rtl) training for two hours five times during the year.	Stipends for 50 Parkside teachers to participate in Response to Intervention (Rtl) training for two hours five times during the year.	50 teachers x 2hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$15,000	50 teachers x 1hr x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$7,500	50 teachers x 1hr x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$7,500
	Stipends for 60 Parkside teachers to participate in PBIS training for 1.5 hours each month	Stipends for 60 Parkside teachers to participate in PBIS training for 1.5 hours each month	Stipends for 60 Parkside teachers to participate in PBIS training for 1.5 hours each month	60 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits)	60 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits)	60 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits)

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
				\$24,300	\$24,300	\$24,300
	Stipends for 25 Parkside teachers to participate in Solid Foundation (NH PIRC) training for 1.5 hours five times during the year.	Stipends for 25 Parkside teachers to participate in Solid Foundation (NH PIRC) training for 1.5 hours five times during the year.	Stipends for 25 Parkside teachers to participate in Solid Foundation (NH PIRC) training for 1.5 hours five times during the year.	25 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 5 sessions x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$5,625	25 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 5 sessions x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$5,625	25 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 5 sessions x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$5,625
	Stipends for four elementary Reading tutors to tutor below-level students in Reading for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	Stipends for four elementary Reading tutors to tutor below-level students in Reading for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	Stipends for four elementary Reading tutors to tutor below-level students in Reading for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	4 teachers x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$7,920	1 teachers x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$7,920	1 teachers x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$7,920
	Stipends for two Math tutors to tutor below-level students in Math for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	Stipends for two Math tutors to tutor below-level students in Math for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	Stipends for two Math tutors to tutor below-level students in Math for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,960	1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,960	1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,960

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	<p>Stipends for one high school teachers to teach dual credit (middle and high school) course one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.</p> <p>Minimum class size is 12 students.</p>	<p>Stipends for one high school teachers to teach dual credit (middle and high school) course one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.</p> <p>Minimum class size is 12 students.</p>	<p>Stipends for one high school teachers to teach dual credit (middle and high school) course one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.</p> <p>Minimum class size is 12 students.</p>	<p>1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits</p> <p>\$3,960</p>	<p>1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits</p> <p>\$3,960</p>	<p>1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits</p> <p>\$3,960</p>
	<p>Stipends for 5 teacher reps to develop a <i>New Parkside Teacher Mentor</i> kit for to be used by new Parkside teachers with a mentor. New Parkside teachers must understand the Transformation Model and how the school works. Teacher reps will meet for 2hrs for five meetings.</p>	N/A	N/A	<p>5 teachers x 2hrs x 4 meetings x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits</p> <p>\$1,200</p> <p>Teachers participating agree to mentor new Parkside teachers</p>	0	0

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	Stipends for Parkside mentors to use <i>New Parkside Teacher Mentor</i> kit with new Parkside teachers. Estimate: five new teachers with five new Parkside teachers for four hours.	Stipends for Parkside mentors to use <i>New Parkside Teacher Mentor</i> kit with new Parkside teachers. Estimate: five new teachers with five new Parkside teachers for four hours.	Stipends for Parkside mentors to use <i>New Parkside Teacher Mentor</i> kit with new Parkside teachers. Estimate: five new teachers with five new Parkside teachers for four hours.	5 new teachers x 4hrs x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$600	5 new teachers x 4hrs x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$600	5 new teachers x 4hrs x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$600
	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force	4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$3,240	4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$3,240	4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$3,240
	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group	4 teachers x 3hrs x 4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$3,240	4 teachers x 3hrs x 4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$3,240	4 teachers x 3hrs x 4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits \$3,240

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	Substitutes to cover classrooms for teachers participating in AIMSweb training. Two cohorts of two days for 30 Parkside teachers (60 total)	N/A	N/A	120 substitute days x \$75 (substitute pay) + (FICA [7.65%] and WC [0.9] 8.55%) \$6.41 \$9,769.20	0	0
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (LEA Appendix E)</i>	Two technology integration consultants to provide job-embedded PD to teachers in classrooms so they can integrate technology into lesson plans to provide more depth of knowledge and interaction for students; provide training and support on identifying useful data, analyzing data, and using that data to make instructional and	A technology integration consultants to provide job-embedded PD to teachers in classrooms so they can integrate technology into lesson plans to provide more depth of knowledge and interaction for students; provide training and support on identifying useful data, analyzing data, and using that data to make instructional and pedagogical	A technology integration consultants to provide job-embedded PD to teachers in classrooms so they can integrate technology into lesson plans to provide more depth of knowledge and interaction for students; provide training and support on identifying useful data, analyzing data, and using that	\$62,600	31,300	31,300

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
<i>must be completed</i>	pedagogical change.	change.	data to make instructional and pedagogical change.			
	AIMSweb training (two cohorts of 30 teachers trained over two days)	N/A	N/A	(\$4,500 per cohort x 2) \$9,000	0	0
	AIMSweb Pro Complete (assessment and monitoring software)	AIMSweb Pro Complete (assessment and monitoring software)	AIMSweb Pro Complete (assessment and monitoring software)	\$5/student /year x 520 students \$2,600	\$5/student /year x 800 students \$2,600	\$5/student /year x 800 students \$2,600
	A Response to Intervention consultant to work in classrooms two days at three grade levels	A Response to Intervention consultant to work in classrooms one day at three grade levels	A Response to Intervention consultant to work in classrooms one day at three grade levels	\$7,800	\$3,900	\$3,900
	A PBIS services (NH CEBIS) Includes all materials and trainers	A PBIS services (NH CEBIS) Includes all materials and trainers	N/A	\$79,585	\$83,505	0
	Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center)	Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center)	Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center)	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	services	services	services			
	A Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center) consultant	A Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center) consultant	A Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center) consultant	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700
	Schoolwide licenses Study Island	0	0	11,017	0	0
	National Writing Project (Plymouth State University)	National Writing Project (Plymouth State University)	National Writing Project (Plymouth State University)	24,400	24,400	24,400
	1 bus to take extended learning students home 4 days x33 weeks	2 buses to take Apex students home	2 buses to take Apex students home	\$70/day (55 students) 70 x 1 x4 x33 \$9,240	\$70/day (55 students) 70 x 1 x4 x33 \$9,240	\$70/day (55 students) 70 x 1 x4 x33 \$9,240
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connecti</i>	Supplies for parent engagement activities during and after school	Supplies for parent engagement activities during and after school	Supplies for parent engagement activities during and after school	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
<i>on between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>						
	Raffle items for student incentives for positive activities, such as perfect attendance, attending on test days, such as NECAP and ACCESS, having fewer than three discipline infractions, and other activities that contribute to increases in student achievement	Raffle items for student incentives for positive activities, such as perfect attendance, attending on test days, such as NECAP and ACCESS, having fewer than three discipline infractions, and other activities that contribute to increases in student achievement	Raffle items for student incentives for positive activities, such as perfect attendance, attending on test days, such as NECAP and ACCESS, having fewer than three discipline infractions, and other activities that contribute to increases in student achievement	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
	N/A	N/A	Supplies for refresher PD events	0	0	0

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	AIMSweb training books	N/A	N/A	(\$35 x 30 books) \$1,050	0	0
	15 copies of <i>Instructional Rounds in Education A Network Approach to Improving Teaching and Learning</i> (ISBN-13: 978-1-934742-17-4) to be used by administrators and teachers to develop a shared understanding of what high-quality instruction looks like and what Parkside and the Manchester School District need	N/A	N/A	\$750	0	0

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	to do to support it @\$50/copy					
Equipment <i>Each item must be listed separately along with a justification of why you need it to support your plan. An Equipment Justification Form (LEA Appendix F) must be completed.</i>	Internet wireless routers and access points	N/A	N/A	\$6,000	0	0
	<p>Four mobile carts will be shared by the school's four content (Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science) teams. These 21st Century carts will each have 30 interactive, touch-screen devices capable of supporting e-textbooks and e-books (web-based and off-line), content creation, communication, and other media; a document camera, an LCD projector, an interactive board, and a laptop.</p> <p>Costs broken down below</p>					

