

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 PageLEA -1
NH LEA Application Table of Contents.....LEA -2
General Grant InformationLEA -3-4
SIG LEA Application Process.....LEA -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 -15
Section B: Descriptive Information/Evidence of CommitmentLEA -15-28
 Action Plan Template LEA -29
Section C: Budget..... LEA -42
 Three Year Budget Plan Template..... LEA -43
 One Year School Budget Narrative Template..... LEA -50
Section D: Assurances.....LEA -54-55
Section E: Waivers..... LEA -56
LEA Appendix A: Process to Determine School Eligibility for SIG LEA -57
LEA Appendix B: NH’s Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools Definition LEA-70
LEA Appendix C: Baseline School Data Profile..... LEA -72
LEA Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric.....LEA -74
LEA Appendix E: Professional Dev. & Contracted Service Justification Form .. LEA -75
LEA Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form LEA -80
LEA Appendix G: Application Scoring Rubric LEA -82
Aligning Project Plan with Indicators 94

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 rank order the qualifying schools based on the final score on the District Scoring rubric and 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 based on the score on the District Scoring Rubric, as noted in the final regulations for the grant by the US Department of Education.

LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

April 1	LEA intent to apply and planning grant request due to the NH DOE
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	Three step application review
by June 15	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 1.
- 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 1.
- 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

Deborah Connell at dconnell@ed.state.nh.us or 603-271-3769

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

LEA/District: Franklin School District

SAU#: 18

Superintendent Name: Dr. Maureen Ward

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: April 1, 2011

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
Franklin Middle School	X			
Franklin High School		X		

District Mailing Address:

119 Central Street, Franklin, NH 03235

Phone: 603-934-3108

Fax: 603-934-3462

E-Mail: mward@sau18.org

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

Mailing Address (if different from above):

Work Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail:

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	Group representing <small>(School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)</small>
Brian Boynton Lori Lynch	Parent FHS Parent FMS
Mike O'Neill Maureen Ward Crystal Tilton Maryclare Heffernan Amy Cammack	Business Administrator Superintendent Grant Fiscal Manager Outside Facilitator (SERESC) Assistant Superintendent
Richard Towne Kevin Barbour	FHS Principal FMS Principal

Scott Maxner	FMS Assistant Principal
Jule Finley Amanda Green Dan Sylvester	FHS Teacher FMS Teacher FMS Teacher

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

Planning grants of \$3,000 funded by Title I 1003(a) 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
Outside Expert/Facilitator: Maryclare Heffernan, SERESC	Maryclare Heffernan	1 full days of meetings for planning, goal setting, activity planning	4-22-2011	5-10-2011	\$2,000
Supplies and Material	Amy Cammack	Materials needed to plan and complete SIG application	4-22-2011	5-10-2011	Supplies \$540.68 Food \$200.00
Stipends	Amy Cammack	Completed SIG application	4-22-2011	5-10-2011	Salary \$200 X 12 = \$2,750 Benefits \$ 509.16
Indirect Costs	N/A	N/A	4-22-2011	5-10-2011	\$59.40
					\$6,000.00

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2011

LEA Application

SAU#:18 District Name: Franklin School District

Superintendent: Dr. Maureen Ward

Address: 119 Central Street

City: Franklin Zip: 03235 Tel: 603-934-3108

E-mail: mward@sau18.org Fax: 603-934-3462

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

Name:

Address:

City: Zip: Tel:

E-mail: Fax:

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	Group representing (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)
Mike O'Neill Maureen Ward Maryclare Heffernan Amy Cammack	Business Administrator Superintendent Outside Facilitator (SERESC) Assistant Superintendent
Richard Towne Kevin Barbour Scott Maxner	FHS Principal FMS Principal FMS Assistant Principal
Jule Finley Amanda Green Dan Sylvester	FHS Teacher FMS Teacher FMS Teacher
Brian Boynton Laurie Lynch	Parent FHS Parent FMS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED:

Complete 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
Franklin Middle School	330309000511	X						X
Franklin High School	330309000128		X					X

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

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION/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*

The Franklin School District used data from the SINI and DINI plans to determine need for both the middle and high school. Given the short length of time between notification and grant completion initiating new surveys and assessments was not feasible and the committee felt that prior data provided pertinent information to make an informed decision on the needs of both schools.

Part of this SIG grant would be to incorporate yearly surveys such as “My Voice” to provide the schools with areas that need more work and those that should be celebrated as successful.

Discussion with the planning team, review of SINI and DINI data indicates the following elements of the Transformational Model of intervention: Curricular/Instructional Reform; Leadership Reform; Culture and Climate Improvement; Increase Learning Time.

Alignment of standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment:

Franklin School District recently hired a new Superintendent and new high school administration. There is not a process in place for regular curriculum and/or text book review and there is significant evidence through observations, checking plan books, and discussions that teachers do not use state standards to plan instruction. There is a severe shortage of instructional materials and resources to assistant teachers and students as reported by both teachers and parents. The only standards based assessment is NECAP. The district purchased and began training in the use of Study Island at all grade levels in January 2011.

The recommended next steps in curriculum, instruction, and assessment alignment are to: hire curriculum coordinators for math/science and for literacy; develop a protocol for text book adoption and curriculum review; provide sustained classroom-based professional development/coaching in instructional practices; provide sustained training on the integration of technology in daily lessons; develop benchmark and other standards-based assessments that can provide guidance towards instructional planning and student interventions, demonstrate and communicate an understanding of curriculum K-12, identify and provide necessary resources to implement the curriculum, provide flexible scheduling and collaboration, build team structure at the district, building, and grade level to ensure cohesive curriculum content and improve student learning. It is also necessary to demonstrate effective teaching practice for all learners through embedded high quality professional development and instructional practices with teacher mentors and coaches. Ongoing formative assessments, identification and implementation of interventions to support student growth must be documented. We need to develop an effective and objective performance based evaluation tool.

Reforming leadership practices through evaluation system reform, rewards, and embedded professional learning, including structural capacities reform:

As required in the NH SIG transformation model the High School Principal and Assistant Principal and the Middle School Assistant Principal were replaced in July 2010. The Middle School Principal will be replaced July 2011. In September 2010 all administrators were given a one day workshop by Matt Upton and Mark Paige of Drummond and Woodsum on evaluation and observation processes including legal and ethical responsibilities of both. A new form was adopted September 2010 for Observations and Evaluations using Domain 1: Unit/Lesson Planning, Preparation, Instruction, Assessment; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction; Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities. Concurrently, we have initiated a new administrative evaluation form based on: Professional Growth; Instructional Leadership; use of Data to Drive Decisions; Organizational Efficiency to Improve Learning; Effective Communication; and Use of Curriculum to Improve Learning. These changes in evaluation processes still need professional development and training to ensure that evaluations are used to affect change in instruction, assessment, or program choice to promote student learning. At the Middle School, parents, students, and teachers consistently report a frustration in the lack of input they have in the decision-making process. Changes to this have already taken place as the future principal has met many times with staff, has instituted teams for planning, scheduling, and curriculum etc. The high school principal holds monthly communication meetings to involve parents and has scheduled planned meeting times for the 2011/2012 school year with departments to share concerns and successes. Discussion has taken place this year on a performance model or some type of teacher leadership model. It is the intent of the district leadership that these discussions will be formalized over the next year to explore putting a model in place that will benefit both students and teachers.

Teachers have shown a strong desire to work with administration in affecting change. They are frustrated at the lack of success and are eager to engage in a model of learning and professional development that will result in positive changes in academic growth for all students. The current leadership team has prior history of success in increasing student proficiency and is flexible and willing to work to ensure positive outcomes for Franklin students.

Improving Culture and Climate:

Culture and climate are extremely problematic at the middle school. The high school culture and climate has changed significantly over the past year. All teachers and administrators have been afforded multiple training opportunities on bullying, cyber-bullying and reporting. PBIS was

initiated a few years ago but it does need to be revisited and more training needs to be done to ensure total compliance. It is the intent of the district to bring back the “Yellow Team” model which addresses discipline at the classroom level and involves faculty and staff in the development of protocols resulting in a safe school for all. This is also a proactive approach to Response to Intervention (RTI). There is a need to set expectations for staff and students early in the school year. Providing a safe and welcoming student centered environment through an improved physical appearance, and better signage supports the revitalization of a school designed for student growth, safety, and comfort. The desire is for students to display a sense of belonging and a feeling that someone cares if they are doing well in academic, social, and civic realms. Surveys like “My Voice” could provide baseline data early in this process for students, parents, faculty and community. This baseline data would be used to revise process and procedures for such things as climate and culture or communication to improve each year. An example would be to increase communication between teachers and parents to a minimum of once per month or to decrease office referrals by 5% in each of the three years. A repeat of the survey in two years will provide data on how well we are doing. It is necessary to develop a system of student leadership and peer mentoring. Growing principal advisory councils to further communication and exchange of information will further forge parent/community partnership for sustained student support.

Increasing Learning Time for Students, Developing External Supports, Community Engagement in Schools, and Extended Learning Opportunities.

In general parents feel disconnected from their students’ learning, report a lack of support from teachers, and a lack of awareness of their child’s academic progress. The high school initiated an online program where both students and parents can log in to check student progress. Missing assignments as well as current grades are listed and updated weekly. This system appears to be working but there are still teachers that do not regularly post assignments and/or grades. The building administrators have made this a requirement for evaluation and follow-up checks are done on a monthly basis to ensure compliance.

It is the intent of new administration to find ways to increase learning time for students both during the day and outside of regular classroom hours. Before school, after school, and Saturday programs are currently being considered. These programs would be staffed with certified teachers, use Study Island to promote continuity and tracking, select a variety of times to meet all needs, and finally, if possible to provide transportation.

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*.

Franklin School District is a district where the demand for improvement is far greater than current capacity for improvement. Faculty, staff, parents, students give time and energy to the district to provide supports and assistance needed to improve student growth but monetary resources for books, supplies, training, professional development, and team collaboration time is lacking due to the impoverished nature of the community. The district is under City governance that instituted a Tax Cap. The history is a decrease in City supported funding over the past five years

demonstrating a lack of belief in the ability of the school system and/or the students to be successful. Other conditions include disengaged parents and students, a context of poor learning climate, persistently low student expectations. High School math scores show proficiency at 23%, 11%, and 15% respectively over the past 3 years. Reading went from 62% proficient in 2008 to 50% in 2010. At the middle school math proficiency at 8th grade was 33% this year while reading is at 57%.

The NH SIG application affords Franklin a one-time opportunity to apply research to practice and to change the attitude of parents, students and community from one of low expectations for student performance to one of high expectations for every child. To do this, the district leadership team is poised to work closely with leading consultants to guide the change process in a way that is fully aligned with implementation and change research. This research will guide district practice to create sustained, ongoing, systemic change. It is expected that the Franklin SIG grant will be fully implemented at the end of a two-year period, but it will take significantly longer to ensure the system change is well established and sustainable. The framework for that change will be established through the guidance, coaching, and leadership support provided through the grant process.

Franklin's leadership team will be trained and supported to use evidence-based change practices: implementation stages, drivers of change, roles, and effective intervention practices. Guidance throughout this process is necessary to clarify the role of an effective leadership team to support the complexities of the change process and to ensure that those processes are effecting the desired changes. To that end, continuous checks, measurements, and assessments must be in place to ensure program fidelity and progress outcomes.

The leadership team will be responsible for preparing faculty and staff for the change process, assuring clarity about what will change for students, guiding ongoing implementation with lead consultants, and working with the district and the community/parents to support the change process. The Team will meet regularly in facilitated sessions to learn, reflect and analyze outcomes.

To meet the needs of the Transformational Model the Franklin School District recognizes that additional supports will need to be put in place to complement the assets of the current leadership team. The SIG application could address these shortfalls in the following ways:

- hire leadership mentors through the NH Principals Association to mentor all new administrators
- hire curriculum coordinators in the areas of math/science and literacy to assist with the alignment of standards to instruction and assessment and to analyze current curriculum
- provide training for the leadership team on change processes
- provide training on the collection and use of data to drive decisions or decision-making to affect change
- use of external consultants to facilitate team work at both local and state level to provide research, guidance, and discussion on best practices, implementation, results, and next steps

The second part of this developmental model is to build teacher capacity. To change the activities of faculty and staff, they must be supported to acquire the knowledge, skills and abilities to effectively intervene with students. In order for teachers to change they need new information, professional learning aligned to the improvement goals, and time to work with coaches in their classrooms to implement and refine new practices. Teachers must be supported

and also have a safe environment in which to try new instructional practices, and receive guidance from experts in their content area. They must have opportunities to reflect, apply and deepen new practices. The SIG plan calls for the following supports to build teacher capacity:

- mathematics and literacy curriculum coordinators
- mathematics and literacy classroom coaches
- establish a system of pay for performance for teachers engaged in improvement practices
- develop protocols for training and time for teachers in the use of collaborative dialogue to reflect on and improve instructional practices
- offer on-site college credit courses aligned with improvement initiatives
- establish a teacher mentorship program

Finally, it is important that all federal and state grants be managed by a dedicated experienced grant manager/accountant. This role is essential to the effective management and reporting of all grant funds but particularly of SIG funds.

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).

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.

Both the Franklin Middle and High school elected to participate.

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:

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

It will be necessary for Franklin School District to contract with a service provider to assist in implementing a Transformational Model. The initial purpose for the grant was discussed with a variety of agencies so that each agency could bring their expertise and record of success to the table. The committee will chose the agency that best meets the needs of the Franklin Schools. It is possible that the needs will not be met with one agency but Franklin may need to contract with two or more agencies to meet all needs.

Franklin School Administrators had a one day workshop in September 2010 facilitated by Attorneys Matthew Upton and Mark Paige to discuss the differences between Observation and

Evaluation and to design an evaluation tool that focused on instruction, assessment, and curriculum alignment and best teaching practices. Administration had a discussion with the teacher's union during negotiations this year on performance/merit pay. Those discussions will continue in this coming year.

Both the middle and high school will focus on curriculum development for math and literacy. Further Franklin High School will develop and implement a competency-based curriculum model. It is the intent of the district to hire two curriculum coordinators and two teacher coaches with this grant. Due to the severe need of both the middle and high schools it is felt that having one coach and curriculum director certified in math/science and the other certified in reading/language arts. This will provide both the facilitation and directional support as well as in classroom technical assistance to build capacity within our own faculty.