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	120 interactive, touch-screen devices capable of supporting e-textbooks and e-books (web-based and off-line), content creation, communication, and other media (30 on each cart)	N/A	N/A	\$66,960	0	0
	4 mobility carts each holds 30 devices	N/A	N/A	\$1,800 x 4 \$7,200	0	0
	4 interactive boards	N/A	N/A	\$1,700 x 4 \$6,800	0	0
	4 carts for interactive board	N/A	N/A	\$600 x 4 \$2,400	0	0
	4 LCD projectors	N/A	N/A	\$600 x 4 \$2,400	0	0

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
	4 document cameras	N/A	N/A	\$400 x 4 \$1,600	0	0
	4 laptop for interactive board carts	N/A	N/A	Toshiba 160GB laptop (\$1,119) with Acad. Select Office Professional Plus 2010 License Only Microsoft Select (\$52.90) (\$1,171.90 x 4) \$4,678.60	0	0
	150 Headsets @ \$13	N/A	N/A	\$1,950	0	0
	50 Headphones @ \$50	N/A	N/A	\$2,500	0	0
Professional Development Activities Summary	PD activities include the salaries and benefits of stipend hours for staff participating	PD activities include the salaries and benefits of stipend hours for staff participating	PD activities include the salaries and benefits of stipend hours for	INCLUDED WITHIN	INCLUDED WITHIN	INCLUDED WITHIN

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
<i>ze your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form LEA (Appendix E) must be completed</i>	in Math, Rtl, PBIS, AIMSweb, Solid Foundation, training; consultants leading the training; substitute classroom, coverage, and books and supplies to support training	in Math, Rtl, PBIS, AIMSweb, Solid Foundation, training; consultants leading the training; substitute classroom, coverage, and books and supplies to support training.	staff participating in Math, Rtl, PBIS, AIMSweb, Solid Foundation, training; consultants leading the training; substitute classroom, coverage, and books and supplies to support training.			
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>	All travel has been included in contracted services	All travel has been included in contracted services	All travel has been included in contracted services	0	0	0
Administration <i>Include other costs associated</i>	Contracted services of a SIG Coordinator to provide project	Contracted services of a SIG Coordinator to provide project	Contracted services of a SIG Coordinator to provide project	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000

Account Category	Year 1 General Budget Description	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
<i>ed with supporting plan implementation.</i>	management; facilitate meetings; attend NH Dept of Ed meetings; connect project components at each school, and best practices, across the three district schools; collect data and stakeholder feedback; write reports, and communicate findings to all stakeholders	management; facilitate meetings; attend NH Dept of Ed meetings; connect project components at each school, and best practices, across the three district schools; collect data and stakeholder feedback; write reports, and communicate findings to all stakeholders	management; facilitate meetings; attend NH Dept of Ed meetings; connect project components at each school, and best practices, across the three district schools; collect data and stakeholder feedback; write reports, and communicate findings to all stakeholders			
Subtotal				\$471,040	\$298,985	\$226,485
Indirect Costs	Subtotal x <2.5%	Subtotal x <2.5%	Subtotal x <2.5%	\$11,482	\$7,263	\$5,521
Total				\$482,522	306,248	232,606

ONE YEAR DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE

2011-2012

(Please complete one per school)

Use this form to provide sufficient detail regarding proposed expenditure for the 2011-2012 project period, including pre-implementation expenses. Complete all appropriate justification forms (Appendix E and F, pages LEA 42-43).

School Name: Middle School At Parkside

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.</i>	Salary and benefits for a half-time social worker. 2011-2012 five-year salary (\$46,109) * 16.66% (\$7,682) + two-person health (\$26,000), two-person dental (\$2,200), FICA (7.65), teacher retirement (8.02%) Total 81,991 * .5 = \$40,995.50	\$40,995.50
	Stipends for 50 Parkside teachers to participate in Response to Intervention (Rtl) training for two hours five times during the year.	50 teachers x 2hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$15,000
	Stipends for 60 Parkside teachers to participate in PBIS training for 1.5 hours each month	60 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$24,300
	Stipends for 25 Parkside teachers to participate in Solid Foundation (NH PIRC) training for 1.5 hours five times during the year.	25 teachers x 1.5 hrs x 5 sessions x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$5,625
	Stipends for two elementary Reading tutors to tutor below-level students in Reading for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	2 teachers x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
		benefits \$7,920
	Stipends for one Math tutor to tutor below-level students in Math for one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year.	1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,960
	Stipends for one high school teacher to teach dual credit (middle and high school) course one hour after school four times weekly for 33 weeks a year. Minimum class size is 12	1 teacher x 4hrs/week x 33 weeks x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,960
	Stipends for 5 teacher reps to develop a <i>New Parkside Teacher Mentor</i> kit for to be used by new Parkside teachers with a mentor. New Parkside teachers must understand the Transformation Model and how the school works. Teacher reps will meet for 2hrs for five meetings. Teachers participating must agree to mentor new Parkside teachers	5 teachers x 2hrs x 4 meetings x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$1,200
	Stipends for Parkside mentors to use <i>New Parkside Teacher Mentor</i> kit with new Parkside teachers. Estimate: five new teachers with five new Parkside teachers for four hours.	5 new teachers x 4hrs x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$600

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Evaluation Models Task Force	4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,240
	Stipends for 4 teacher reps for 3hrs each month to participate in District Alternative Teacher Performance Incentives Work Group	4 teachers x 3hrs x 9 months x \$30 (\$25 stipend + corresponding benefits) \$3,240
	Substitutes to cover classrooms for teachers participating in AIMSweb training. Two cohorts of two days for 30 Parkside teachers (60 total)	120 substitute days x \$75 (substitute pay) + (FICA [7.65%] and WC [0.9] 8.55%) \$6.41 \$9,769.20
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (LEA Appendix E) must be completed</i>	Two technology integration consultants to provide job-embedded PD to teachers in classrooms so they can integrate technology into lesson plans to provide more depth of knowledge and interaction for students; provide training and support on identifying useful data, analyzing data, and using that data to make instructional and pedagogical change.	\$62,600
	AIMSweb training (two cohorts of 30 teachers trained over two days)	\$ (4,500 x 2 cohorts) \$9,000
	AIMSweb Pro Complete (assessment and monitoring software) School enrollment is 700. Subtract 180 special ed students already served	\$5/student/year x 520 students \$2,600

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
	A Response to Intervention consultant to work in classrooms two days at three grade levels	\$7,800
	A PBIS services (NH CEBIS) Includes all materials and trainers	\$79,585
	Contract with the NH Parent Information Resource Center (NH PIRC) to facilitate parent meetings and events to help parents become more involved in their children's academic and social growth.	\$5,000
	A Solid Foundation (NH Parent Information Resource Center) consultant	\$1,700
	Schoolwide licenses Study Island	11,017
	National Writing Project (Plymouth State University)	\$24,400
	1 bus to take extended learning students home 4 days x33 weeks	\$70/day (55 students) \$9,240
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Supplies for parent engagement activities during and after school	\$5,000
	Supplies for student incentives	\$5,000

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	AIMSweb training books	(\$35 x 30 books) \$1,050
	15 copies of <i>Instructional Rounds in Education A Network Approach to Improving Teaching and Learning</i> (ISBN-13: 978-1-934742-17-4) to be used by administrators and teachers to develop a shared understanding of what high-quality instruction looks like and what Parkside and the Manchester School District need to do to support it @\$50/copy	\$750
Equipment <i>Each item must be listed separately along with a justification of why you need it to support your plan. An Equipment Justification Form (LEA Appendix F) must be completed.</i>	Internet wireless routers and access points	\$6,000
	Four mobile carts will be shared by the school's four content (Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science) teams. These 21 st Century carts will each have 30 interactive, touch-screen devices capable of supporting e-textbooks and e-books (web-based and off-line), content creation, communication, and other media; a document camera, an LCD projector, an interactive board, and a laptop.	
	120 interactive, touch-screen devices capable of supporting e-textbooks and e-books (web-based and off-line), content creation, communication, and other media (30 on each cart)	\$66,960
	4 mobility carts each holds 30 devices	\$1,800x 4 \$7,200