All professional development from all funding sources (local and grant) will focus on the four goals established in the SIG grant. Sustained professional development and coaching in both literacy and math will support school-wide use of research-based instructional strategies. Professional learning communities around subject and grade level competencies will be established along the lines of the Reading First project. Sustained professional development will also provide training to implement effective, coherent formative and summative assessments based on the established competencies. Implementation will then be part of the evaluation process to ensure that all teachers are using what they have learned to effect student success.

Measurements of success will be based on increase test scores for students on both the NECAP and Study Island assessments and teachers will demonstrate proficiency by revising, rewriting, or planning new lessons based on competencies. On-going technology integration training will sustain growth in instructional reform and provide needed supports to classroom and online learning.

Leadership supports will include training in a shared leadership model that includes the establishment of site/advisory councils. A commitment to redefining the teacher evaluation has already begun. This performance/merit pay plan will be based on agreed upon goals for teachers: additional credits, professional development, increase student proficiency, additional leadership roles to name a few. Each item will have a percent attached to it so the successful teacher can earn extra pay through completion of one or more approved plan items. An example would be a fifth grade teacher whose class increased proficiency by 5% may earn 60% of a possible \$1,000. This teacher also completed a three (3) credit graduate class earning her an addition 20% for a total of 80% of the available \$1,000. Another teacher may have earned a graduate credit but his or her class did only improved by 1%. That teacher would earn 20% of the available \$1,000. The SIG grant will provide professional development to align teacher learning goals through coaching, modeling, and other direct instructional supports. Continuous review of school structure and schedules will be provided in the SIG grant to provide alternative learning and interventions for all students.

A consistent and equitable discipline system needs to be revisited. Both the high and the middle schools have PBIS discipline systems in place that needs revitalization. The SIG grant will provide the professional development, the focus, and the time to do so. It is our intent to decrease bullying and cyber bullying at each of the schools by 5% in each year until it is eradicated completely.

The SIG grant will provide time and resources to guide leaders and teachers through a reflective process of understanding how to improve the culture and climate at each of the schools. Coaches will work with teachers to engage students and families in learning through activities such as student led conferences and the development of individual progress plans for each student.

Franklin High School developed an advisory program that they plan to continue into the 2011-2012 school year. The SIG grant will provide ongoing professional development opportunities to sustain the progress and performance of this model of student engagement.

A baseline survey such as My Voice is needed in year 1 to provide a tool to determine progress.

A request for bids went out to four agencies. The projects “specs” included baseline surveys for parents, students, faculty, administration and community on school effectiveness, curriculum, climate, instruction, and assessment for alignment to state competencies. A special review of instruction to SES and IEP students is essential as these are the areas where we have the largest achievement gaps. The bids will be screened based on clarity, completeness, track record, references, and verbal discussions with prior customers to judge competency.

Franklin School District intends to use Title IV grant funding for professional development in culture and climate to bring in speakers for both faculty and students/parents. We feel that everyone needs to be trained to recognize acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and to develop strategies to deal with those behaviors that are detrimental to a positive educational climate. The board budgeted for a total upgrade of technology systems to support the integration of hands on learning, use of white boards to augment classroom instruction, online learning, and to enhance connectivity within buildings. Servers will be replaced over a three year cycle to ensure we have the capacity to save student portfolios and have instant access when needed for e-learning. The plan for two curriculum coordinators and two teacher coaches would not continue past the three-year grant period. The district would hire one curriculum coordinator in the fourth year to sustain the work accomplished in prior years. It is critical that we build capacity with strong supports until best practices are firmly established – thus for three years we need four people to guide, mentor, facilitate, and build that capacity.

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.

Franklin Middle School:

Alignment of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction:

Understand, demonstrate, and develop course competencies:

Year 1:

- Work in small groups to review,
- revise, and
- publicize course competencies using coaches and professional development.

Year 2 & 3:

- Revise,
- finalize, and
- implement course competencies.

Map curriculum horizontally and vertically Grades 5 – 12:

Year 1:

- Map and establish pacing guides for reading and mathematics using Curriculum Coordinators hired through the SIG grant.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement,
- review, and
- revise mapping and/or pacing guides to ensure a structure that promotes substantial growth in student achievement.

Identify and provide necessary resources to implement the curriculum:

Year 1:

- Work in small groups with coaches to determine needs.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continual assessment and revision to sustain progress

Provide flexible scheduling and faculty collaboration time:

Year 1:

- Work with consultants to analyze current schedule,
- determine needs,
- develop schedule for 2012-2013 school year to meet student and staff needs.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement new schedule providing for student needs and faculty collaboration.

Build team structure at district and school levels to support school teams:

Year 1:

- Work with coaches and mentors at school and district levels to develop sustained systems of support for school professional learning communities.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continuous assessment of team effectiveness

Provide embedded high quality professional development:

Year 1:

- Hire curriculum coordinators and coaches to develop a plan for professional development that aligns itself to the goals outlined in the SIG plan.

Year 2 & 3:

- Teachers will showcase lessons learned from professional development. They will modify instructional and assessment practices based on effective teaching strategies learned from PD.

Develop formative assessments aligned with established competencies:

Year 1:

- Work with curriculum coordinators to develop a variety of assessments aligned with established competencies. Use those assessments to revise instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement competencies and assessments to improve student learning and instructional practices for teachers.

Development an effective and objective performance based teacher evaluation tool:

Year 1:

- Work with teachers to refine an evaluation tool that can be used to determine performance based rewards.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement evaluation tool.

Use technology to integrate technology in daily lessons effectively:

Year 1:

- Hire an integration specialist to train and support teachers in the use of technology in daily lessons.

Year 2 & 3:

- Expand teacher skills in technology integration and use of online resources to support, enhance, and provide additional learning opportunities.

Leadership and Governance:

Build leadership capacity at administration and teaching levels:

Year 1:

- Initial training for the development and implementation of site councils, advisory councils, Professional Learning Communities.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued reflection and analysis of the effectiveness of the leadership role through annual retreats focused on data to support suppositions.

Define and develop all constituent roles to build and sustain the capacity for transformational leadership:

Year 1:

- Establish a committee to review research and plan for the role of teachers as advisors, principals and instructional leaders, and
- establish procedures that promote personalized learning.

Year 2 & 3:

- All staff will employ best practices in advisory to ensure student engagement as determined by an increase in test scores, a decrease in absenteeism, and a decrease in discipline referrals.

Provide high quality embedded professional development:

Year 1:

- Outside coordinators will assist in the development of a three-year plan for professional development that aligns itself to the goals outlines in the SIG plan.

Year 2& 3:

- Implement and analyze strategies learned through professional development opportunities.

Hold a retreat to secure consensus and establish a plan for implementation of plan:

Year 1:

- Use outside consultants to bring coaches, mentors, curriculum coordinators, and technology integrationist together to determine a plan for improvement of Franklin Middle and High Schools.

Year 2 & 3:

- Annual retreat to analyze results, revise direction, and maintain focus and momentum.

Climate and Culture:

Set expectations for students and faculty early in the year:

Year 1:

- Have staff and administration meet prior to the start of school to set expectations.

Year 2 & 3:

- Revise as necessary to meet needs.

Provide a safe, welcoming, student centered environment & gather baseline data from students, faculty, parents, and community on their perceptions in the areas of academics, safety, physical plant, growth:

Year 1:

- Work with advisory teams, parents, and community to transform the middle school into one of welcome, safety, and student-centeredness.
- Administer a survey to determine perceptions of students, faculty, administration, and parents.

Year 2:

- Analyze data to ensure safety targets are met

Year 3:

- Administer another survey to analyze progress and determine any course changes that need to be made.

Upgrade physical plant appearance to one of welcome:

Year 1:

- Develop a plan to improve the entrance and to ensure that the physical plant displays student work.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continue work on development of physical plant.

Students will consistently display a sense of belonging and feel secure that someone cares if they are doing well in academic, social, and civic realms:

Year 1:

- Site councils, teachers, students, and parents will meet on a regular basis to develop a tool for analysis of student perception.
- Revitalize PBIS to ensure authentic implementation.

Year 2 & 3:

- Analysis data to ensure all students feel connected to the school.

Develop a system for student leadership and peer mentoring:

Year 1:

- Provide professional development for teachers to institute a model of student governance that aligns itself with the SIG plan and can be sustained with local support.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement student advisory councils, student councils, and student representatives on school councils.

Communication:

Develop a strategic plan that identifies roles and responsibilities of all constituents.

Year 1:

- Work with coaches to define roles and responsibilities.

Year 2 & 3:

- Analysis and revision of needs to keep school moving forward with improvement.

Develop an implementation plan for school improvement:

Year 1:

- Work with consultants to outline a plan of implementation that can be sustained and provides opportunities for analysis and revisions.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued analysis of data to ensure that plan is working for the improvement of the students.

Schedule regular parent forums to keep all parents informed on academics, discipline, budget, physical plant, and strategic plans:

Year 1:

- Develop a communication system/plan for informing the public, the faculty, and the board on how well the SIG plan is addressing district needs.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued evaluation of plan and progress.

Develop a technology infrastructure to support software, hardware, integration of technology for instruction, data and warehousing:

Year 1:

- Purchase, train, and install technology as required to support all aspects of the SIG plan.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued professional development to ensure maximum use of and integration of technology on a daily basis to improve student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and instructional alignment to established competencies.

Franklin High School:

Alignment of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction:

Understand, demonstrate, and develop course competencies:

Year 1:

- Work in small groups to review, revise, and publicize course competencies using coaches and professional development.

Year 2 & 3:

- Revise, finalize, and implement course competencies

Map curriculum horizontally and vertically 5 – 12:

Year 1:

- Map and establish pacing guides for reading and mathematics using Curriculum Coordinators hired through the SIG grant.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement, review, and revise mapping and/or pacing guides to ensure structure does promote substantial growth in student achievement.

Identify and provide necessary resources to implement the curriculum:

Year 1:

- Working in small groups with coaches to determine needs.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continual assessment and revision to sustain progress.

Provide flexible scheduling and faculty collaboration time:

Year 1:

- Work with consultants to analyze current schedule, determine needs, develop schedule for 2012-2013 school year to meet student and staff needs.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement new schedule providing for student needs and faculty collaboration.

Build team structure at district and school levels to support school teams:

Year 1:

- Work with coaches and mentors at school and district levels to develop sustained systems of support for school professional learning communities.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continuous assessment of team effectiveness

Provide embedded high quality professional development:

Year 1:

- Hire curriculum coordinators and coaches to develop a plan for professional development that aligns itself to the goals outlined in the SIG plan.

Year 2 & 3:

- Teachers will showcase lessons learned from professional development. They will modify instructional and assessment practices based on effective teaching strategies learned from PD.

Develop formative assessments aligned with established competencies:

Year 1:

- Work with curriculum coordinators to develop a variety of assessments aligned with established competencies. Use those assessments to revise instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement competencies and assessments to improve student learning and instructional practices for teachers.

Develop an effective and objective performance based teacher evaluation tool:

Year 1:

- Work with teachers to refine an evaluation tool that can be used to determine performance based rewards.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement evaluation tool.

Use technology to integrate technology in daily lessons effectively:

Year 1:

- Hire an integration specialist to train and support teachers in the use of technology in daily lessons.

Year 2 & 3:

- Expand teacher skills in technology integration and use of online resources to support, enhance, and provide additional learning opportunities.

Leadership and Governance:

Build leadership capacity at administration and teaching levels:

Year 1:

- Initial training for the development and implementation of site councils, advisory councils, and Professional Learning Communities.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued reflection and analysis of the effectiveness of the leadership role through annual retreats focused on data to support suppositions.

Define and develop all constituent roles to build and sustain the capacity for transformational leadership:

Year 1:

- Establish a committee to review research and plan for the role of teachers as advisors, principals as instructional leaders, and establish procedures that promote personalized learning.

Year 2 & 3:

- All staff will employ best practices in advisory to ensure student engagement as determined by an increase in test scores, a decrease in absenteeism, and a decrease in discipline referrals.

Provide high quality embedded professional development:

Year 1:

- Outside coordinators will assist in the development of a three year plan for professional development that aligns itself to the goals outlines in the SIG plan.

Year 2& 3:

- Implement and analyze strategies learned through professional development opportunities.

Hold a retreat to secure consensus and establish a plan for implementation of plan:

Year 1:

- Use outside consultants to bring coaches, mentors, curriculum coordinators, technology integrationist together to determine a plan for improvement of Franklin Middle and High Schools.

Year 2 & 3:

- Annual retreat to analyze results, revise direction, and maintain focus and momentum.

Climate and Culture:

Set expectations for students and faculty early in the year:

Year 1:

- Have staff and administration meet prior to the start of school to set expectations.

Year 2 & 3:

- Revise as necessary to meet needs.

Provide a safe, welcoming, student centered environment & gather baseline data from students, faculty, parents, and community on their perceptions in the areas of academics, safety, physical plant, growth: :

Year 1:

- Work with advisory teams, parents, and community to transform the high school into one of welcome, safety, and student-centeredness.
- Administer a survey to determine perceptions of students, faculty, administration, and parents.

Year 2:

- Analyze data to ensure safety targets are met

Year 3:

- Administer another survey to analyze progress and determine any course changes that need to be made.

Upgrade physical plant appearance to one of welcome:

Year 1:

- Develop a plan to improve the entrance and to ensure that the physical plant displays student work.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continue work on development of physical plant.

Students will consistently display a sense of belonging and feel secure that someone cares if they are doing well in academic, social, and civic realms:

Year 1:

- Site councils, teachers, students, and parents will meet on a regular basis to develop a tool for analysis of student perception.
- Revitalize PBIS to ensure authentic implementation.

Year 2 & 3:

- Analysis data to ensure all students feel connected to the school.

Develop a system for student leadership and peer mentoring:

Year 1:

- Provide professional development for teachers to institute a model of student governance that aligns itself with the SIG plan and can be sustained with local support.

Year 2 & 3:

- Implement student advisory councils, student councils, student representatives on School councils.

Communication:

Develop a strategic plan that identifies roles and responsibilities of all constituents.

Year 1:

- Work with coaches to define roles and responsibilities.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued analysis and revision of needs to keep school moving forward with improvement.

Develop an implementation plan for school improvement:

Year 1:

- Work with consultants to outline a plan of implementation that can be sustained and provides opportunities for analysis and revisions.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued analysis of data to ensure that plan is working for the improvement of the students.

Schedule regular parent forums to keep all parents informed on academics, discipline, budget, physical plant, and strategic plans:

Year 1:

- Develop a communication system/plan for informing the public, the faculty, and the board on how well the SIG plan is addressing district needs.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued evaluation of plan and progress.

Develop a technology infrastructure to support software, hardware, integration of technology for instruction, data and warehousing:

Year 1:

- Purchase, train, and install technology as required to support all aspects of the SIG plan.

Year 2 & 3:

- Continued professional development to ensure maximum use of and integration of technology on a daily basis to improve student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and instructional alignment to established competencies.

- 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.

	FMS 2010	FMS Goal	FHS 2010	FHS Goal
Math Percent Proficient	44%	50% - 2011 55% -2012 62% - 2013	15%	30% - 2011 35% - 2012 45% - 2013
Reading Percent Proficient	56.5%	60% - 2011 68% - 2012 75% - 2013	50%	58% - 2011 65%-2012 72%- 2013

Franklin Middle School longitudinal NECAP testing data in reading support a focus on 7th and 8th grades as these grades have shown little or no increase in proficiency over the past three years. For example whole school proficiency and above in reading this year was 56% but only 16% of IEP students and 42% of SES students scored proficient or above. NECAP scores in mathematics whole school was 44% yet only 6% of IEP and 38% of SES students scored proficient or above. At the high school level scale scores in Math whole school were 1136, SES 1131, and IEP 1125. For Reading whole school scale scores were 1146, SES 1140, and IEP 1134. These trends support the need for strong support through curriculum coordination and coaching in each discipline to build capacity in faculty to sustain instructional and assessment changes that reflect monitoring of student progress throughout the year and to make adjustments in instruction as that monitoring dictates.

- 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).

Does not apply to Franklin

- 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.

Does not apply to Franklin

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

The School Administration shared District NECAP performance data with the faculty, School Board, and public last year.

Members of the administration, faculty, parents, and school board attended a meeting to discuss the relevance of the grant and how it would be beneficial for Franklin Middle and Franklin High Schools.

Administrators, teacher leaders, parents, and school board will outline the intention to move forward with application and what success would look like for students and faculty. It is the intent of the planning committee to put this application online, revise as required to ensure that all constituents are kept apprised of the process from application, to planning, to implementation, to success.

It is the intent of both the middle and high schools to hold student assemblies to fully explain the goals and plans in order to engage students in the process. It is also the intent to hold parent forums to gather support and understanding of what each school is striving to accomplish.

9) 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.

The Franklin School Board hired a new Principal and Assistant Principal effective July 2010. There were numerous public meetings for input on characteristics desired and an intensive interview process before a selection was made by the Franklin Board. Mr. Towne (high school principal) has a history of creating subject specific professional learning communities (PLC's) to develop lesson plans and assessments based on competencies. He initiated those conversation at FHS this school year and is ready to roll out a competency based report card for the 2011-2012 school year. The board increased the salary of the incoming principal based on his experiences in turning around low performing schools and the implementation of curriculum reviews and best practices. The new principal immediately initiated teams to discuss current practice versus best practice, alignment of instruction to standards, discipline, and communication within and outside of the building.

The Franklin Board reassigned a principal to the middle school effective July 2011 based on his track record of success with Reading First, Differentiated Instructions, small group skills and PLCs. He is proficient in maintaining a positive culture and climate and has already approached the PTO and community groups to assist in transforming the middle school (over the summer) to welcome students back to a fresh start next year.

The Assistant Principal at the middle school was new September 2010. Both the current assistant and the new principal have held multiple meetings with staff to discuss and develop a model of student interventions and alignment of instruction to standards. They have outlined a reorganization of building space, assignments, and use of supports for 2011-2012 school year.

10) 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.

The School Board has been well-informed about the change process, the needs, and the plan for the future. They have expressed ongoing concern about the continued failure of the district to make Adequate Yearly Progress and are committed to supporting the district staff and students in policy and finance in providing whatever is necessary to make positive change. It is the intent of administration to give monthly updates to the board regarding the processes involved in the SIG grant application as well as publically give updates on professional development opportunities, curricular and instructional changes, identification processes, recommended policy changes, etc. The collective voice of faculty, staff, and parents is that change is necessary, may be difficult but they are committed to providing the best possible education for all children and are devoted to committing the time and energy to make that happen. They believe that Franklin Schools can and should be schools that others use to model their own change process after.

Pre-Implementation Guidance:

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

- Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity; or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.
- Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools. As discussed in F-4, in general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities.
- Minor Remodeling of Facilities to Enable Technology:** Pay for the costs of minor remodeling that is necessary to support technology if the costs are directly attributable to the implementation of a school intervention model and are reasonable and necessary.
- Other:** Other activities that are appropriate and aligned with the successful implementation of the selected intervention model.

We would use the 12,000 in Pre-implementation money to purchase a multi-media server. Our current servers are very old and cannot handle the number of clients accessing online data, web-based programs, and/or assessments like NWEA and Study Island. Currently students are scheduled in staggered groups to take NWEA's as the system crashes when all student attempt to log on at the same time. If a student or staff member is using the wireless connection it is not unusual for them to lose connectivity walking from one side of the room to another. A server dedicated to multi-media

streaming will facilitate e-portfolio upgrades for students, ease of access to web-based assessments and programs, and provide more current and interactive instructional manipulatives.

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

Goal	<p>The overarching goal of the Franklin Middle School is to have 85% of students scoring in proficiency or above categories in Mathematics and Language Arts/Reading on the 2013 NECAP tests.</p> <p>1. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to established competencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understand, demonstrate, and communicate curriculum competencies for mathematics and reading for grades 5 – 12.• Map vertically and horizontally both mathematics and reading curriculum for grade 5 – 12• Identify and provide necessary resources to implement the aligned curriculum• Provide flexible scheduling and collaboration time• Build team structures at the district, school, and grade levels to ensure cohesive curriculum and to improve student learning• Provide effective teaching strategies through embedded, high quality professional development and instructional coaches• Identify and document interventions that support student growth through informative assessments• Develop an effective and objective performance based evaluation tool <p>2. Leadership and Governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Build instructional leadership capacity at the administration and teaching level• Define and develop all constituent roles to build and sustain the capacity for transformational leadership• Provide effective, high quality, embedded professional development through instructional coaches• Retreat for consensus of the SIG plan and implementation of same <p>3. Climate and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Set expectations early• Provide a safe, welcoming, student centered environment• Provide an inviting physical plant appearance• Student will display a sense of belonging and a feeling that someone cares if they are doing well in the academic, social and civic realms• Administer My Voice survey to create baseline data
-------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a system for student leadership and peer mentoring • Expand principal advisory, site councils that address communication <p>4. Communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a strategic plan that identifies roles and responsibilities and a plan for implementation • Develop and implement student led conferences • Schedule regular parent forums to keep parent informed on academics, discipline, budget, physical plants, and strategic plan • Develop a technology infrastructure to support software, hardware, integration of technology for instruction, data, and warehousing 					
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> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround model</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Restart model</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> School closure model</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transformation model</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Tier III proposed model</p> <p style="text-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>Establish multiple ways to provide real world applications</p>	<p>SIG</p>	<p>Sept. 2011- June 2013</p>	<p>Superintendent</p> <p>Bldg. Administrators</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>Curriculum Coordinators</p> <p>Coaches</p>	<p>Assignments, projects</p> <p>Monthly check ins</p>	<p>Grades: 5% increase in proficiency on NECAP assessments from previous year</p> <p>Feedback from students, teachers, parents from MyVoice or similar survey</p>	<p>Technology Integration Specialist</p> <p>40,000</p>

					60% of lesson plans will show connection to real world application	
Explore flexible scheduling	SIG	Sept 2011- June 2013	Superintendent Bldg. Administrators	Student and teacher schedules	Grade Reports Feedback from students, teachers, parents using Survey Monkey Minutes from scheduling committee and discussion on how new schedule is working based on discipline referrals, work accomplished, 5% increase on Study Island test scores from beginning to end of each school year.	Teacher Stipends to provide extended instructional time 3,000
Increase staff knowledge and implementation of researched-based instructional practices	SIG RLIS Title I Title II A	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Superintendent Curriculum Coordinator Building Principals	Classroom observations and evaluations Inclusion of best practices in lessons	Comparison of NECAP and Study Island test scores 5% increase on NECAP assessment for all students from previous year and 5-8% increase on Study Island scores for all students from beginning to end of	Literacy Coach (.5 FMS & .5 FHS) 60,000

					year.	
Increase staff knowledge and use of aligned instructional and assessment practices	SIG RLIS Title I Title II A	Sept. 2011- June 2014	Superintendent Bldg. Administrators	Use of aligned instructional and assessment practices as recorded through observation and evaluation Use of Differentiated Instruction and Response to Intervention	Comparison of NECAP and Study Island Test Scores 5% increase in student scores on NECAP assessments from previous year 100% teacher participation in professional development activities during the school year and 80% during the summer.	Curriculum Coordinator 60,000
Comprehensive review of curriculum, programs, use of data to modify instruction, leadership by Sept 2011 with a monthly check-in on progress throughout the 2011-2012 School Year	SIG Title IIA	July 2011- June 2012	Superintendent	Baseline data collection on where we are with monthly updates on improvement in delivery of instruction, program needs, etc	Review of observations, evaluations, test scores 60% of lesson plans revised to include specific language relative to student mastery	External Provider: 38,000
Renewal of purpose of teaching, developing collegial atmosphere, teaming, providing support for change process	SIG	July 2011- June 2013	Superintendent	My Voice Survey baselines, absentee data for students and teachers, Feedback from students,	Comparison of data on absenteeism, bullying, grievances, discipline 10% decrease in	Professional Renewal: Courage to Teach: Jean Haley

				parents, teachers	bullying incidents from previous year. 20% decrease in office referrals from previous year 0 grievances	20,000
Mentorship for Building Administrators	RLIS Grant	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Superintendent	Notes taken during consultation, feedback on My Voice surveys, wellness of administration and participation data	My Voice surveys, Feedback from teachers and students using MyVoice or similar survey.	NH Association of Principals 6,000
Data Training designed to give both administrators and teachers skill in using data to effect instructional change	SIG RLIS Title IIA	July 2011- June 2012	Superintendent	Teacher and Administrator knowledge and use of data to drive instruction Observations and evaluations	Test Scores showing increases of at least 5% over previous summative assessments – possibly using Study Island, conversations at team and staff meetings based around improvement through data Observation Data gathered from scripted walkthroughs 60% lesson plans revised to reflect implementation of newly acquired skills	External Consultant TBD 5,000

Teacher workshop on bullying, retreats for leadership and teachers	Local Funds RLIS, Title IIA Consulting from External Provider	July 2011- June 2013	Superintendent	Agenda for meetings, Hand-outs	Feedback from staff, students, parents PBIS behavior Demonstrate 20% decrease in office referrals from previous year.	Local funds, Title Funds External Consultant: 2,500
Student led parent conferences	SIG	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Bldg. Administrators, Student Advisors	Notes from Conferences	Feedback from students, parents, teachers from person to person conversations and survey monkeys 90% participation in student led conferences the first year with a target of 100% by the third year	Stipends for transformational teacher leaders and training to develop and assist in student led conference training. 8,000
Substitutes for PD for teacher training	RLIS, Title IIA, SIG	Sept 2011- June 2013	Superintendent Bldg Principals	Timesheets	Feedback from staff and data gathered from observations during walkthroughs	3,000
Attorney Consultation	SIG RLIS Title IIA	July 2011- June 2014	Superintendent	Invoices	Meeting notes	5,000

Develop a performance plan for teacher evaluation	SIG	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Superintendent Board members Teachers Union	Develop an effective performance pay plan based on best practices, student growth, observations, and district needs	Document developed and approved by both board and teacher's union that includes 4 domains: Unit Lesson Planning, Classroom Environment, Instruction, Professional Responsibilities Plan to be fully implemented by year three	7,400 for substitutes, supplies, research other plans
SIG grant manager/coordinator: Contracted Service	SIG	Sept 2011- June 2014	Curriculum Coordinator Bldg. Principals Superintendent	Online grant reports, evaluations, updates, revisions	Approved changes, updates, payment schedules 100% compliance	6,000
Laptops for observations/evaluations, out of classroom connections, data gathering during meetings and workshops.	SIG	Sept 2011- Dec. 2011	Superintendent Building Principals Team Leaders Curriculum Coordinators Coaches	Reports, feedback from students, staff, administrators on timeliness of feedback, connectivity, sharing research and notes from meetings and workshops	Feedback from students, teachers, parents – verbal and surveys within 5 days. Notes disseminated to staff within 2 days of training or walkthrough observations	679 x 10 – 6,790
Conference registration and travel for curriculum alignment, authentic assessment, program	SIG	July 2011- June	Superintendent Bldg. Principals	Increased test scores. Increased use of RTI,	Surveys: meet as staff to review and develop plan for improvement.	10,000

development, alignment of competencies, bullying, communication, reporting		2014		DI, Student attendance Decrease in discipline Increased parent involvement in school	Data collection to demonstrate 100% attendance and implementation Reports showing notes from PD and intended use; along with follow up to ensure actually implementing changes in the classroom	
---	--	-------------	--	---	---	--

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Action Plan
Franklin High School

Goal	<p>The overarching goal of the Franklin High School is to have 85% of students scoring in proficiency or above categories in Mathematics and Language Arts/Reading on the 2013 NECAP tests.</p> <p>1. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to established competencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand, demonstrate, and communicate curriculum competencies for mathematics and reading for grades 5 – 12. • Map vertically and horizontally both mathematics and reading curriculum for grades 5 – 12 • Identify and provide necessary resources to implement the aligned curriculum • Provide flexible scheduling and collaboration time • Build team structures at the district, school, and grade levels to ensure cohesive curriculum and to improve student learning • Provide effective teaching strategies through embedded, high quality professional development and instructional coaches • Identify and document interventions that support student growth through informative assessments • Develop an effective and objective performance based evaluation tool <p>2. Leadership and Governance:</p>
-------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build instructional leadership capacity at the administration and teaching level • Define and develop all constituent roles to build and sustain the capacity for transformational leadership • Provide effective, high quality, embedded professional development through instructional coaches • Retreat for consensus of the SIG plan and implementation of same <p>3. Climate and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set expectations early • Provide a safe, welcoming, student centered environment • Provide an inviting physical plant appearance • Student will display a sense of belonging and a feeling that someone cares if they are doing well in the academic, social and civic realms • Administer My Voice survey to create baseline data • Develop a system for student leadership and peer mentoring • Expand principal advisory, site councils that address communication <p>4. Communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a strategic plan that identifies roles and responsibilities and a plan for implementation • Develop and implement student led conferences • Schedule regular parent forums to keep parent informed on academics, discipline, budget, physical plants, and strategic plan • Develop a technology infrastructure to support software, hardware, integration of technology for instruction, data, and warehousing
--	---