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
	4 interactive boards	\$1,700 x 4 \$6,800
	4 carts for interactive board	\$600 x 4 \$2,400
	4 LCD projectors	\$600 x 4 \$2,400
	4 document cameras	\$400 x 4 \$1,600
	4 laptop for interactive board carts	Toshiba 160GB laptop (\$1,119) with Acad. Select Office Professional Plus 2010 License Only Microsoft Select (\$52.90) (\$1,171.90 x 4) \$4,678.60
	150 Headsets @ \$13	\$1,950
	50 Headphones @ \$50	\$2,500
	Study Island licenses for whole school	11,017

Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form LEA (Appendix E) must be completed</i>	PD activities include the salaries and benefits of stipend hours for staff participating in Professional Learning Communities, Response to Intervention, PBIS, AIMSweb, Solid Foundation, training; and the consultants leading the technical education, AIMSweb, Solid Foundation, PBIS, Rtl.; substitute classroom, coverage, and books and supplies required to support training.	INCLUDED WITHIN
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>	Contracted services of a SIG Coordinator to provide 30 days project management; facilitate meetings; attend NH Dept of Ed meetings; connect project components at each school, and best practices, across the three district schools; collect data and stakeholder feedback; write reports, and communicate findings to all stakeholders	\$24,000
Subtotal		\$471,040
Indirect Costs	Subtotal x 2.5% Indirect	\$11,482
Total		\$482,522

ASSURANCES

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

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II 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 on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that our LEA serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds (US ED requirement);
 - If the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II 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 sustain after the funding period ends (NHDOE requirement) .

Superintendent's signature

Date signed

School Board Chair

Date signed

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 Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011-2012 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

- Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver – to waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

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

In accordance with the US Department of Education Guidance for the School Improvement Grant, the identification of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” must be based on each school’s state assessment results for the “All Students” group in Reading and Mathematics combined. As the term “persistent” implies “over time”, New Hampshire used the four most current testing years of data available for elementary/middle schools (AYP index scores from testing years 2006-2009), and the three years of available testing years data for high schools (AYP index scores from testing years 2007-2009). The two sets of schools were rank ordered separately.

New Hampshire uses a US Department of Education-approved index score system to calculate adequate yearly progress (AYP) based on the state assessment results. This system, which gives “credit” to partially proficient student scores, was adopted by New Hampshire to more accurately depict progress and proficiency in New Hampshire schools. In accordance with the SIG guidance, each school’s annual Reading and Math index score for the “All Students” group was combined, with a cumulative score four-year score produced for elementary /middle schools, and a cumulative three-year score for high schools.

The use of the cumulative index score to rank order and identify schools for the purposes of this grant was initially approved by USDE on February 4, 2010. The deadline for submitting the 2010 SIG grant application does not allow for the use of 2011 AYP index scores, which are tentatively scheduled for release in April 2011.

Tier I Schools

Schools categorized as Tier I must meet one of the following conditions:

- (1) *The school is within the five percent, or five (whichever is greater) of the persistently lowest-achieving Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) in the state; OR*
- (2) *The school is a high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years; OR*
- (3) *The school is Title I-eligible and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school in (1) above. Additionally, the school must be either in the bottom 20 percent of all schools in the state, or has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2 consecutive years. The guidance defines "Title I-eligible" as either a school currently receiving Title I funds or a school eligible for, but not receiving funds.*

Identification of Tier I Schools (Condition 1)

- *The school is within the five percent, or five (whichever is greater), of the persistently lowest-achieving Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) in the state.*
 - Total number of Title I SINIs in 2010-11 = 146 (140 elementary/middle and 6 high schools)
 - 5% of 146 = 7 Title I SINIs (maximum number to be identified)
 - None of the 5 Title I SINI high schools are within the lowest five percent of high schools
 - Rank order the Title I SINIs from low to high, based on the four-year cumulative index scores.
 - Identify the 7 lowest-ranked Title I SINIs. ***Do not include Title I SINIs currently participating in SIG (Manchester Gossler Park and Parker Varney):***

District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Four-Year Cumulative Index Score
State of NH	Average Combined Index Score	171.8	174.2	176.5	178.5	701
Manchester	Beech Street School	116.7	122.6	135.9	134.3	509.5
Manchester	Wilson School	134.4	134.3	142.9	144.7	556.3
Manchester	Bakersville School	131.4	140.5	148.8	161.8	582.5
Franklin	Franklin Middle School	143.3	150.1	147.5	154.9	595.8
Fall Mt. Regional	Alstead Primary School	143.7	150.7	150	161.7	606.1
Farmington	Henry Wilson Memorial	145.2	146.1	152.4	164.4	608.1

Manchester	McDonough School	150.9	148.9	155.7	164.6	620.1
------------	------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Identification of Tier I Schools (Condition 2)

(2) *The school is a high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years.*

- There are no New Hampshire high schools that meet the criteria.

Identification of Tier I Schools (Condition 3)

(3) *The school is Title I-eligible and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school in the rank-ordered list under Condition 1. Additionally, the school must be either in the bottom 20 percent of all schools in the state, or has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for at least 2 consecutive years. The guidance defines “Title I-eligible” as either a school currently receiving Title I funds or a school eligible for, but not receiving funds.*

- Rank order all elementary/middle schools in the state for which four years of index score data is available (N= 367)
- Identify which schools have a combined index score equal to or lower than the highest-achieving school in the rank-ordered list for Condition 1 (McDonough School).
- Next, determine if any of the schools identified above meet the “Title I eligible” definition.
- Next, determine if the schools are in the bottom 20 percent of all schools (20% of 367 = 73) or have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
- ***Do not include eligible schools that are currently participating in SIG (Milton Nute Jr HS, Pittsfield MS, and Manchester Parkside MS)***
- Listed below are the Title I-eligible schools with a cumulative index score no higher than that of the lowest-achieving school in Condition 1 (Manchester McDonough School).

District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Four Cum Index Score
Manchester	Middle School at Parkside	137.7	140.6	145.5	143.3	567.1
Manchester	Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School	136.2	142.1	150.9	145.8	575.0

Tier II Schools

Schools categorized as Tier II must be Title I-eligible high schools and must meet one of the following conditions:

- (1) *The school is Title I-eligible and is within the lowest-achieving five percent of high schools or the five lowest-achieving, whichever number is greater; OR*
- (2) *The school has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. As noted in the identification of Tier I schools, there are no high schools meeting Condition (2).*

Identification of Tier II Schools (Condition 1)

(1) *The school is Title I-eligible and is within the lowest-achieving five percent of high schools or the five lowest-achieving, whichever number is greater. The guidance defines "Title I-eligible" as either a school currently receiving Title I funds or a school eligible for, but not receiving funds.*

- Rank order all high schools for which three years of index score data is available (N = 76)
- 5 % of 76 = 4 schools. The guidance requires that a minimum of 5 schools be identified.
- Determine the Title I eligibility of each school. (Note : Manchester West meets the lowest-performing criteria, but is not Title I eligible).
- ***Do not include high schools currently participating in SIG (Nute HS and Pittsfield HS).***

District	School	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Three-Year Cumulative Index Score
State of NH	Average Combined Index Score	146.7	154.4	156.1	457.2
Farmington	Farmington Senior High School	124.4	129.9	132.5	386.8
Franklin	Franklin High School	141.6	128.8	137.2	407.6
Hillsboro-Deering	Hillsboro-Deering High School	139	141.1	129.1	409.2
Laconia	Laconia High School	140.9	144.4	139.5	424.8
Littleton	Littleton High School	137.4	134.7	156.0	428.1

Identification of Tier II Schools (Condition 2)

(2) *The school has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years .*

- As noted in the identification of Tier I schools, there are no high schools meeting this criteria.