Strategy	Implement leadership strategies for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring through the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround model <input type="checkbox"/> Restart model <input type="checkbox"/> School closure model <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transformation model <input type="checkbox"/> Tier III proposed model _____ (if not choosing one of the four US ED models)
-----------------	---

Proposed Activities for 2011-2012	Resources	Timeline	Oversight	Monitoring (Implementation)	Monitoring (Effectiveness)	Title I School Improvement Funds
<i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve the</i>	<i>What existing and/or new resources will</i>	<i>When will this activity</i>	<i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to document</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to assess</i>	<i>Include amount allocated to this activity</i>

<i>desired outcome. Provide sufficient detail so that reviewers will understand the purpose and proposed implementation of each activity.</i>	<i>be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	<i>begin and end?</i>	<i>needs to be involved?</i>	<i>implementation? How often and by whom?</i>	<i>effectiveness? How often and by whom?</i>	<i>if applicable. Provide the requested detail on the Budget Narrative Form.</i>
Establish multiple ways to provide real world applications	SIG	Sept. 2011- June 2013	Superintendent Bldg. Administrators Teachers Curriculum Coordinators Coaches	Assignments, projects Monthly check ins	Grades: 5% increase in proficiency on NECAP assessments from previous year Feedback from students, teachers, parents using Survey Monkey or similar document 60% of lesson plans will show connection to real world application	Technology Integration Specialist 40,000
Explore flexible scheduling	SIG	Sept 2011- June 2013	Superintendent Bldg. Administrators	Student and teacher schedules	Grade Reports Feedback from students, teachers, parents using survey monkey or similar document Minutes from scheduling committee and discussion on how new schedule is working based on discipline referrals, work accomplished,	Teacher Stipends to provide extended instructional time 3,000

					5% increase on Study Island test scores from initial annual assessment.	
Increase staff knowledge and implementation of researched-based instructional practices	SIG RLIS Title I Title IIA	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Superintendent Curriculum Coordinator Building Principals	Classroom observations and evaluations Inclusion of best practices in lessons	Comparison of NECAP and Study Island test scores to develop correlation 5% increase on NECAP assessment for all students from previous year and 5-8% increase on Study Island scores for all students from initial annual assessment.	Mathematics Coach (.5 FMS & .5 FHS) 60,000
Increase staff knowledge and use of aligned instructional and assessment practices	SIG RLIS Title I Title IIA	Sept. 2011- June 2014	Superintendent Bldg. Administrators	Use of aligned instructional and assessment practices as recorded through observation and evaluation Use of Differentiated Instruction and Response to Intervention	Comparison of NECAP and Study Island Test Scores 5% increase in student scores on NECAP assessments from previous year 100% teacher participation in professional development activities during the school year and 80% during the summer	Curriculum Coordinator 60,000

<p>Comprehensive review of curriculum, programs, use of data to modify instruction, leadership by Sept 2011 with a monthly check-in on progress throughout the 2011-2012 School Year</p>	<p>SIG</p>	<p>July 2011- June 2012</p>	<p>Superintendent</p>	<p>Baseline data collection on where we are with monthly updates on improvement in delivery of instruction, program needs, etc</p>	<p>Review of observations, evaluations, test scores</p> <p>60% of lesson plans revised to include specific language relative to student mastery</p>	<p>External Provider:</p> <p>Consulting Partners, INC</p> <p>38,000</p>
<p>Work alignment of High School Competencies, graduation rates (and tracking) , HS redesign, book talks</p>	<p>SIG Title IIA</p>	<p>July 2011- June 2012</p>	<p>Superintendent</p> <p>Building Principals</p> <p>Curriculum Coordinators</p>	<p>Feedback and recommendations</p> <p>Course competencies</p> <p>Advisory Council recommendations</p>	<p>Review of data and implementation</p> <p>60% lesson plans have changed partially or substantially to align with competencies.</p> <p>Observation data gathered from walkthroughs</p> <p>90% staff participation in book talks.</p>	<p>External Consultant: TBD</p> <p>20,000</p> <p>Supplies 6,000</p>
<p>Mentorship for Building Administrators</p>	<p>RLIS Grant</p>	<p>Sept. 2011- June 2012</p>	<p>Superintendent</p>	<p>Notes taken during consultation, feedback on My Voice surveys, wellness of administration and participation data</p>	<p>My Voice surveys, Feedback from teachers and students through survey monkey</p>	<p>NH Association of Principals</p> <p>6,000</p>

Data Training designed to give both administrators and teachers skill in using data to effect instructional change	SIG RLIS Title IIA	July 2011- June 2012	Superintendent	Teacher and Administrator knowledge and use of data to drive instruction Observations and evaluations	Test Scores, conversations at team and staff meetings based around improvement through data 60% lesson plans revised to reflect implementation of newly acquired skills Observation data gathered from walkthroughs	External Consultant TBD 5,000
Teacher workshop on bullying, retreats for leadership and teachers	Local Funds, RLIS Title IIA Consulting from External Provider	July 2011- June 2013	Superintendent	Agenda for meetings, Hand-outs	Feedback from staff, students, parents using survey monkey PBIS behavior decrease by 20% from previous year Demonstrate 20% decrease in office referrals from previous year	Local funds, Title Funds External Consultant: 8,000
Student led parent conferences	SIG	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Bldg. Administrators, Student Advisors	Notes from Conferences	Feedback from students, parents, teachers using survey monkey 90% participation in	Stipends for transformational teacher leaders and training to develop and assist in student led

					student led conferences the first year with a target of 100% by the third year	conference training. 8,000
Books and Resources	SIG				Increase in professional libraries and online resources directly tied to goals established in SIG	5,200
Substitutes for PD for teacher training	RLIS Title IIA SIG	Sept 2011- June 2013	Superintendent Bldg Principals	Timesheets	Feedback from staff using survey monkey Observation data gathered from walkthroughs that PD is effective	42,665.70
Attorney Consultation	SIG and local	July 2011- June 2014	Superintendent	Invoices	Meeting notes Contract revisions At least 3 trainings for staff on review of 504 and IEP laws and requirements	5,000
Develop a performance plan for teacher evaluation	SIG Title IIA RLIS	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Superintendent Board members Teachers Union	Develop an effective performance pay plan based on best practices, student growth, observations, and district needs	Document developed and approved by both board and teacher's union by year three	5,000 for substitutes, supplies, research other plans

SIG grant manager/coordinator	SIG	Sept 2011- June 2014	Curriculum Coordinator Bldg. Principals Superintendent	Online grant reports, evaluations, updates, revisions	Approved changes, updates, payment schedules 100% compliance	12,000
Laptops for observations/evaluations, out of classroom connections, data gathering during meetings and workshops.	SIG	Sept 2011- Dec. 2011	Superintendent Building Principals Team Leaders Curriculum Coordinators Coaches	Reports, feedback from students, staff, administrators on timeliness of feedback, connectivity, sharing research and notes from meetings and workshops	Feedback from students, teachers, parents – verbal and surveys within 5 days. Notes disseminated to staff within 2 days of training or observations	679X 10 =6,790
Conference registration and travel for curriculum alignment, authentic assessment, program development, alignment of competencies, bullying, communication, reporting	SIG	July 2011- June 2014	Superintendent Bldg. Principals	Increased test scores. Increased use of RTI, DI, Student attendance Decrease in discipline Increased parent involvement in school	Surveys: meet as staff to review and develop plan for improvement. Data collection to demonstrate 100% attendance and implementation Reports showing notes from PD and intended use; along with follow up to ensure actually implementing changes in the classroom Observation data gathered from	10,000

					walkthroughs	
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------	--

C. 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 Franklin Middle and High School Budget

School Name	Year I Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Franklin Middle School	6,000	375,052.34	319,062.37	306,162.37	1,000,277
Franklin High School	6,000	377,163.33	310,383.33	312,462.38	1,000,009
LEA-level Activities (technology)		51,000	30,460	7,100	88,560
Total Budget	12,000	803,215.67	659,905.70	625,724.75	2,088,846

Three Year School Budget Plan

Franklin Middle School

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>	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636Retire.; 3,060FICA; 488 U/C	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary; 12,740.81Health; 485.13 Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636Retire.; 3,060FICA; 488 U/C	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636Retire.; 3,060FICA; 488 U/C	60,631.94	60,631.94	60,631.94
	Literacy Coach 60,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 333W/C; 5,454Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	Literacy Coach 60,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 333W/C; 5,454Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	Literacy Coach 60,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 333W/C; 5,454Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	84,334.94	84,334.94	84,334.94
	Curriculum Coordinator: 60,000 base	Curriculum	Curriculum	89,966.60	89,966.60	89,966.60

	salary; 18,372.47 Health; 485.13 Dental; 333W/C; 5,454Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	Coordinator: 60,000 base salary; 18,372.47 Health; 485.13 Dental; 333W/C; 5,454Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	Curriculum Coordinator: 60,000 base salary; 18,372.47 Health; 485.13 Dental; 333W/C; 5,454Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C			
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>	Consulting Partners: Review curriculum, programs, data use, assessment: Courage To Teach NH School Principals Mentor Data Training Teacher Leadership	Consulting Partners: Review curriculum, programs, data use, assessment: Courage To Teach NH School Principals Mentor Data Training Teacher Leadership Training	Consulting Partners: Review curriculum, programs, data use, assessment: Courage To Teach NH School Principals Mentor Data Training Teacher Leadership	38,000 10,000 3,000 2,500 2,500 2,500 6,000	10,000 3,000 2,500 2,500 2,500 6,000	 2,500 2,500 2,500 6,000

	Training Student Led Conference Training Grant Manager	Student Led Conference Training Grant Manager	Training Student Led Conference Training Grant Manager			
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	My Voice Surveys	My Voice Surveys	My Voice Surveys	2,000	2,000	2,000
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Supplemental materials/books for literacy and mathematics			2,000	2,800	2,600
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>	Ipads/Laptops for connections, evaluations, access to students out of regular classroom 10			6,790		

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>	Stipends for flexible scheduling	Stipends for flexible scheduling	Stipends for flexible scheduling	7,110.93	7,110.93	7,110.93
	Substitutes for teacher training	Substitutes for teacher training	Substitutes for teacher training	3,000	3,000	3,000
	Substitutes for Performance Plan development	Substitutes for Performance Plan development	Substitutes for Performance Plan development	3,000	3,000	3,000
	Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment, alignment, competencies	Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment, alignment, competencies	Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment, alignment, competencies	15,000	10,000	10,000
	Stipends for summer curriculum work	Stipends for summer curriculum work	Stipends for summer curriculum work	20,182.28	20,182.28	20,182.28
	Stipends for flexible scheduling	Stipends for flexible scheduling	Stipends for flexible scheduling	7,110.93	7,110.93	7,110.93
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>	Associated with Professional Development	Associated with Professional Development	Associated with Professional Development	5,000	3,000	3,000

Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>	Attorney Costs			5,000		
Indirect Costs	2%	2%	2%	6,535.67	6,535.67	6,535.67
Total				375,052.34	319,062.37	306,162.32

Three Year School Budget Plan

Franklin High School

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>	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636Retire.; 3,060FICA; 488 U/C	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary; 12,740.81Health; 485.13 Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636Retire.; 3,060FICA; 488 U/C	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary; 12,740.81 Health; 485.13 Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636Retire.; 3,060FICA;	60,631.94	60,631.94	60,931.94

<p><i>A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (LEA Appendix E) must be completed</i></p>	<p>assessment:</p> <p>Alignment to Competencies and High School Redesign</p> <p>Data Training</p> <p>Teacher Leadership Training</p> <p>Student Led Conference Training</p> <p>Grant Manager</p>	<p>use, assessment:</p> <p>Alignment to Competencies and High School Redesign</p> <p>Data Training</p> <p>Teacher Leadership Training</p> <p>Student Led Conference Training</p> <p>Grant Manager</p>	<p>assessment:</p> <p>Alignment to Competencies and High School Redesign</p> <p>Data Training</p> <p>Teacher Leadership Training</p> <p>Student Led Conference Training</p> <p>Grant Manager</p>	<p>10,000</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>6,000</p>	<p>10,000</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>6,000</p>	<p>2,500</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>6,000</p>
<p>Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i></p>	<p>For Franklin High School Redesign: books, folders, etc</p> <p>My Voice Surveys</p>	<p>My Voice Surveys</p>	<p>My Voice Surveys</p>	<p>2,000</p>	<p>2,000</p>	<p>2,000</p>

Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Supplemental resources/books for literacy and mathematics			2,000	2,000	1,200
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>	Ipads/Laptops for connections, evaluations, access to students out of regular classroom 10			6,790		
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>	Stipends for flexible scheduling Substitutes for teacher training Substitutes for Performance Plan development Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment,	Stipends for flexible scheduling Substitutes for teacher training Substitutes for Performance Plan development Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment, alignment,	Stipends for flexible scheduling Substitutes for teacher training Substitutes for Performance Plan development Registration for Workshops around	7,110.95 3,000 3,000 15,000	7,110.95 3,000 3,000 10,000	7,110.95 3,000 3,000 10,000

	alignment, competencies Stipends for summer curriculum work	competencies Stipends for summer curriculum work	curriculum, assessment, alignment, competencies Stipends for summer curriculum work	27,293.23	27,293.23	27,293.23
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>	Associated with Professional Development	Associated with Professional Development	Associated with Professional Development	5,000	3,000	3,000
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>	Attorney Costs			5,000		
Indirect Costs	2%	2%	2%	6,535.67	6,535.67	6,535.67
Total				377,163.33	310,383.33	312,462.38