TIER III Schools

Schools categorized as Tier III must meet one of the following conditions:

- (1) *The school is a Title I School in Need of Improvement (SINI) that did not meet the Tier I criteria, OR*
- (2) *The school is a Title I-eligible school that does not meet the Tier I or Tier II requirements and is in the bottom 20 percent of all schools in the state or has not made AYP for any two years.*

Identification of Tier III Schools (Condition 1)

- (1) *The school is a Title I School in Need of Improvement (SINI) that did not meet the Tier I criteria.*
 - As 7 of the 146 Title I Schools in Need of Improvement are eligible in Tier I, rank order the remaining Title I SINIs that are not currently participating in SIG. Elementary-middle and high schools are rank-ordered separately.

District	School	2006-07 Index Combin ed	2007-08 Index Combin ed	2008-09 Index Combin ed	2009-10 Index Combin ed	Cumulati ve Index Score
State of NH	Average Combined Index Score	171.8	174.2	176.5	178.5	701
Berlin	Brown Elementary School	149.6	153.2	163.3	155.6	621.7
Nashua	Ledge Street School	157	150	155.5	159.4	621.9
Newfound Area	Danbury Elementary School	156.7	150	153.5	164.9	625.1
Fall Mountain Regional	Charlestown Primary School	151.3	156.2	160	165.1	632.6
Winchester	Winchester School	149.7	154.9	160.8	169	634.4
Claremont	Disnard Elementary School	162.6	154.5	156.2	163.7	637
Allenstown	Armand R. Dupont School	146.9	153.9	166.9	169.6	637.3
Somersworth	Somersworth Middle School	160.4	160.2	159	160.5	640.1

Hinsdale	Hinsdale Elementary School	156.2	152.9	158.8	172.5	640.4
District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score
Franklin	Bessie C. Rowell School	147.2	161.7	166	166.2	641.1
Monadnock Regional	Troy Elementary School	154	160.4	158.7	168.3	641.4
Newfound Area	Newfound Memorial Middle Sch	145.1	153.4	173.2	170.4	642.1
Newport	Newport Middle School	153.4	160.4	164.7	166.7	645.2
Contoocook Valley	Pierce Elementary School	164.6	150.4	170	163.3	648.3
Milton	Milton Elementary School	157.5	163.1	166.4	164.3	651.3
Goshen-Lempster Cooperative	Goshen-Lempster Cooperative	159.8	168.1	156.6	168.4	652.9
Allenstown	Allenstown Elementary School	158.5	157.7	166.1	171.2	653.5
Hinsdale	Hinsdale Middle	156.4	157.3	166.7	173.9	654.3
Nashua	Dr. Norman W. Crisp School	161.1	164	166.2	163.8	655.1
Newport	Towle Elementary School	150	161	176.6	168.4	656
Barnstead	Barnstead Elementary School	161.6	162.2	166.3	166	656.1
Somersworth	Hilltop School	158.1	164.1	173.9	161.2	657.3
Colebrook	Colebrook Elementary School	161.1	163.8	166.4	166.3	657.6
Manchester	Northwest Elementary School	158.9	160.7	167.1	171.6	658.3
Manchester	Hallsville School	159.5	164.4	161.6	174.6	660.1

Nashua	Mt. Pleasant School	165	164.2	164.8	166.9	660.9
Derry Cooperative	Grinnell School	161.8	164.7	163.3	171.5	661.3
Fremont	Ellis School	161	166.4	167.3	168.2	662.9
Concord	Dame School	172.1	157.9	152.9	180.5	663.4
Hillsboro-Deering Cooperative	Hillsboro-Deering Elementary	163.7	166.6	163.4	170.3	664
Pittsfield	Pittsfield Elementary School	163.5	163.2	165	172.5	664.2
District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score
Nashua	Fairgrounds Elementary School	163.3	173	160.6	169.7	666.6
Berlin	Hillside Elementary School	170.7	165.5	167.9	162.7	666.8
White Mountains Regional	Whitefield Elementary School	169.5	161.8	170	165.6	666.9
Unity	Unity Elementary School	172.1	168.3	165	166.8	672.2
Winnisquam Regional	Winnisquam Regional Middle Sch	164.4	166.9	175.1	166.8	673.2
Wakefield	Paul Elementary School	160.2	158.2	179.4	175.5	673.3
Haverhill Cooperative	Haverhill Cooperative Middle	158.5	164.8	169.2	181.8	674.3
Farmington	Valley View Community Elem	168	163.2	167.1	177.1	675.4
Dover	Woodman Park School	170.4	166.3	168.9	172.7	678.3
Raymond	Iber Holmes Gove Middle School	166.5	166.7	169.7	176	678.9
Claremont	Maple Avenue School	169.4	168.2	168.7	173.5	679.8
Wilton	Florence Rideout Elementary	173.5	166.6	169.4	170.6	680.1

Cornish	Cornish Elementary School	164.3	158.6	173.4	184.7	681
Mascoma Valley Regional	Indian River School	168.4	166.5	175.9	171.1	681.9
Newport	Richards Elementary School	170.4	169.6	170	172	682
Concord	Beaver Meadow School	172.5	171.7	170.5	167.5	682.2
Newfound Area	Bristol Elementary School	161.6	170.5	171.1	179.3	682.5
White Mountains Regional	Lancaster Elementary School	168.1	168.7	174.2	171.6	682.6
Seabrook	Seabrook Elementary School	167.9	176.7	169.5	168.8	682.9
Rochester	East Rochester School	171.3	167.7	170.8	173.6	683.4
Laconia	Pleasant Street School	173.2	174.9	165.7	169.7	683.5
Rochester	Chamberlain Street School	167.3	175.8	171.9	169.7	684.7
District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score
Raymond	Lamprey River Elementary Sch	167.1	167.1	171.7	179.6	685.5
Somersworth	Maple Wood Elementary School	174.7	172	170	169	685.7
Laconia	Woodland Heights Elem Sch	177	169.7	166.9	172.4	686
Merrimack Valley	Penacook Elementary School	168.4	167.1	173.6	179.6	688.7
Lincoln-Woodstock Cooperative	Lin-Wood Public School (Elem)	163.6	163.7	177.4	184.1	688.8
Winnisquam Regional	Southwick School	164	174.1	175.7	177	690.8
Lebanon	Hanover Street School	169.3	176	173.4	172.2	690.9

Mascenic Regional	Boynton Middle School	164.1	172.7	176.9	177.6	691.3
Hudson	Dr. H. O. Smith School	169.4	170.5	172.7	179	691.6
Rochester	William Allen School	173.7	174.7	172.9	172.1	693.4
Laconia	Elm Street School	166	175.9	175.2	177.6	694.7
Haverhill Cooperative	Woodsville Elementary School	167.4	170.1	177.3	181.7	696.5
Portsmouth	New Franklin School	165.5	171.1	178.1	183.1	697.8
Goffstown	Bartlett Elementary School	178.3	172.2	173.1	174.8	698.4
Newfound Area	New Hampton Community School	167.9	167.9	179.7	183.8	699.3
Rollinsford	Rollinsford Grade School	175.9	172.1	174.7	176.6	699.3
Weare	Weare Middle School	168	173.5	176.3	182.1	699.9
Rochester	School Street School	163.9	166.5	190.8	179.6	700.8
Concord	Rundlett Middle School	174.4	174.4	176	177.7	702.5
Weare	Center Woods School	173.2	175.8	176	178.1	703.1
Deerfield	Deerfield Community School	171.1	173.4	175.8	183.1	703.4
District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score
Governor Wentworth Regional	Ossipee Central School	170.1	175.7	178.3	179.9	704
Governor Wentworth Regional	Kingswood Regional Middle Sch	171.9	176	183.1	173.2	704.2
Barrington	Barrington Elementary School	169.1	175.4	177.9	182	704.4

Mascoma Valley Regional	Enfield Elementary School	182.1	172.8	173.6	176.7	705.2
Litchfield	Litchfield Middle School	170.5	170.8	180.6	183.4	705.3
Portsmouth	Mary C. Dondero Elementary Sch	177	179.2	176.4	172.7	705.3
Northwood	Northwood Elementary School	174.6	176.2	179.4	176.4	706.6
Inter-Lakes Cooperative	Inter-Lakes Middle Tier	172.6	175.3	176.3	182.8	707
Gilmanton	Gilmanton Elementary School	170.7	170.9	177.6	188.1	707.3
Chesterfield	Chesterfield Central School	167.4	179.3	180.5	182.7	709.9
Lebanon	Lebanon Junior High School	172.9	172.7	183.2	182.4	711.2
Shaker Regional	Belmont Middle School	173.3	178.1	177.7	182.9	712
Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative	Jaffrey Grade School	170.4	176.9	181.9	183.1	712.3
Epping	Epping Elementary School	173	180.9	178.8	179.7	712.4
Littleton	Mildred C. Lakeway School	176	174.8	174.9	186.9	712.6
Londonderry	North Londonderry Elementary	181.8	177.4	176.5	177.9	713.6
Lebanon	Mt. Lebanon School	180.3	178.7	177.4	177.9	714.3
Sanborn Regional	Memorial School	180.3	177.6	177.7	178.8	714.4
Dover	Dover Middle School	175.3	177	180.7	181.4	714.4
Merrimack Valley	Boscawen Elementary School	177.4	176.9	174.7	186.3	715.3
Kearsarge Regional	Kearsarge Regional Middle Sch	175.7	174.2	182.8	183.1	715.8
District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score

Sanborn Regional	Daniel J. Bakie School	175.6	174.3	181.8	184.3	716
Hudson	Nottingham West Elementary	174.5	179.7	179.3	183.2	716.7
Andover	Andover Elementary School	178.6	175.6	179	185.2	718.4
Gorham Randolph Shelburne Coop	Edward Fenn School	177.9	181.2	179.4	181.3	719.8
Milford	Heron Pond Elementary School	180	180.1	179.6	180.3	720
Milford	Jacques Memorial Elementary	inherits SINI designation of Heron Pond Elementary				
Conway	John H. Fuller School	175.9	180.5	180.9	183.2	720.5
Nottingham	Nottingham Elementary School	178	177.1	183.6	182	720.7
Marlborough	Marlborough Elementary School	177	169.7	183.8	190.6	721.1
Newmarket	Newmarket Elementary School	177.6	179.7	181.1	183.6	722
Timberlane Regional	Pollard Elementary School	177.9	181.2	180.2	182.9	722.2
Concord	Broken Ground School	178	180.1	182.4	182.2	722.7
Derry Cooperative	Ernest P. Barka Elementary Sch	173.4	180.7	182.6	186.2	722.9
Keene	Jonathan M. Daniels School	178.3	181	175.5	188.2	723
Inter-Lakes Cooperative	Inter-Lakes Elementary School	180.1	185.2	175.9	182.9	724.1
Pelham	Pelham Elementary School	178.1	182.4	182.4	181.5	724.4
Salem	Mary A. Fisk Elementary School	176.1	182	184.5	182.2	724.8

Henniker	Henniker Community School	178.1	180.2	182.4	186.1	726.8
Goffstown	Maple Avenue School	181.9	179.2	179.5	186.5	727.1
Hooksett	David R. Cawley Middle School	181.2	181.2	183.4	182.8	728.6
Rochester	McClelland School	173.6	183.6	186.5	184.9	728.6
Hudson	Hills Garrison Elementary School	178.3	182.9	185.5	182.6	729.3
District	School	2006-07 Index Combin ed	2007-08 Index Combin ed	2008-09 Index Combin ed	2009-10 Index Combin ed	Cumulati ve Index Score
Keene	Symonds Elementary School	176.5	181.9	179	192.5	729.9
Mont Vernon	Mont Vernon Village School	179.3	182.6	181.7	187.1	730.7
Chester	Chester Academy	181.3	181.6	182.9	185.8	731.6
Bethlehem	Bethlehem Elementary School	183.4	182.1	182.6	184.4	732.5
Litchfield	Griffin Memorial School	181.3	181.2	184.5	185.5	732.5
Hooksett	Hooksett Memorial School	181.4	181.7	183.5	186.3	732.9
Concord	Kimball-Walker School at Rumford	178.6	182.8	189.4	185	735.8
Londonderry	South Londonderry Elementary	186.1	181.9	184.1	184.2	736.3
Hooksett	Fred C. Underhill School	182.2	181.8	182.1	192	738.1
Bow	Bow Elementary School	185.3	186	184	185.2	740.5
Westmoreland	Westmoreland School	182.1	186.5	186	188.9	743.5
Amherst	Clark Wilkins	185.4	186.6	188.3	189.9	750.2
Exeter Region Cooperative	Cooperative Middle School	186.8	185.5	189	192	753.3

Amherst	Amherst Middle School	186.7	192.2	187.7	189.8	756.4
District	<u>Title I SINI High Schools</u>		2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score
State of NH	Average Combined Index Score		146.7	154.4	156.1	457.2
Mascenic Regional	Mascenic Regional High School		142.7	145.2	149.2	437.1
White Mts. Regional	White Mts. Regional High School		148.1	151.9	137.9	437.9
Prospect Mt. JMA	Prospect Mt. High School		145.6	153.1	150.8	449.5
Raymond	Raymond High School		148.9	145.7	158.8	453.4
Concord	Concord High School		158.7	157.9	152.7	469.3
John Stark Regional	John Stark Regional High School		155.0	165.8	160.5	481.3

Identification of Tier III Schools (Condition 2)

(2) *The school must be Title I eligible, must not meet the Tier I or Tier II requirements , and is in the bottom 20 percent of all schools in the state or has not made AYP for at least two years.*

- Determine which elementary/middle schools are within the bottom 20 percent:
--20% of 367 elementary/middle schools = 73, ranked low to high.
- Determine which of the schools in the bottom 20 percent are Title I eligible and also did not meet the Tier I or Tier II requirements.
- Note: The following schools are within the bottom 20 percent but do not meet the Title I eligibility requirements:
--Manchester Schools (Hillside Middle, Highland Goffs-Falls, Weston, Webster, Jewett)
--Marlow (John Perkins Elementary)
--Fall Mountain (North Walpole Elementary)

District	School	2006-07 Index Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumu Index Score
State of NH	Average Combined Index Score	171.8	174.2	176.5	178.5	701.0
Hillsboro-Deering	Hillsboro-Deering Middle School	152.8	149.5	159.1	163.9	625.3
Claremont	Claremont Middle School	157.9	159.1	158.0	158.0	633.0
Northumberland	Groveton High School (Middle)	149.2	157.3	172.4	157.6	636.5
Croydon	Croydon Village School	175.0	170.8	150.0	141.5	637.3
Monadnock Regional	Gilsum Elementary School	141.5	154.0	155.3	187.3	638.1
Stewartstown	Stewartstown Community School	162.6	163.3	155.5	157.0	638.4
Monadnock Regional	Monadnock Regional Middle Sch	148.4	170.1	165.4	156.6	640.5
Hill	Jennie Blake School	149.9	159.7	159.6	171.7	640.9
Fall Mountain Regional	Acworth Elementary	164.7	160.9	170.6	147.8	644.0
Seabrook	Seabrook Middle School	144.7	158.7	171.9	171.2	646.5
Wilton-Lyndeborough	Wilton-Lyndeborough Middle	165.4	163.4	166.2	152.9	647.9
Berlin	Berlin Junior High School	152.1	162.6	166.5	175.1	656.3
Rochester	Rochester Middle School	153.9	162.7	171.3	170.6	658.5
Stratford	Stratford Public School (Elem)	162.3	160.3	163.2	173.4	659.2
Pittsburg	Pittsburg Elementary	170.9	162.7	169.9	155.9	659.4
Claremont	Bluff School	160.5	160.3	167.3	172.9	.0

Lisbon Regional	Lisbon Regional (Middle)	161.3	150.3	169.5	182.9	664.0
Merrimack Valley	Merrimack Valley Middle	158.9	165.2	168.8	171.2	664.1

Total: 18 elementary/middle schools

- Determine which high schools are within the bottom 20 percent:
--20% of 76 high schools = 15, ranked low to high.
- Determine which of the schools in the bottom 20 percent are Title I eligible and also did not meet the Tier I or Tier II requirements.
- Note: Manchester West HS, Manchester Memorial HS, and Spaulding HS are within the bottom 20 percent, but do not meet the Title I eligibility requirements.