**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: Franklin Middle School

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>	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary:12,740.81Health; 485.13Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636 Retire.; 3.060 FICA; 488 U/C	60,631.94
	Literacy Coach 60,000 base salary:12,740.81 Health; 485.13Dental; 333 W/C; 5,454 Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	84,334.94
	Curriculum Coordinator: 60,000 base salary: 18,372.47Health; 485.13 Dental; 333 W/C; 5,454 Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	89,966.60
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>	Consulting Partners: Review curriculum, programs, data use, assessment:	38,000
	Courage To Teach	20,000
	NH School Principals Mentor	6,000
	Data Training	2,500
	Teacher Leadership Training	2,500
	Student Led Conference Training	2,500
	Grant Manager	6,000
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	My Voice Surveys	2,000
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Supplemental materials/books for literacy and mathematics	2,000

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>	Ipads/Laptops for connections, evaluations, access to students out of regular classroom 10	6,790
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>	Stipends for flexible scheduling Substitutes for teacher training Substitutes for Performance Plan development Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment, alignment , Competencies Stipends for Summer Curriculum Work	7,110.95 3,000 3,000 15,000 20,182.28
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>	Associated with Professional Development	5,000
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>	Attorney Costs	5,000
Indirect Costs	2%	6,535.67
Total		375,052.34

School Name: Franklin High School

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>	Technology Integration Teacher 40,000 base salary:12,740.81Health; 485.13Dental; 222 W/C; 3,636 Retire.; 3.060 FICA; 488 U/C	60,631.94
	Literacy Coach 60,000 base salary:12,740.81 Health; 485.13Dental; 333 W/C; 5,454 Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	84,334.94
	Curriculum Coordinator: 60,000 base salary: 18,372.47Health; 485.13 Dental; 333 W/C; 5,454 Retire.; 4,590 FICA; 732 U/C	89,966.60
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>	Consulting Partners: Review curriculum, programs, data use, assessment:	38,000
	Alignment to high school redesign (competencies)	10,000
	Data Training	2,500
		2,500

	Teacher Leadership Training Student Led Conference Training Grant Manager	2,500 6,000
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	For Franklin High School Redesign: books, folders, etc	6,000
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>	Supplemental books/resources for literacy and mathematics	2,000
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>	Ipads/Laptops for connections, evaluations, access to students out of regular classroom 10	6,790
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>	Stipends for flexible scheduling Substitutes for teacher training Substitutes for Performance Plan development Registration for Workshops around curriculum, assessment, alignment , Competencies Stipends for Summer Curriculum Work	7,110.95 3,000 3,000 15,000 27,293.23
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>	Associated with Professional Development	5,000
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>	Attorney Costs	5,000
Indirect Costs	2%	6,535.67
Total		377,163.33

D. ASSURANCES:

By signing below, the Local Educational Agency (LEA), _____, 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

E. 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 Southside 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-Year Cumulative 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 Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative 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 Combined	2007-08 Index Combined	2008-09 Index Combined	2009-10 Index Combined	Cumulative 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	Cumulative 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	661.0
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).

LEA Appendix C: Baseline School Data Profile

School Name:			
	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.	FMS: 375/da FHS: 350	FMS: 375/da FHS: 360	FMS: 390/da FHS: 350
Does the school provide any of the following in order to offer increased learning time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. longer school day • 2. before or after school • 3. summer school • 4. weekend school • 5. Other 	FMS 1. Yes Casey 2, Yes 3. Only SPED 4. No 5. No FHS 1. Yes: Casey 2. Yes: Casey 3. Yes: Through Grants and SPED 4. No 5. No	FMS 1. Yes Casey 2, Yes 3. Only SPED 4. No 5. No FHS 1. Yes: Casey 2. Yes: Casey 3. Yes: Through Grants and SPED 4. No 5. No	FMS 1. Yes Casey 2, Yes 3. Only SPED 4. No 5. No FHS 1. Yes: Casey 2. Yes: Casey 3. Yes: Through Grants and SPED 4. No 5. No
The number of school days during the school year (plus summer, if applicable, if part of implementing the restart, transformation or turnaround model) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students	FMS 94.8 FHS 92.3	FMS 94.4 FHS 90.1	FMS 94.6 FHS 92.5

could have attended school during the regular school year;			
Student dropout rate	10.1	3.1	Not yet available
Student attendance rate	FMS: 94.78	94.41	94.61
The number of students who completed advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics);	FMS: Algebra 20 Geometry 3 FHS Calculus 49	19 7 FHS Calculus 13	12 5 FHS Calculus 24
The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;	None	None	None
The number of students who complete advance coursework AND complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution;	None	None	None
Number of discipline incidents	FMS: 1360 FHS 2457	1826 FHS: 2347	2138 FHS: 2075
Number of truant students	No data	No data	FHS 30
The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days;	94.49	95.45	90.48
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;	FMS: No for Math and Reading FHS: No Whole School and White. Other groups too small	FMS: Yes ALL FHS: No Ed. Disable. For Math and Reading	FMS YES ALL FHS: No Ed. Disable. For math and reading

Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system	Not available	Not available	Not available
Teacher attendance rate	93.57	94.53	88.98

LEA Appendix D: LEA Capacity Rubric

Criteria	Poor	Satisfactory	Strong	LEA Self Assessment
LEA governance and decision making methods	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for no district or school level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives, with decision power held by the local school board	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for district level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives	LEA governance is structured in a method that allows for district and school level decision making authority in regards to reform initiatives, allowing for operational flexibility at the school level	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
Title I audit reports	Findings in areas requiring a repayment of funds	Findings in areas noted-repayment of funds not required	No findings in the fiscal area	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong
Approval of the district in need of improvement and/or school in need of improvement plans	Not approved by the SEA	Approved by the SEA with revisions	Approved by the SEA without revisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong
School Leadership Team	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Strong

	to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	Evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been exceeded.	
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.				

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

1. Description of Activity:

Courage to Teach (CTT) is a program of quarterly retreats for the personal and professional renewal of public school educators. The program is especially designed for pre K-12 educators – teachers, counselors, and administrators on whom our society depends for so much but for whom we provide so little. Courage to Teach focuses on renewing the inner lives of professionals in education. CTT was developed by Parker J. Palmer and the Fetzer Institute in 1994. CTT renews through exploration of a teacher’s life; reconnects to identity and integrity; creates a context for careful listening and deep connection: honors diversity in person and profession: helps educators create safe spaces and trusting relationships; explores connections and seeks to develop teaming within the school.

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

This request is connected to goal # 3 Climate and Culture. It is the intent of these retreats to provide teachers and administrators with the tools and skills needed to invest in creating relationships with each other, with students, with parents, and with the community to bring about a change in attitude and culture at the Franklin Middle School.

3. Name of Contractor:

NH courage and Renewal: Jean Haley, Anne Riley, Louise Forseze

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

Jean Haley: MA in Guidance and Counseling from U Mass. Worked in New England public schools as a middle school English teacher and later as a high school guidance counselor. Participated in a variety of course work and workshops centered on issues of gender equity, drug and alcohol counseling, human sexuality, peer mediation, brain development and learning differences. Jean served as the director of the Mustard Seed Preschool at St. Paul’s Church in Concord and directs NH Courage and Renewal.

Anne Riley: Master of Education in Counseling from Boston University. Taught English and French at middle and high school, worked as a school guidance counselor, worked with Adult Education programs. She is a group facilitator for Courage to Teach/Courage to Lead.

Louise Forseze has a BA in Elementary Education, Master of Education in School Administration and an Education Certificate in Mentoring. She has 35 years of classroom teaching experience, 11 years as an assistant principal, and five years as a school district mentor. Louise has trained teacher at Southern NH University, the Greater Manchester professional development center, and in NH school districts. Louise is the Director of Peak Education Performance of Manchester.

5. **Budget:** *(Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* Budgeted cost is 10,000 each of two years.
6. **Beginning Date:** Sept. 2011 **Ending Date:** June 2013
7. **Services to be Provided:** *(Include a description of the services to be provided. Identify any anticipated products that will be developed as a result of the services.)* The format for delivery of services is through retreats twice a year outside of the school district. The facilitators provide all materials and training supplies. Facilitators will also visit Franklin Middle School between retreats during regularly scheduled staff meetings or team times to answer questions, refresh goals established, and generally assist with the renewal and dedication process.
8. **Participants:** 2 Administrators, 2 counselors, 26 teachers.
9. **Evaluation Process:** *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)*
Evidence of successful Professional Learning Teams, Comments on surveys will show an increase of welcome and belonging within the school, student attendance and performance will increase.

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

10. Description of Activity:

Total audit/review of curriculum – textbooks, supplemental supplies, lesson plans, alignment to state standards. This will also include interviews and surveys with teachers, students, parents, compilation of data, exit interviews and presentation to faculty, administration and school board. The result will be a report showing where alignment is exemplary and where needs are great.

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

This will provide a baseline of current practice, list “gaps” in curriculum and/or alignment, give suggestions on next steps, discuss current assumptions and practices that are ‘roadblocks’ to improvement., audit spending patterns, and organizational practices.

12. Name of Contractor:

Consulting Partners, Inc

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

Mr. Frank Colvario, project director, has been employed in senior financial and administrative positions in urban, suburban and regional school districts. His employment and consulting have included assignments in cities such as Boston, Holyoke, Methuen, Pittsfield, Westfield, Worcester; towns such as Barnstable, Burlington, Hadley, Georgetown, Grafton, Lee, Lenox, Lincoln, Lynnfield, Maynard, Northbridge, Southbridge, Wellesley, Westwood; and regional school district such as Ashburnham-Westminster, Berkshire Hills, Dover-Sherborn, Groton-Dunstable, Nashoba Valley Vocational Technical High School, Nauset, Southern Berkshire Hills, Tantasqua Triton and Wachusett Regional School Districts. In addition, Mr. Colvario has completed extensive assignments for the Executive Office of Education and was a senior consultant for the Department of Education in connection with the Lawrence Public Schools.

Frank Colvario and Consulting Partners, Inc. have also been employed by state-wide and regional insurance organizations such the Massachusetts Interlocal Insurance Association (MIIA) and Metrogard. For these companies Frank Colvario provided financial reviews and reports that led to documentation that

reduced or eliminated municipal fraud. In addition, Mr. Colvario completed research and submitted formal reports concerning topics such as Prevailing Wages and Municipal Auditing in Massachusetts.

Barbara A. VonVillas, Ph.D., senior associate, is currently an Adjunct Professor in the Writing Department at Roger Williams University where she teaches *Critical Writing for the Professions*. She has presented to department faculty on the topic of a K-16 writing curriculum.

From 1999-2006, Dr. VonVillas was the Superintendent of Schools in Burrillville, RI where she led a curriculum initiative that resulted in PK-12 guidelines, benchmarks, and rubrics in each discipline, she promoted assessment efforts that resulted in several High Performing Schools, she instituted a secondary literacy program, and she conducted a series of action research projects intended to promote improved teacher performance and increased K-12 Literacy and Writing.

From 1995-1999, she was the Director of Operations (Deputy Superintendent) of Wachusett Regional School District (MA), where she provided direction and oversight for the successful development of a comprehensive curriculum for each discipline at all grade levels, which conformed to the state frameworks. During this time, she also provided professional development at Fitchburg State College.

Before that, as Supervisor of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment at Ayer (MA) High School, she joined a team charged with reconstructing the entire instructional program in conjunction with Ed Reform to make the district a magnet for school choice.

Previously, Dr. VonVillas was the Principal of a 7-12 school in (CT) Regional District #11, where she rebuilt the instructional program to include block scheduling and transitioned the lower school to the middle school concept.

Her 35 years of experience have also included 2 years as an Assistant Principal: Director of Student Services, where she provided oversight for the high school Guidance and Special Education Departments as well as 18 years as a 9-12 teacher of English. Concurrently, as an Adjunct Instructor, she facilitated the acquisition of college credit through the Early Enrollment Program at Rhode Island College.

Dr. VonVillas has 3 degrees from the University of Rhode Island (B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. in English) and a Certificate of Advanced Studies (CAGS) in Educational Administration from Rhode Island College. She has been trained in *Differentiated Instruction, Understanding by Design, and Cognitive Coaching* by ASCD and *Multiple Intelligences* by Dr. Howard Gardner. She is a nationally certified trainer for *4MAT Learning Styles*. She has been a prolific writer for professional journals, the most recent being AASA's *The School Administrator* which published her piece entitled "You Can't Please Everyone." She also served as a member of a Rhode Island School Committee for 6 years, 4 years as Chair. She is currently a member of the Middletown (RI) Town Council.

Robert R Putnam, EdD, senior associate, is currently the Director of Teaching and Learning for the Berkshire Hills Regional Schools (BHRSD) in Stockbridge and Great Barrington, MA. where he oversees PreK-12 curriculum development and alignment to state standards, district grant writing, program evaluation, professional development, regular

education testing and analysis, textbook adoption, , comprehensive induction of new teachers, Title 1, English Language Education, long-range technology planning, and staff and administrator supervision and evaluation systems.

In his previous role as an elementary principal for the BHRSD Dr. Putnam consolidated four elementary schools into one consolidated regional elementary and oversaw the successful transition into a newly built facility. During his tenure as principal he reorganized the school resulting in an increase in student achievement on state assessments. The reorganization included scheduling uninterrupted learning blocks and common planning times for every grade level, data-based decision making, literacy and math coaches, and the introduction of new reading and mathematics curricula.

Dr. Putnam has received extensive training in curriculum beyond his formal degrees. He participated in training with Grant Wiggins in the Understanding by Design model of curriculum development. He has been trained as a curriculum auditor by Curriculum Management Systems. He has also been trained at the Institute for Learning, in the best of current knowledge about learning processes, principles of instruction, and the design of school systems.

Dr. Putnam's teaching career included four years of teaching third grade, two years in the first grade, one year in kindergarten, and four years as the K-5 music teacher. His administrative career includes 3 years as an elementary principal and 4 years as Director of Teaching and Learning. His consulting career includes work with The National Coalition for School Improvement, Consulting Partners Inc, and independent work with neighboring Berkshire districts on supervision and evaluation, curriculum, and teacher mentoring. Exhibiting an entirely different talent, Rob has been a professional musician since 1978 and has performed on guitar, bass, and keyboards as both a solo performer and as an accompanist for Arlo Guthrie, Pete Seeger, the Empire Brass Quintet, Havana Midnight, as well as many local Berkshire artists. He has worked in concert halls, recording studios, radio and television. Rob Putnam possesses a B.A., M.A. and Ed. D., all from the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, MA.