District	School	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative Index Score
State of NH	Average Combined Index Score	146.7	154.4	156.1	457.2
Epping	Epping High School	142.7	132.1	153.9	428.7
Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative	Conant High School	142.1	148.6	139.2	429.9
Claremont	Stevens High School	141.6	141.6	146.8	430.0
Monadnock Regional	Monadnock Regional High School	122.7	154.6	153.9	431.2
Berlin	Berlin Senior High School	128.2	153.7	149.9	431.8

Total: 5 high schools

LEA Appendix B: New Hampshire's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools Definition

The following provides details as to the information and process used by New Hampshire to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Definitions from New Hampshire's Rules for Public School Approval (NH RSA 189:25):

- A public school containing any of the grades kindergarten through 8 is classified as an elementary school.
- A public elementary school containing any combination of grades 4-8 may be classified as a public middle school, subject to meeting the rules applicable to all middle schools. (NH RSA 189:25)
- A public school or public academy containing any of the grades 9 through 12 is classified as a secondary, or high school, subject to meeting the rules applicable to all high schools.

Using the above referenced state definitions and in accordance with guidance provided within the Frequently Asked Questions Concerning Phase II of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund document, items B-V-4 through B-V-18, New Hampshire developed the following:

New Hampshire's "persistently lowest-achieving schools" are:

- (a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I Schools in Need Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

and

- (b) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

Review of student achievement results. All available student achievement data for the “all students” group from New Hampshire’s approved state assessment, the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), was reviewed for each school on the above-referenced lists. Four years of NECAP data (2006-2009) was reviewed for elementary and middle schools, and three years of NECAP data (2007 - 2009) was reviewed for high schools. As the data available increases in future years, four years of data across all school attendance areas will be used. As the raw student achievement data for the state’s reading and mathematics assessments converts to a 100-point index score system, the index scores in each content area for the “all students” group were added together for each school in order to produce an annual combined score. The index system is consistent with items B-V-8 and B-V-16 through B-V-18 of the Frequently Asked Questions Concerning Phase II of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund document. The annual combined scores were then totaled (four years for elementary or middle schools and three years for high schools) to produce a cumulative achievement score for each school. New Hampshire chose not to weight data used in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Selection of schools. For each list, schools were rank-ordered from lowest to highest on the basis of the cumulative achievement score. Schools at the top of each rank-ordered list were determined to be the state’s persistently lowest-achieving. Seven elementary and/or middle schools (5% of 146) from the Title I Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring list, and five high schools from the Title I Eligible list were selected (as of December 2010).

Based on the most recent four years of data, no high school in New Hampshire (as of December 2010) met the selection criteria for low graduation rate (graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years).

Appendix C: Baseline School Data Profile

Parkside Baseline for:	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
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.	(6 hours x 60 minutes) + 16 minutes) 376 minutes x 180 days 67,680 minutes	(6 hours x 60 minutes) + 16 minutes) 376 minutes x 180 days 67,680 minutes	(6 hours x 60 minutes) + 16 minutes) 376 minutes x 177 days 66,552 minutes
Does the school provide any of the following in order to offer increased learning time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> longer school day before or after school summer school weekend school Other 	The school has a 21 st CCLC afterschool programs that offers homework help and enrichment activities.	The school has a 21 st CCLC afterschool programs that offers homework help and enrichment activities.	Yes, each teacher stays afterschool to provide homework help one day each week. The school has a 21 st CCLC afterschool programs that offers homework help and enrichment activities.
The number of school days during the school year (plus summer, if applicable, if part of implementing the restart, transformation or			

Parkside Baseline for:	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
turnaround model) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students could have attended school during the regular school year;			
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student attendance rate	92%	92%	
The number of students who completed advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics);	NONE	NONE	NONE
The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;	N/A	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	N/A

Parkside Baseline for:	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Number of discipline incidents	1,974	2,131	As of May 6, there have been 1,646 discipline incidents
Number of truant students			As of May 6, there are 284 students who are truant for more than five consecutive full days (number is not duplicated)
The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days;	<p>69 FTE teachers x 183 = 12,627</p> <p>661 total days absent (includes 452.5 sick days [70 days by two teachers on leave], 82 personal days, 75.5 in-district workshops, 38 travel days, 14 bereavement</p> <p>12,627 – 661 = 11,966</p> <p>Divide 11,966 by 12,627= 94.76%</p>	<p>65 FTE teachers x 183 = 12,627</p> <p>873.5 total days absent (includes 646.5 sick days [230 days by seven teachers on leave], 90 personal days, 101 in-district workshops, 24 travel days, 12) bereavement</p> <p>11895 – 873.5 = 11,021.5</p> <p>Divide 11,021.5 by 11895= 92.65%</p>	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;	<p>RD 99%</p> <p>MA 99%</p>	<p>RD 99%</p> <p>MA 99%</p>	<p>RD 100%</p> <p>MA 99%</p>

Parkside Baseline for:	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system			Teachers are not rated by evaluation; evaluation is a narrative
Teacher attendance rate	646.5 absences	661 teacher absences	
<p>* Students begin at 7:45 and are released at 2:01; because of a waiver, only two of the five snow days will be made up in 2010-11.</p> <p>** Teacher absences include in-house workshops, travel workshops, bereavement days, personal and bonus days, maternity leave, and sick time.</p>			

MSD Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric

Criteria	Poor	Satisfactory	Strong	LEA Self Assessment
LEA governance and decision making methods	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for no district or school level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives, with decision power held by the local school board	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for district level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for district and school level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives, allowing for operational flexibility at the school level	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
Title I audit reports	Findings in areas requiring a repayment of	Findings in areas noted-repayment of	No findings in the fiscal area	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong

	funds	funds not required		
Approval of the district in need of improvement and/or school in need of improvement plans	Not approved by the SEA	Approved by the SEA with revisions	Approved by the SEA without revisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
Development of schools as professional learning communities	The school has not yet begun to address the practice of a professional learning community or an effort has been made to address the practice of professional learning communities, but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.	A critical mass of staff has begun to engage in professional learning community practice. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.	The practice of professional learning communities is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
Identification of district leadership team and assignment of responsibilities	No district leadership team nor identified person assigned for monitoring implementation	Lacks specific identification of personnel for the district leadership team and for monitoring implementation.	A specific district leadership team is identified and one or more persons are assigned for monitoring implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
School Leadership Team	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders Evidence is produced to document	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong

	1116 and 1117 have been met.	1116 and 1117 have been met.	whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been exceeded.	
<p>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 regarding LEA capacity.</p>				

MSD Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. **Description of Activity:** Implement PBIS at Parkside—PBIS will be introduced to staff at Parkside. NH CEBIS will train Parkside staff over two years.
2. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:** A SIG goal is to improve school climate. Increasing teachers’ understanding and capacity to implement PBIS (positive behavioral intervention and supports) is a key activity to improving school climate. PBIS will provide the model and platform on which a safe school climate is realized, one where all students have opportunities to learn and achieve.
3. **Name of Contractor:**
NH CEBIS
4. **Qualifications of Contractor:** *(Attach a resume in lieu of a narrative):*
Only NH vendor for PBIS. Requested by Southside SIG team and Parkside SIG team.

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

Background:

Year 1

NH CEBIS Staff:

Director	1 day/month	12	1200	14400
Evaluation Coordinator	1 day/month	12	600	7200
Project Associate	1 day/week	52	125	6500
Benefits for PA				1202.5
TOTAL				29302.5

Supplies & Materials

Universal Team Manuals	5/school	1 school	\$100	500
Coaches Manuals	2/school	1 school	\$50	100
Chart Paper		5	30	150
Nametags		2	50	100

Photocopies	500
Misc. Office Supplies	150

TOTAL	1500
-------	-------------

Contracted Services

Facilitators	2 days/month	1 school	1000	20000
SWIS Training of 3 people	1/2 day		1200	600
Leadership Team/SAU Meetings	1 day/month		1200	14400
SWIS & CICO Subscription	300/school	1 school		300
Whole-School Trainings	(2/year)		1200	2400

37700

Item	Cost
NH CEBIS Staff	\$29,302.50
Supplies & Materials	\$1,500.00
Contracted Services	\$37,700.00
Trainings	\$11,082.50
Travel	\$0.00
TOTAL	\$79,585.00

Year 2

NH CEBIS Staff:

Director	1 day/month	12	1200	14400
Evaluation Coordinator	1 day/month	12	600	7200
Project Associate	1 day/week	52	125	6500
Benefits for PA				1202.5
TOTAL				29302.5

Supplies & Materials

Targeted Team				
Manuals	5/school	1 school	\$100	500
Coaches Manuals	2/school	1 school	\$50	100
Chart Paper		5	30	150
Nametags		2	50	100
Photocopies				500
Misc. Office Supplies				150
TOTAL				1500

Contracted Services

Facilitators	2 days/month	1 school	1000	20000
SWIS Training of 3 people	1/2 day		1200	600
Leadership Team/SAU Meetings	1 day/month		1200	14400
SWIS & CICO Subscription	300/school	1 school		300
Whole-School Trainings (2/year)			1200	2400
				37700

Item	Cost
NH CEBIS Staff	\$29,302.50
Supplies & Materials	\$1,500.00
Contracted Services	\$37,700.00
Trainings	\$15,002.50
Travel	\$0.00
TOTAL	\$83,505.00

5. **Beginning Date:** June 2011

Ending Date: June 30, 2014

Services Justification Form: Solid Foundation

Description of Activity: Solid Foundation at Parkside

1. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:** As part of involving parents in their children's academic and social growth, Parkside, will contract with the NH Parent Information Resource Center to bring the **Solid Foundation**, a Research-Based Parent Involvement Program, to their school community. NH PIRC will facilitate training events for parents, teachers, and other staff members.
2. **Name of Contractor: NH PIRC,** The New Hampshire State PIRC builds the capacity of parents and school personnel to effectively communicate, expand parent involvement education, build strong school-family-community partnerships, and link families to community resources. As a result, students will have access to the support they need to achieve high standards (source: <http://www.nationalpirc.org/directory/NH.html>)

3. **Qualifications of Contractor: NH PIRC Solid Foundation**

The NH Parent Information and Resource Center (NH State PIRC) is a US Department of Education-funded program aimed at improving student academic performance by increasing parental involvement in children's education. The NH State PIRC promotes parent involvement in education through information, products, trainings, workshops, publications, toolkits, and technical assistance to parents, schools, school districts, PTAs, and community organizations.

As part of a school-based partnership, the NH State PIRC offers **Solid Foundation**, a Research-Based Parent Involvement Program <http://www.adi.org/solidfoundation/>.

What is **Solid Foundation**?

Solid Foundation is a school-based team process that helps:

- Strengthen family-school connections
- Engage parents in their children's learning
- Improve student academic and social learning

Working with an External Partner (a trained coach from the district, state, PIRC, or community group), the school adopts one of the **Solid Foundation** Paths.

Solid Foundation is a tool used to build strong school communities that support student success. The school community is realized *through proven practices that make up Solid Foundation's Building Blocks – Shared Leadership, Education, Policies, Communication, and Connection*. Reading skills grow...creating a strong foundation for all other learning; study habits are formed...propelling student success in school and beyond; responsible behavior is cultivated...resulting in respect for self and others. In Solid Foundation the connection between parents and their child's learning is not left to chance.

Solid Foundation:

- Evaluates perceptions of stakeholders
- Identifies areas where stronger partnerships are needed
- Offers evidence based strategies that improve partnerships

Solid Foundation provides a school team with the tools, resources, and a proven process to develop, implement, and monitor a two-year plan based on a data-rich needs assessment. The web-based Resource Manual is full of research-based strategies, trainings, curriculum, forms, and tools that assist the school team in implementing its action plan. The Resource Manual includes field-tested materials developed by ADI in hundreds of schools and is now supplemented with resources from *Beyond the Bake Sale*, the classic book on evidence-based parent engagement strategies. Solid Foundation's online system provides agendas, resources, planning tools, and systematic documentation of implementation of a high-quality plan for improved parent involvement and a strong school community. The school community--families, school staff, volunteers--together build students' *solid foundation* of skills, habits, and qualities of character that will serve them for a lifetime: Reading, Studying, Respect, and Responsibility.

Solid Foundation is a parent engagement process within a web-based structure to assess, plan, implement, and monitor parent involvement at the school level. Features of the web-based structure include:

- Step by step approach
- Quality Resources
- Self-Sustaining Methods
- Flexible Options
- External Partner Support
- Site-Based Decision Making
- Web-Based Monitoring

10 Efficient Steps:

1. School Team Meets with External Partner for Orientation Meeting
2. Principal Completes School Information Form
3. Gather Key Documents
4. External Partner Completes Policy Analysis
5. School Team Meets with External Partner to Review School Community Index
6. Principal Downloads and Prints Resource Manual
7. Team Completes Needs Assessment
8. Team Creates Action Plan with External Partner
9. Team Implements Action Plan
10. Team and External Partner Monitor and Evaluate

Contact: **New Hampshire Solid Foundation Network**, Karen Gerdts at the NH PIRC
kgerdts@nhpirc.org, 603-8-5667.

The Parent Information Center | PO Box 2405 | Concord, NH 03302
(603) 224-7005 | (603) 224-4365 (FAX)

Cost: \$5,000 per school /per year + \$1,700 for facilitator services in Year1, Year 2 and Year 3.

6. **Beginning Date:** June 2011

Ending Date: June 30, 2014

Description of Activity: AIMSweb Assessment and Data Management for RTI at Parkside

AIMSweb is a benchmark and progress monitoring system based on direct, frequent and continuous student assessment. The results are reported to students, parents, teachers and administrators via a web-based data management and reporting system to determine response to intervention. The AIMSweb system components provide one comprehensive progress monitoring and RTI Solution:

Benchmark – Assess all students three times per year for universal screening (early identification), general education progress monitoring, and AYP accountability.

Strategic Monitor – Monitor at-risk students monthly and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional changes.

Progress Monitor – Write individualized annual goals and monitor more frequently for those who need intensive instructional services (source: <http://www.aimsweb.com/>)

4. **Costs:** Year 1 costs: \$12,650

5. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:** A SIG Transformation goal is to promote the continued use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction. In order to move all students forward academically, and especially for our subgroups whose academic progress lags behind others, specifically, our ELL and Special Education populations we need to be able to accurately assess them for services and then to monitor their progress. Mrs. Somoza-Norton, principal of Parkside Middle School, met with Mrs. Azevedo, principal of Southside, who had done her own research and will be using AIMSweb in her school's Transformation.. The Parkside team also researched student assessment and monitoring tools. They were encouraged by AIMSweb's claims and by the ease of use that Special Ed staff members have experienced. They decided to use it at their school, too. The Manchester School District will contract with the AIMSweb for student subscriptions (\$5/student/year), training, and workbooks. Cohorts of 30 staff can train at one time. Parkside staff will train two cohorts of 30 in two two-day training sessions. Another strength of this product is that it works with Response to Intervention, which is a SIG initiative.

6. **Name of Contractor:** AIMSweb, a Pearson Brand @ 866.313.6194. For more information, see <http://www.aimsweb.com/>

Qualifications of Contractor: Selected by Southside SIG team and Parkside SIG team.