14. **Budget:** *(Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* 38,000

15. **Beginning Date:** July 1,2011

Ending Date: December 30,2011

16. **Services to be Provided:** The consultant will provide an assessment of the current Franklin curriculum to determine its effectiveness as a “standards based” comprehensive middle and high school curriculum in the areas of reading and mathematics including special education inclusion and instruction within the regular classroom. Areas of Review will include: **Leadership:** identify the key stakeholders engaged in design and implementation of the current and future curriculum; survey and interview the leadership stakeholders for relevant data, opinion and possible solutions; survey and interview other stakeholders (teachers, students, parents) for relevant data, opinion and possible solutions. **Instruction System:** (standards, scope sequence) review current middle and high school curriculum and associated resources for alignment with state and federal standards and for cohesive implementation within and across grades; assess instruction with focus on implementation of the curriculum; determine the extent that technology integration supports the implementation of the curriculum, facilitate instruction and impacts student performance. **Assessment System:** examine student performance data, teacher assessments formative and authentic, as relating to curriculum instruction. A comprehensive report will be shared on the finding identifying areas of strength and weakness of the current curriculum and providing specific recommendation for change/improvement to the curriculum in the areas of Reading, Mathematics, and Special Education. On and off site consult services to develop training that enhances the delivery of

teaching/learning; providing periodic informal and formal reports to the superintendent on the progress in each area of the curriculum, and other supportive services as determined.

17. **Participants:** 3

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

LEA Appendix E: Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form

19. **Description of Activity:**

Alignment of high school competencies.

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

Improve connections and alignment between competencies, instruction, assessment, instructional resources, mapping, student achievement.

21. **Name of Contractor:**

TBD

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

23. **Budget:** *(Include costs such as staff compensation, materials, contracted services and other related costs).* 20,000

24. **Beginning Date:** Sept. 2011

Ending Date: June 30, 2013

25. **Services to be Provided:** *(Include a description of the services to be provided. Identify any anticipated products that will be developed as a result of the services.)* Work with high school staff to review current practice and develop new lessons, resources, project learning, assessments aligned with competencies. This would be a “process” for all subject domains to follow in working with their teams in their disciplines.

26. **Participants:** 100% high school teaching staff

27. **Evaluation Process:** *(Describe how you will evaluate that services have been delivered successfully.)* **Well articulated lessons, assessments, resources, instructional practices as observed by evaluators, discussions with students, parents, and faculty, and student results on assessments.**

LEA Appendix F: Equipment Justification Form

<p>Item Description: Ipads and/or Laptops to provide immediate feedback during observations/evaluations. Provide teacher and administrators the ability to connect with parents and students outside of the classroom in a timely manner. Provide the ability to take and send notes to teams during workshops.</p>		
<p>Number to be purchased: 20</p>	<p>Approximate cost per item: 670 include per student or per teacher information</p>	<p>Total Cost: \$13,400</p>
<p>Location: Where will the equipment be used? Franklin Middle School, Franklin High School, SAU Office, Workshops, Home.</p>		
<p>Purpose: Detail the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will it support the program? Provide instant feedback and connections for communication with students, parents, teams. • Who will use it? Administration, team leaders, curriculum coordinators, coaches • How many students/staff will use it? 20 faculty 		
<p>Reasonableness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify the need: We're a very small, highly impoverished district where technology has not kept pace with the real world. • Explain how it is not otherwise available through the district. The district has cut technology and technology support for the budget for the past 10 years. 		
<p>Storage: Where will the equipment be located/stored in individual offices and classroom</p>		

Inventory and Tracking:

Identify the person responsible the following:

Entering equipment on Title I Equipment Inventory Report Technology Director

Tracking equipment if moved from above location Technology Director

Signing equipment in and out if equipment is approved for student use N/A

Storing equipment over the summer Technology Director

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 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	Information Not Provided	Lacks Sufficient Information	Marginal: requires clarification or additional information	Good: clear & complete; all areas addressed	Exemplary: well conceived & thoroughly developed	Reader Comments
1) LEA has submitted a completed district cover page and listed the names and titles of SIG coordinator and committee members.	0	0	0	1	2	
<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>						
1) The needs assessment adequately addressed all areas on the <i>Needs Assessment 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.	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-<i>Appendix E</i> .</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-<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	1	2	4	6	

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.	0	1	2	4	6	
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).	0	1	2	4	6	
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.	0	1	2	4	6	
9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	
10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.	0	1	2	4	6	
11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	

<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 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 Provided	Lacks Sufficient Information	Marginal: requires clarification or additional information	Good: clear & complete; all areas addressed	Exemplary: well conceived & thoroughly developed	Reader Comments
1) LEA has submitted a completed district cover page and listed the names and titles of SIG coordinator and committee members.	0	0	0	1	2	
<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>						
1) The needs assessment adequately addressed all areas on the <i>Needs Assessment 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.	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-<i>Appendix E</i> .</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-<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	1	2	4	6	

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.	0	1	2	4	6	
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).	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
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.	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	
10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.	0	1	2	4	6	
11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	

<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	Information Not Provided	Lacks Sufficient Information	Marginal: requires clarification or additional information	Good: clear & complete; all areas addressed	Exemplary: well conceived & thoroughly developed	Reader Comments
1) LEA has submitted a completed district cover page and listed the names and titles of SIG coordinator and committee members.	0	0	0	1	2	
<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>						
1) The needs assessment adequately addressed all areas on the <i>Needs Assessment 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.	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-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	0	0	0	0	N/A

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.	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
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).	0	1	2	4	6	
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.	0	1	2	4	6	
9) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	
10) Described the process the LEA will use to (a) recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model; and (b) a description of existing partnerships or potential partnerships the LEA will form to effectively implement a restart model.	0	1	2	4	6	
11) Described the commitment of the school community (school board, school staff, parents/guardians, etc.) to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices to support the intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	

Action Plan Year 1 Action Plan is complete including: <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	

Aligning Project Plan with Indicators- Transformation Model
Leading Indicators, Lagging Indicators, and Implementation Indicators
 Completed by LEA

LEA and School Information

LEA: Franklin School District

Address: 119 Central Street, Franklin, NH 03235

Telephone: 603-934-3108

Superintendent: Dr. Maureen Ward

Telephone: 603-934-3108

Email: mward@sau18.org

Primary contact for SIG project (if other than Superintendent):

Address:

City:

Telephone:

Email:

School: Franklin High School

Address: 119 Central Street,

City: Franklin, NH 03235

Telephone: 603-934-5441

Aligning Needs Assessment and Project Plan - Transformation Model

Leading Indicators, Lagging Indicators, and Implementation Indicators

This Needs Assessment is first completed by the LEA on this form to support the SIG plan. The LEA and the school each has specific responsibilities for implementing a SIG transformation. The SIG Online Tool provides for one process for tracking and reporting progress. The school's transformation team is responsible for the process. This team is typically the school leadership team with one or more LEA staff added. Including LEA staff (usually called the internal partner) on the school transformation team enables the team to address implementation indicators relative to the LEA as well as the school. The LEA completes this initial Needs Assessment, then transfers responsibility for maintaining the online system to the school transformation team once the team is in place.

For each leading and lagging indicator, the LEA enters the school's most recent, yearly data (Pre), benchmarks for each project year, and the Goal to be achieved by the end of Year 3. Achieving that goal is evidence that the indicator has been met at the end of the project.

Federal Metric Requirements—Lagging Indicators	Pre	Benchmark Year 1	Benchmark Year 2	Goal
1. AYP status	NO for Reading and Math	Meets AYP for both Reading and Math	Meets AYP for both Reading and Math	Meet performance target for all students in both Reading and Math
2. Which AYP targets the school met and missed (how many met and missed?). Attach list of AYP targets missed in most recently available year.	<p>Reading Met: Participation for White and Economically Disadvantaged Missed: Educational Disability Participation and missed Reading Index in Whole school, while, economically disadvantaged</p> <p>Math Met: Participation in Whole school, White, Economically Disadvantaged. Missed: Participation in Educational Disability and missed Index Target in Whole school, White, Economically Disadvantaged and Educational Disadvantaged</p>	<p>Met: Participation in ALL areas Missed: NONE</p> <p>Met Target Index in Reading for White, Economically Disadvantaged Missed: Target Index in Reading for Educational Disability.</p> <p>Met Target Index in Math For Whole School, White, Economically Disadvantaged Missed Target Index for Education Disadvantaged</p>	<p>Met: Participation in ALL areas Missed: NONE</p> <p>Met Target Index in Reading for White, Economically Disadvantaged, Educational Disability.</p> <p>Met Target Index in Math For Whole School, White, Economically Disadvantaged Missed Target Index for Education Disadvantaged</p>	<p>Met: To consistently meet participation rates for all subjects and all groups. To consistently meet target index scores in both reading and math with the exception of</p> <p>Missed: Educational Disability will take a while to change the expectations</p>
3. School improvement status (Improvement Year 1, Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Planning, or Restructuring)	Reading Year 1 Math Year 2	Reading Safe Harbor Math Safe	Reading Made AYP Math Made AYP	

		Harbor		
4. Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup. Show “all students” group here. Attach spreadsheet to show subgroups.	% All Students Proficient and Above R – 48 M – 20 Male R – 41 M – 24 Female R – 57 M – 15 White R – 49 M – 21 LEP Status R – 49 M – 20 IEP R – 45 M – 9 SES R – 41 M – 19 Migrant R – 48 M – 20 Title 1 R – 48 M - 20	% All Students Proficient and Above R – 53 M – 40 Male R – 50 M – 30 Female R – 65 M – 30 White R – 58 M – 30 LEP Status R – 58 M – 30 IEP R – 55 M – 15 SES R – 50 M – 26 Migrant R – 55 M – 30 Title 1 R – 55 M - 30	% All Students Proficient and Above R – 60 M – 60 Male R – 58 M – 38 Female R – 75 M – 45 White R – 65 M – 40 LEP Status R – 65 M – 40 IEP R – 60 M – 25 SES R – 58 M – 35 Migrant R – 65 M – 40 Title 1 R – 65 M - 35	% All Students Proficient and Above R – 80 M – 80 Male R – 65 M – 50 Female R – 85 M – 55 White R – 75 M – 50 LEP Status R – 75 M – 55 IEP R – 65 M – 35 SES R – 65 M – 45 Migrant R – 75 M – 50 Title 1 R – 75 M - 45
5. Average scale scores on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup. Show “all students” group here. Attach spreadsheet to show subgroups.	R: 1146 All R – 1140 SES R – 1134 IEP M: 1136 All M – 1131 SES M – 1125 IEP	R: 1160 All R – 1155 SES R – 1148 IEP M: 1148 All M – 1145 SES M – 1138 IEP	R: 1180 All R – 1170 SES R – 1162 IEP M: 1158 All M – 1155 SES M – 1148 IEP	R: 1190 All R – 1195 SES R – 1185 IEP M: 1175 All M – 1168 SES M – 1165 IEP
6. Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Graduation rate	67.4	75	80	90

8. College enrollment rates	71% College 2 % Military	85% College	90% College	90% College
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Implementation Indicators are from the Transformation Toolkit which provides explanations and references to resources, as does the SIG Online Tool.

After aligning the Needs Assessment and with the plan, the transformation team uses the SIG Online Tool to carefully assesses each indicator, develop detailed plans, and track progress. This “quick” assessment of Implementation Indicators by the LEA helps align the needs with the strategies and interventions in the plan and their intended outcomes.

Strand A: Establish and Orient the LEA Transformation Team	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has a transformation (or turnaround) team.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA has assessed team and LEA capacity to support transformation.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA provides team members with information on what the LEA can do to promote rapid improvement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has designated an internal lead partner for each transformation school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand.</p> <p>Training needs to happen for teams and for leaders to successfully lead a transformational change in the school but with limited resources in time and dollars this is very difficult to accomplish.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand.</p> <p>Facilitated training to bring teams and leaders together. Safe and honest discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of teams and individuals will help to put people into positions where they can affect change from a position of strength.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each.</p> <p>Teacher leadership training to facilitate ownership of not just individual classrooms but of the school as a whole will bring about a culture change to one of pride, caring, and acceptance of responsibility.</p> <p>Student led conference training to develop teachers who effectively train students in the art of being able to take responsibility and for students to be able to demonstrate their knowledge effectively.</p>	

Strand B: Move Toward School Autonomy (LEA)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has examined current state and LEA policies and structures related to central control and made modifications to fully support transformation.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA has reoriented its culture toward shared responsibility and accountability.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA has established performance objectives for each transformation school.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has aligned resource allocation (money, time, human resources) with the school's instructional priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA has established a turnaround office or zone (to also include transformations and other models).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA negotiates union waivers if needed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. A new evaluation tool was established in September 2010 but more work needs to be done with responsibility and accountability.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Coaches and mentors will assist with helping classroom teacher expand their knowledge of and responsibility for all students.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Coaches (Math & Literacy), Curriculum Coordinator and integration teacher will demonstrate new methods, map curriculum, determine power standards to improve student performance.</p>	

Strand C: Select a Principal and Recruit Teachers (LEA)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has determined whether an existing principal in position for two years or less has the necessary competencies to be a transformation leader.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA advertises for candidates in local newspapers, publications such as Education Week, regional education newsletters or web sites; alternatively, engage a search firm.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA has an established policy and process/rubric for screening candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has an established process for preparing to interview candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA has an established criteria and format for interviewing candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA selects and hires qualified principals with the necessary competencies to be change leaders.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The LEA has a plan and process in place to establish a pipeline of potential turnaround leaders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The LEA has a plan and process in place to recruit and retain highly-qualified teachers to support the transformation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. The high school hired a transformational principal in July 2010.	
Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. The district contracted with the New Hampshire Principal's Association to provide a mentor for the high school principal. This will continue for one more year.	
Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Continued mentorship for the 2 nd year will establish solid groundwork for the change process. The principal will continue his work on communication, up-grades to technology, the alignment of competencies to instruction and assessments, implementation of a competency based report card, access for parents and students to an online grading system, and the development of Professional Learning Communities.	