7. **Beginning Date:** June 2011

Ending Date: June 30, 2014

Description of Activity: Response to Intervention (Rtl) at Parkside

RTI is a school improvement strategy that depends on a collaborative, data-driven approach to improve student outcomes. At its core is the use of rigorous, standards-based curricula and regular progress monitoring to identify struggling students and provide supports of varying intensity depending on each student's needs. The RTI framework is a component of the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA, (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), as an alternative to traditional methods of identifying learning disabilities. Its applicability to the wider school population has reduced the numbers of students misidentified as learning disabled, and has reached many students with learning issues whom the traditional method may have overlooked (source: <http://www.education.nh.gov/news/2009/20090629.htm>).

In July 2009, more than 40 Manchester School District leaders attended a statewide institute on Response to Intervention (RTI), sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Education. The July 2009 RTI institute featured Shannon Harken, an Iowa educator and a leader in implementing RTI in the Midwest. When district leaders returned, they began to implement Rtl; however, the process has not been formalized. Shannon Harken is the preferred vendor to provide onsite training at Parkside.

7. **Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:** Delivering the instructional service that an individual student needs is critical to their academic success. When educators are able to accurately identify struggling students and provide them with the supports of varying intensity depending on each student's needs. Educators at all schools need

8.

Name of Contractor: TBD, Shannon Harken is preferred

9. Heartland AEA 11, Iowa

10. **Beginning Date:** June 2011

Ending Date: June 30, 2014

11. Description of Activity: Educational Technology Consultant at Parkside

Parkside will be using SIG funds to secure technology for students' hands-on use. Hands-on learning will be built around mobile carts featuring interactive, touch-screen devices capable of supporting e-textbooks and e-books (web-based and off-line), content creation, communication, and other media learning, and interactive white boards, document cameras, and laptops. Additional support will be needed to provide training and support on identifying useful data, analyzing data, and using that data to make instructional and pedagogical change. To maximize this investment, we need a well-trained staff to implement this activity. To maximize this investment, we need a well-trained staff to implement this activity.

Parkside will look for a technology consultant skilled in using and integrating interactive, touch-screen devices capable of supporting e-textbooks and e-books (web-based and off-line), content creation, communication, and other media into the middle school curriculum. Ideally, the consultant will be current and/or former educators who have a track record of integrating technology into learning. The educational technology consultants must be able to align content with the ISTE National Technology Standards for Teachers (NETS-T) and the ISTE National Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S) based on effective design standards from the National Staff Development Council (NSDC).

In New Hampshire, all grade eight students are required to have Digital Portfolios. Because Dr. Cathy Higgins of the NH Dept of Ed has been managing the Title IID (Enhancing Education Through Technology) grants in New Hampshire, we would request her guidance in staff this contract.

- 12. Describe how this request is connected to the specific goals of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant:** Extending and expanding teachers' capacity to integrate technology into their lesson plans, and extending and expanding students' access to technology are two goals in Parkside's plan.

- 13. Name of Contractor:** TBD

Qualifications of Contractor: Contractor qualifications will match

Budget: \$62,600 in Year 1

- 8. Beginning Date:** June 2011

Ending Date: June 30, 2014

MSD Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form

MSD Appendix G: Application Scoring Rubrics

New Hampshire Department of Education
 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)
 District Scoring Rubric

This version is to be used for any LEA that has at least one Tier I and/or Tier II AND a Tier III school.

SAU#: _____ District Name: _____ Total # of Schools Applying: _____ Reviewer Name: _____ District Score: _____ _____						
Directions: Circle the appropriate point values and total each column	Informati on Not	Lacks Sufficien	Marginal requires clarificat	Good: clear & comple	Exemplary: well conceived	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	
<i>A - Schools to be served:</i>						
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	
<i>B - Descriptive Information – Evidence for each Tier I and Tier II school</i>						

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

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

<p>7) Described the intervention model proposed for each <u>Tier III</u> school the LEA has committed to serve. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>8) Described the goals the LEA has established (subject to approval by the NH DOE) in order to hold accountable the Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

Action Plan						
Year 1 Action Plan is complete including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Pre-implementation activities are appropriate and within the SIG guidance. • 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 (2010-2011) Detail School Budget Narrative (including pre-implementation expenses if the district is choosing to utilize them-not required) and justification forms (if applicable). <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	0	1	

D - Assurances						
1) Signed Assurance page	0	0	0	0	1	
E - Waivers						
1) Is the LEA applying for any waivers?	0	0	0	0	0	

LEA Appendix G: Application Scoring Rubrics

New Hampshire Department of Education
1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)
District Scoring Rubric

This version is to be used for LEA's that have Tier I and/or Tier II schools only.

SAU#: _____ District Name: _____
Total # of Schools Applying: _____
Reviewer Name: _____ District Score: _____

Directions: Circle the appropriate point values and total each column	Information Not	Lacks Sufficient	Marginal: requires clarification or	Good: clear & complete	Exemplary: well conceived	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 for each Tier I and Tier II school						
<p>1) The needs assessment adequately addressed all areas on the <i>Needs Assessment Review Feedback Rubric</i> and the <i>Baseline School Data Profile</i> was complete. Described the results of the needs assessment conducted for each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA proposes to serve, and the relationship of those results to the selection of the Intervention Model indicated above.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>2) Consider LEA’s self assessment on the LEA Capacity Rubric (SEA application-Appendix D).</p> <p>The LEA also, described the LEA’s capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Intervention Model selected for each school.</p> <p>Base rating on measurements from the Intervention & Budget Alignment Rubric in the SEA application-Appendix E .</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>3) Provided an explanation for any eligible Tier I school the LEA has elected to NOT include in its application to support the LEA’s decision that it lacks the capacity to serve such school(s).</p>	0	0	0	0	0	

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

<p>7) Described the intervention model proposed for each <u>Tier III</u> school the LEA has committed to serve. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).</p>	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
<p>8) Described the goals the LEA has established (subject to approval by the NH DOE) in order to hold accountable the Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.</p>	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
<p>9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

<p>Action Plan</p> <p>Year 1 Action Plan is complete including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Pre-implementation activities are appropriate and within the SIG guidance. • Resources • Timeline • Oversight • Monitoring of implementation • Monitoring of effectiveness • Funds needed <p>The model chosen is clearly connected to the activities chosen in the Action Plan.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
C – Budget						
1) Completed the Overview Budget grid	0	0	0	0	1	
2) Completed the Three Year School Budget Plan (1 per school)	0	0	0	0	1	
3) Completed the One Year (2010-2011) Detail School Budget Narrative (including pre-implementation expenses if the district is choosing to utilize them-not required) and justification forms (if applicable). <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	0	1	

D - Assurances						
1) Signed Assurance page	0	0	0	0	1	
E - Waivers						
1) Is the LEA applying for any waivers?	0	0	0	0	0	

LEA Appendix G: Application Scoring Rubrics

New Hampshire Department of Education
1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)
District Scoring Rubric

This version is to be used for any LEA that has a Tier III school only.

SAU#: _____	District Name: _____
Total # of Schools Applying: _____	
Reviewer Name: _____	District Score:

Directions: Circle the appropriate point values and total each column	Informati on Not Provided	Lacks Sufficient	Marginal: requires clarificati on or	Good: clear & complet	Exemplary: well conceived	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	
--	---	---	---	---	---	--

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

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

<p>7) Described the intervention model proposed for each <u>Tier III</u> school the LEA has committed to serve. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>8) Described the goals the LEA has established (subject to approval by the NH DOE) in order to hold accountable the Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

Action Plan Year 1 Action Plan is complete including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Pre-implementation activities are appropriate and within the SIG guidance. • 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 (2010-2011) Detail School Budget Narrative (including pre-implementation expenses if the district is choosing to utilize them-not required) and justification forms (if applicable). <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	0	1	

<i>D - Assurances</i>						
1) Signed Assurance page	0	0	0	0	1	
<i>E - Waivers</i>						
1) Is the LEA applying for any waivers?	0	0	0	0	0	