Strand D: Work with Stakeholders and Build Support for Transformation (LEA and School)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has assigned transformation team members the task of creating a plan to work and communicate with stakeholders prior to and during implementation of the transformation.	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School has announced changes and anticipated actions publicly; communicated urgency of rapid improvement, and signaled the need for rapid change.	__ N X S __ Y
3. The LEA/School has engaged parents and community.	__ N X S __ Y
4. The LEA/School has support for transformation from all stakeholders.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA/School has established a positive organizational culture.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA/School helps stakeholders overcome resistance to change.	X N __ S __ Y
7. The LEA/School persists and perseveres, but discontinues failing strategies.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. The principal has established a Principal’s Advisory Council and academic teams.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Continued work on communication, community involvement, establishment of Professional Learning Communities, and alignment of competencies to curriculum.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. The use of coaches, curriculum coordinators, and the technology integration specialist will further align competencies and standards vertically, horizontally, and between disciplines. Communication will continue between all groups. Laptops will allow connectivity in ‘real time’ to respond to and/or to share good teaching practices throughout the day.</p>	

Strand E: Contract with External Providers (LEA and School)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has identified potential providers.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA has written and issued a request for proposals from potential providers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA has developed a transparent selection criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has reviewed proposals, conducted due diligence, and selected provider(s).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA negotiates contracts with providers, including goals, benchmarks, and plans to manage assets.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA has planned for and initiated an ongoing cycle of continuous progress monitoring and adjustment.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The LEA is prepared to proactively deal with problems and drop strategies that do not work.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The LEA has a plan for evaluation and has clarified who is accountable for collecting data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. There is no one person in charge of coordinating these efforts. The district is on a shoestring budget whereby administrators have taken on too many roles to be successful in all of them.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Additional staff dedicated to data collection and interpretation of data is needed. These people will also work with teams to develop instructional improvements.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Curriculum Coordinators will : Develop curriculum maps Benchmarks Common Assessments Effective teaching strategies Collect, Interpret and share data Design and model lessons to address deficiencies: eg: multiple modalities, chunking, scaffolding, differentiating.</p>	

Strand F: Establish and Orient the School Transformation Team	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has appointed a school transformation team.	X N ___ S ___ Y
2. The team members receive information on what the school can do to promote rapid improvement.	X N ___ S ___ Y
Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. There has not been a formal move to appoint staff to a team.	
Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Through workshops a description of duties, time committee, and responsibilities needs to be determined for team members and leaders.	
Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators will train team members on what data to look for, how to assess alignment and what indicators of success look like. Substitute days and professional development are built into the grant to give faculty the opportunity to seek formal and informal professional development that will further develop their own skills or introduce them to new methods of teaching, assessing, and reporting.	

Strand G: Lead Change (Especially for Principals)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The principal is a change leader.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal effectively and clearly communicates the message of change.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal collects and acts on data from a variety of sources and in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The principal, after reviewing the data, seeks quick wins.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The principal provides optimum conditions for a school transformation team to make decisions and act on their decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The principal, with the school transformation team, persists and perseveres, but discontinues failing strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Some changes have been made during the 2010-2011 school year that need to continue: communication, Principal’s Advisory, competencies.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. The mentor program gives the principal another “wall” to bounce ideas off of without fear of evaluation. The principal currently uses data to drive change.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each.</p> <p>Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators will assist the principal in sending a common message as well as provide model lessons to struggling teachers. The expected outcome is to have a map for every course, a list of resources, and common assessments or benchmarks no less than quarterly.</p> <p>All staff should be able to clearly articulate goals and objectives for their own courses and for each student that they teach.</p>	

Strand H-Part 1: Evaluate, Reward, and Remove Staff – (Evaluating Staff)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has established a system of procedures and protocols for recruiting, evaluating, rewarding, and replacing staff.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal regularly evaluates a range of teacher skills and knowledge, using a variety of valid and reliable tools.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal includes evaluation of student outcomes in teacher evaluation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The principal makes the evaluation process transparent.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The principal provides training to those conducting evaluations to ensure that they are conducted with fidelity to standardized procedures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. There is an established procedure for documenting the evaluation process.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The principal provides timely, clear, constructive feedback to teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The evaluation process is linked with the LEA's collective and individualized professional development programs.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
9. The LEA/School assesses the evaluation process periodically to gauge its quality and utility.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Principals had training in September 2010 on the difference between observation, evaluation, and professional development goals but there needs to be more dialogue on exactly what is an effective teacher, what evidence of effective teaching is, and how to write an evaluation to create improvement.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Time and money for professional development to work together to create a set of indicators that all successful teachers will be able to demonstrate needs to happen.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Time is needed to develop a performance plan. The expected outcome is the development of a plan by teachers and administrators that clearly lists the criteria expected from highly effective teachers and classrooms along with a rubric for rewarding teachers that meet specified targets using student growth/achievement as at least one of the indicators of success.</p>	

Strand H – Part 2: Evaluate, Reward, and Remove Staff – (Rewarding Staff)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has created a system for making awards that is transparent and fair.	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School has worked with teachers and teachers' union at each stage of developing and implementing the system of awards.	X N __ S __ Y
3. The LEA/School has implemented a communication plan for building stakeholder support.	X N __ S __ Y
4. The LEA/School has secured sufficient funding for long-term program sustainability.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA/School has developed a system of providing performance-based incentives using valid data on whether performance indicators have been met.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA/School has identified and established non-monetary incentives for performance.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. This is in the infancy stage. During collective bargaining in the 2010/2011 school year it was mentioned by administration as a future goal. Teachers were opened to discussion.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. The faculty needs time to research existing models, visit schools where performance-based plans are used, and/or attend workshops on developing a local model.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each.</p> <p>Provide substitutes for teachers to give faculty the time to research, attend workshops, and develop a system for performance-based incentives based on an evaluation system that specifically addresses agreed upon indicators of success.</p>	

Strand H – Part 3: Evaluate, Reward, and Remove Staff – (Removing Staff)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has created several exit points for employees (e.g., voluntary departure of those unwilling, unable to meet new goals, address identified problems).	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School has established and communicated clear goals and measures for employees’ performance that reflect the established evaluation system and provide targeted training or assistance for an employee receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation or warning.	__ N X S __ Y
3. The LEA has reformed tenure protections, seniority rights, and other job protections to enable quick performance-based dismissals.	X N __ S __ Y
4. The LEA has negotiated expedited processes for performance-based dismissals in transformation schools.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA has formed teams of specialists who are familiar with the rules and regulations that govern staff dismissals.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA has a team available to help principals as they deal with underperforming employees to minimize principal’s time spent dismissing low performers.	X N __ S __ Y
7. The LEA/School facilitates swift exits to minimize further damage caused by underperforming employees.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Living in N.H. with RSA 189:13, 31, 32 dismissing a teacher is not a simple process and past practice has been to avoid the time and controversy in going through the removal process for tenured teachers.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Alignment of competencies, expectations, mapping curriculum, and most importantly developing a tool for performance evaluation will assist in re-thinking the purpose of evaluation.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Working with coaches, Curriculum Coordinators, mentors, and attending professional development opportunities on teacher expectations and performance indicators will provide administration the tools needed to authentically evaluate teacher performance as related to student outcomes. We should see more teachers on performance improvement plans and even a few opting for early retirement.</p>	

Strand I: Provide Rigorous Staff Development	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School provides professional development that is appropriate for individual teachers with different experience and expertise.	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School offers an induction program to support new teachers in their first years of teaching.	X N __ S __ Y
3. The LEA/School aligns professional development with identified needs based on staff evaluation and student performance.	X N __ S __ Y
4. The LEA/School provides all-staff, high-quality, ongoing, job-embedded, and differentiated professional development.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA/School structures professional development to provide adequate time for collaboration and active learning.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA/School provides sustained and embedded professional development related to implementation of new programs and strategies.	X N __ S __ Y
7. The LEA/School sets goals for professional development and monitors the extent to which it has changed practice.	X N __ S __ Y
8. The LEA ensures that school leaders act as instructional leaders, providing regular feedback to teachers to help them improve their practice.	X N __ S __ Y
9. The LEA/School directly aligns professional development with classroom observations (including peer observations) to build specific skills and knowledge of teachers.	X N __ S __ Y
10. The LEA/School creates a professional learning community that fosters a school culture of continuous learning.	X N __ S __ Y
11. The LEA/School promotes a school culture in which professional collaboration is valued and emphasized.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Money to hire a curriculum coordinator and provide substitutes for teachers to attend workshops and team meetings has been cut from the budget for the past several years.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. We need coaches (math/literacy), curriculum coordinators, mentors, and time for workshops and team meetings.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators will plan and facilitate a systematic review of all professional development to ensure alignment to school goals and individual needs. A master list of available workshops will be created and suggestions made to individual staff members on which ones to attend to improve their instruction and/or assessment.</p>	

Strand J: Increase Learning Time	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The principal is familiar with research and best practices associated with efforts to increase learning time.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal has assessed areas of need, selected programs/strategies to be implemented and identified potential community partners.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal creates enthusiasm for extended learning programs and strategies among parents, teachers, students, civic leaders, and faith-based organizations through information sharing, collaborative planning, and regular communication.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA/School has allocated funds to support extended learning time, including innovative partnerships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA assists school leaders in networking with potential partners and in developing partnerships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA/School creates and sustains partnerships to support extended learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The LEA/School ensures that teachers use extra time effectively when extended learning is implemented within the regular school program by providing targeted professional development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The LEA/School monitors the progress of the extended learning time programs and strategies being implemented, and uses data to inform modifications.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Understanding and effectively using data is a roadblock. Funds are in short supply so offering stipends to extend the school day and to provide transportation has not happened.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Training on the use of data is needed. Money to pay for teachers to extend their day and to provide transportation to students who choose to remain after school or attend Saturday school is needed. Technology needs to be updated to meet current software needs.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Data training will assist faculty in understanding how to use the data to affect change. The LEA is looking at using funds from other grant sources to provide afterschool and/or Saturday programs to support classroom teaching using Study Island as an on-line learning tool. Labs and computers need to be updated to provide simultaneous multiple user capability.</p>	

Strand K: Reform Instruction	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The school has established a team structure among teachers with specific duties and time for instructional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal focuses on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal aligns professional development with classroom observations and teacher evaluation criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The principal ensures that teachers align instruction with standards and benchmarks.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. All teachers monitor and assess student mastery of standards-based objectives in order to make appropriate curriculum adjustments.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. All teachers, working in teams, differentiate and align learning activities with state standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. All teachers assess student learning frequently using standards-based classroom assessments.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. All teachers, working in teams, prepare standards-aligned lessons.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
9. All teachers provide sound instruction in a variety of modes: teacher-directed whole-class; teacher-directed small-group; student-directed small group; independent work; computer-based; homework.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
10. All teachers demonstrate sound homework practices and communication with parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
11. All teachers employ effective classroom management.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Time for professional development to create teams and to give teams time for meetings blocks these initiatives. Having technology available for teachers to access and use data in classrooms, at home, in workshops has not happened.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Time to meet and discuss needs in teams, attend workshops in teams, and develop successful lessons in teams is needed.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Substitutes for meetings. Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators to facilitate meetings and train teachers on how to differentiate, use a variety of modes, use data effectively, communicate with colleagues, students, and parents in a timely manner. End of 3-years there will be lessons based on individual needs showing differentiation, new lessons will be developed based on data, meetings will model dialogue rich in effective teaching practices and individual student needs.</p>	

Aligning Project Plan with Indicators- Transformation Model
Leading Indicators, Lagging Indicators, and Implementation Indicators

Completed by LEA

LEA and School Information

LEA: Franklin School District

Address: 119 Central Street, Franklin, NH 03235

Telephone: 603-934-3108

Superintendent: Dr. Maureen Ward

Telephone: 603-934-3108

Email: mward@sau18.org

Primary contact for SIG project (if other than Superintendent):

Address:

City:

Telephone:

Email:

School: Franklin Middle School

Address: 200 Sanborn Street

City: Franklin, NH 03235

Telephone: 603-934-5441

Aligning Needs Assessment and Project Plan - Transformation Model

Leading Indicators, Lagging Indicators, and Implementation Indicators

This Needs Assessment is first completed by the LEA on this form to support the SIG plan. The LEA and the school each has specific responsibilities for implementing a SIG transformation. The SIG Online Tool provides for one process for tracking and reporting progress. The school's transformation team is responsible for the process. This team is typically the school leadership team with one or more LEA staff added. Including LEA staff (usually called the internal partner) on the school transformation team enables the team to address implementation indicators relative to the LEA as well as the school. The LEA completes this initial Needs Assessment, then transfers responsibility for maintaining the online system to the school transformation team once the team is in place.

For each leading and lagging indicator, the LEA enters the school's most recent, yearly data (Pre), benchmarks for each project year, and the Goal to be achieved by the end of Year 3. Achieving that goal is evidence that the indicator has been met at the end of the project.

Federal Metric Requirements—Lagging Indicators	Pre	Benchmark Year 1	Benchmark Year 2	Goal
9. AYP status	NO for Reading and Math	Meets AYP for both Reading and Math	Meets AYP for both Reading and Math	Meet performance target for all students in both Reading and Math
10. Which AYP targets the school met and missed (how many met and missed?). Attach list of AYP targets missed in most recently available year.	Reading Met: None Missed: All Math Met: None Missed: All	Met Target Index in Reading for White, Economically Disadvantaged Missed: Target Index in Reading for Educational Disability. Met Target Index in Math For Whole School, White, Economically Disadvantaged Missed Target Index for Education Disadvantaged	Met Target Index in Reading for White, Economically Disadvantaged, Educational Disability. Met Target Index in Math For Whole School, White, Economically Disadvantaged Missed Target Index for Education Disadvantaged	Met: To consistently meet participation rates for all subjects and all groups. To consistently meet target index scores in both reading and math with the exception of Missed: Educational Disability will take a while to change the expectations
11. School improvement status (Improvement Year 1, Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Planning, or Restructuring)	Reading Restructuring Year 1 Math Restructuring Year 1	Reading Safe Harbor Math Safe Harbor	Reading Made AYP Math Made AYP	

12. Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup. Show “all students” group here. Attach spreadsheet to show subgroups.	See attached spreadsheet	Increase percentage proficient and above in all groups by no less than 8 %	Increase percentage proficient and above in all groups by no less than 8 %	% All Students Proficient and Above R – 80 M – 80 Male R – 65 M – 50 Female R – 85 M – 55 White R – 75 M – 50 LEP Status R – 75 M – 55 IEP R – 65 M – 35 SES R – 65 M – 45 Migrant R – 75 M – 50 Title 1 R – 75 M – 45
13. Average scale scores on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup. Show “all students” group here. Attach spreadsheet to show subgroups.	See attached	Increase scale score in all grades by no less than 10 points	Increase scale score in all grades by no less than 10 points.	With 20 points of target for all groups in all grades
14. Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15. Graduation rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
16. College enrollment rates	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Implementation Indicators are from the Transformation Toolkit which provides explanations and references to resources, as does the SIG Online Tool.

After aligning the Needs Assessment and with the plan, the transformation team uses the SIG Online Tool to carefully assesses each indicator, develop detailed plans, and track progress. This “quick” assessment of Implementation Indicators by the LEA helps align the needs with the strategies and interventions in the plan and their intended outcomes.

Strand A: Establish and Orient the LEA Transformation Team	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has a transformation (or turnaround) team.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA has assessed team and LEA capacity to support transformation.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA provides team members with information on what the LEA can do to promote rapid improvement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has designated an internal lead partner for each transformation school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand.</p> <p>Training needs to happen for teams and for leaders to successfully lead a transformational change in the school but with limited resources in time and dollars this is very difficult to accomplish.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand.</p> <p>Facilitated training to bring teams and leaders together. Safe and honest discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of teams and individuals will help to put people into positions where they can affect change from a position of strength.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each.</p> <p>Teacher leadership training to facilitate ownership of not just individual classrooms but of the school as a whole will bring about a culture change to one of pride, caring, and acceptance of responsibility.</p> <p>Student led conference training to develop teachers who effectively train students in the art of being able to take responsibility and for students to be able to demonstrate their knowledge effectively.</p> <p>Mentoring program for Principal to develop leadership with skill and heart; one who understands that teaming means giving the “power” to others to shine while constantly supporting, mentoring, and pushing for new heights.</p>	

Strand B: Move Toward School Autonomy (LEA)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has examined current state and LEA policies and structures related to central control and made modifications to fully support transformation.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA has reoriented its culture toward shared responsibility and accountability.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA has established performance objectives for each transformation school.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has aligned resource allocation (money, time, human resources) with the school's instructional priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA has established a turnaround office or zone (to also include transformations and other models).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA negotiates union waivers if needed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. A new evaluation tool was established in September 2010 but more work needs to be done with responsibility and accountability.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Coaches and mentors will assist with helping classroom teacher expand their knowledge of and responsibility for all students.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Coaches (Math & Literacy), Curriculum Coordinator and integration teacher will demonstrate new methods, map curriculum, determine power standards to improve student performance.</p>	

Strand C: Select a Principal and Recruit Teachers (LEA)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has determined whether an existing principal in position for two years or less has the necessary competencies to be a transformation leader.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The LEA advertises for candidates in local newspapers, publications such as Education Week, regional education newsletters or web sites; alternatively, engage a search firm.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The LEA has an established policy and process/rubric for screening candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA has an established process for preparing to interview candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA has an established criteria and format for interviewing candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA selects and hires qualified principals with the necessary competencies to be change leaders.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The LEA has a plan and process in place to establish a pipeline of potential turnaround leaders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The LEA has a plan and process in place to recruit and retain highly-qualified teachers to support the transformation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. The middle school will have a new principal in July 2011.	
Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. The district will contract with the New Hampshire Principal's Association to provide a mentor for the middle school principal. This will continue for two years.	
Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Initiate a principal mentorship program to build a leadership foundation based on communication, respect, and high expectations for students and staff.	

Strand D: Work with Stakeholders and Build Support for Transformation (LEA and School)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has assigned transformation team members the task of creating a plan to work and communicate with stakeholders prior to and during implementation of the transformation.	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School has announced changes and anticipated actions publicly; communicated urgency of rapid improvement, and signaled the need for rapid change.	__ N X S __ Y
3. The LEA/School has engaged parents and community.	__ N X S __ Y
4. The LEA/School has support for transformation from all stakeholders.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA/School has established a positive organizational culture.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA/School helps stakeholders overcome resistance to change.	X N __ S __ Y
7. The LEA/School persists and perseveres, but discontinues failing strategies.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. The middle school needs to develop teams focused on transformation. Parents are not active partners and school has a reputation for bullying and failure.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Develop a strong site council along with online connections between parents, students, and faculty,</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. The use of coaches, curriculum coordinators, and the technology integration specialist will further align competencies and standards vertically, horizontally, and between disciplines. Communication will continue between all groups. Laptops will allow connectivity in 'real time' to respond to and/or to share good teaching practices throughout the day. Use the principal mentor program as a support for the principal during the initial years of transformation.</p>	

Strand F: Establish and Orient the School Transformation Team	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA has appointed a school transformation team.	X N ___ S ___ Y
2. The team members receive information on what the school can do to promote rapid improvement.	X N ___ S ___ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. There has not been a formal move to appoint staff to a team.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Through workshops a description of duties, time committee, and responsibilities needs to be determined for team members and leaders.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators will train team members on what data to look for, how to assess alignment and what indicators of success look like. Substitute days and professional development are built into the grant to give faculty the opportunity to seek formal and informal professional development that will further develop their own skills or introduce them to new methods of teaching, assessing, and reporting. CTT will assist faculty and staff in learning to trust, to seek help, to admit failure, and to share best practices with each other.</p>	

Strand G: Lead Change (Especially for Principals)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The principal is a change leader.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal effectively and clearly communicates the message of change.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal collects and acts on data from a variety of sources and in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The principal, after reviewing the data, seeks quick wins.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The principal provides optimum conditions for a school transformation team to make decisions and act on their decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The principal, with the school transformation team, persists and perseveres, but discontinues failing strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Some changes have been made during the 2010-2011 school year that need to continue: communication, Principal’s Advisory, competencies.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. The mentor program gives the principal another “wall” to bounce ideas off of without fear of evaluation. The principal currently uses data to drive change.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each.</p> <p>Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators will assist the principal in sending a common message as well as provide model lessons to struggling teachers. The expected outcome is to have a map for every course, a list of resources, and common assessments or benchmarks no less than quarterly.</p> <p>All staff should be able to clearly articulate goals and objectives for their own courses and for each student that they teach.</p>	

Strand H-Part 1: Evaluate, Reward, and Remove Staff – (Evaluating Staff)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has established a system of procedures and protocols for recruiting, evaluating, rewarding, and replacing staff.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal regularly evaluates a range of teacher skills and knowledge, using a variety of valid and reliable tools.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal includes evaluation of student outcomes in teacher evaluation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The principal makes the evaluation process transparent.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The principal provides training to those conducting evaluations to ensure that they are conducted with fidelity to standardized procedures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. There is an established procedure for documenting the evaluation process.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The principal provides timely, clear, constructive feedback to teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The evaluation process is linked with the LEA's collective and individualized professional development programs.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
9. The LEA/School assesses the evaluation process periodically to gauge its quality and utility.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Principals had training in September 2010 on the difference between observation, evaluation, and professional development goals but there needs to be more dialogue on exactly what is an effective teacher, what evidence of effective teaching is, and how to write an evaluation to create improvement.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Time and money for professional development to work together to create a set of indicators that all successful teachers will be able to demonstrate needs to happen.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Time is needed to develop a performance plan. The expected outcome is the development of a plan by teachers and administrators that clearly lists the criteria expected from highly effective teachers and classrooms along with a rubric for rewarding teachers that meet specified targets using student growth/achievement as at least one of the indicators of success.</p>	

Strand H – Part 2: Evaluate, Reward, and Remove Staff – (Rewarding Staff)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has created a system for making awards that is transparent and fair.	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School has worked with teachers and teachers' union at each stage of developing and implementing the system of awards.	X N __ S __ Y
3. The LEA/School has implemented a communication plan for building stakeholder support.	X N __ S __ Y
4. The LEA/School has secured sufficient funding for long-term program sustainability.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA/School has developed a system of providing performance-based incentives using valid data on whether performance indicators have been met.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA/School has identified and established non-monetary incentives for performance.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. This is in the infancy stage. During collective bargaining in the 2010/2011 school year it was mentioned by administration as a future goal. Teachers were opened to discussion.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. The faculty needs time to research existing models, visit schools where performance-based plans are used, and/or attend workshops on developing a local model.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each.</p> <p>Provide substitutes for teachers to give faculty the time to research, attend workshops, and develop a system for performance-based incentives based on an evaluation system that specifically addresses agreed upon indicators of success.</p>	

Strand H – Part 3: Evaluate, Reward, and Remove Staff – (Removing Staff)	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School has created several exit points for employees (e.g., voluntary departure of those unwilling, unable to meet new goals, address identified problems).	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School has established and communicated clear goals and measures for employees’ performance that reflect the established evaluation system and provide targeted training or assistance for an employee receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation or warning.	__N X S __ Y
3. The LEA has reformed tenure protections, seniority rights, and other job protections to enable quick performance-based dismissals.	X N __ S __ Y
4. The LEA has negotiated expedited processes for performance-based dismissals in transformation schools.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA has formed teams of specialists who are familiar with the rules and regulations that govern staff dismissals.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA has a team available to help principals as they deal with underperforming employees to minimize principal’s time spent dismissing low performers.	X N __ S __ Y
7. The LEA/School facilitates swift exits to minimize further damage caused by underperforming employees.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Living in N.H. with RSA 189:13, 31, 32 dismissing a teacher is not a simple process and past practice has been to avoid the time and controversy in going through the removal process for tenured teachers.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Alignment of competencies, expectations, mapping curriculum, and most importantly developing a tool for performance evaluation will assist in re-thinking the purpose of evaluation.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Working with coaches, Curriculum Coordinators, mentors, and attending professional development opportunities on teacher expectations and performance indicators will provide administration the tools needed to authentically evaluate teacher performance as related to student outcomes. We should see more teachers on performance improvement plans and even a few opting for early retirement.</p>	

Strand I: Provide Rigorous Staff Development	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The LEA/School provides professional development that is appropriate for individual teachers with different experience and expertise.	X N __ S __ Y
2. The LEA/School offers an induction program to support new teachers in their first years of teaching.	X N __ S __ Y
3. The LEA/School aligns professional development with identified needs based on staff evaluation and student performance.	X N __ S __ Y
4. The LEA/School provides all-staff, high-quality, ongoing, job-embedded, and differentiated professional development.	X N __ S __ Y
5. The LEA/School structures professional development to provide adequate time for collaboration and active learning.	X N __ S __ Y
6. The LEA/School provides sustained and embedded professional development related to implementation of new programs and strategies.	X N __ S __ Y
7. The LEA/School sets goals for professional development and monitors the extent to which it has changed practice.	X N __ S __ Y
8. The LEA ensures that school leaders act as instructional leaders, providing regular feedback to teachers to help them improve their practice.	X N __ S __ Y
9. The LEA/School directly aligns professional development with classroom observations (including peer observations) to build specific skills and knowledge of teachers.	X N __ S __ Y
10. The LEA/School creates a professional learning community that fosters a school culture of continuous learning.	X N __ S __ Y
11. The LEA/School promotes a school culture in which professional collaboration is valued and emphasized.	X N __ S __ Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Money to hire a curriculum coordinator and provide substitutes for teachers to attend workshops and team meetings has been cut from the budget for the past several years.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. We need coaches (math/literacy), curriculum coordinators, mentors, and time for workshops and team meetings.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators will plan and facilitate a systematic review of all professional development to ensure alignment to school goals and individual needs. A master list of available workshops will be created and suggestions made to individual staff members on which ones to attend to improve their instruction and/or assessment.</p>	

Strand J: Increase Learning Time	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The principal is familiar with research and best practices associated with efforts to increase learning time.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal has assessed areas of need, selected programs/strategies to be implemented and identified potential community partners.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal creates enthusiasm for extended learning programs and strategies among parents, teachers, students, civic leaders, and faith-based organizations through information sharing, collaborative planning, and regular communication.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The LEA/School has allocated funds to support extended learning time, including innovative partnerships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. The LEA assists school leaders in networking with potential partners and in developing partnerships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. The LEA/School creates and sustains partnerships to support extended learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. The LEA/School ensures that teachers use extra time effectively when extended learning is implemented within the regular school program by providing targeted professional development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. The LEA/School monitors the progress of the extended learning time programs and strategies being implemented, and uses data to inform modifications.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Understanding and effectively using data is a roadblock. Funds are in short supply so offering stipends to extend the school day and to provide transportation has not happened.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Training on the use of data is needed. Money to pay for teachers to extend their day and to provide transportation to students who choose to remain after school or attend Saturday school is needed. Technology needs to be updated to meet current software needs.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Data training will assist faculty in understanding how to use the data to affect change. The LEA is looking at using funds from other grant sources to provide afterschool and/or Saturday programs to support classroom teaching using Study Island as an on-line learning tool. Labs and computers need to be updated to provide simultaneous multiple user capability.</p>	

Strand K: Reform Instruction	
Implementation Indicators	No / Somewhat / Yes (Check)
1. The school has established a team structure among teachers with specific duties and time for instructional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
2. The principal focuses on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
3. The principal aligns professional development with classroom observations and teacher evaluation criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
4. The principal ensures that teachers align instruction with standards and benchmarks.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
5. All teachers monitor and assess student mastery of standards-based objectives in order to make appropriate curriculum adjustments.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
6. All teachers, working in teams, differentiate and align learning activities with state standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
7. All teachers assess student learning frequently using standards-based classroom assessments.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
8. All teachers, working in teams, prepare standards-aligned lessons.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
9. All teachers provide sound instruction in a variety of modes: teacher-directed whole-class; teacher-directed small-group; student-directed small group; independent work; computer-based; homework.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
10. All teachers demonstrate sound homework practices and communication with parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
11. All teachers employ effective classroom management.	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> Y
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe your obstacles to full implementation of the indicators for this strand. Time for professional development to create teams and to give teams time for meetings blocks these initiatives. Having technology available for teachers to access and use data in classrooms, at home, in workshops has not happened.</p>	
<p>Needs Assessment: Describe the kind of support and additional resources that would help you fully implement all the indicators for this strand. Time to meet and discuss needs in teams, attend workshops in teams, and develop successful lessons in teams is needed.</p>	
<p>Plan: Describe the specific interventions included in the plan that address this strand and the expected outcome of each. Substitutes for meetings. Coaches and Curriculum Coordinators to facilitate meetings and train teachers on how to differentiate, use a variety of modes, use data effectively, communicate with colleagues, students, and parents in a timely manner. End of 3-years there will be lessons based on individual needs showing differentiation, new lessons will be developed based on data, meetings will model dialogue rich in effective teaching practices and individual student needs.</p>	

