

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Maine



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0682

Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

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

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

Availability of Funds

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

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2015.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

The Department will require those SEAs that will use FY 2013 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. However, those SEAs using FY 2013 funds solely for continuation purposes are only required to complete the Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2013 School Improvement Grants Program located at the end of this application.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2013 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@ed.gov.

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at Carlas.Mccauley@ed.gov.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Maine Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, Maine 04333
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Rachelle Tome Position and Office: Chief Academic Officer Contact's Mailing Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, Maine 04333 Telephone: 207-624-6708 Fax: 207-624-6706 Email address: rachelle.tome@maine.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): James E. Rier	Telephone: 207-624-6620
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: February 13, 2014
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this definition, as its methodology for identifying its priority schools has already been approved through its ESEA flexibility request.

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority school in the State. (A State’s Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Directions: SEAs that generate new lists should create this table in Excel using the format shown below. An example of the table has been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X			
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X	X

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA’s application for a School Improvement Grant.

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA’s application with respect to each of the following actions:

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

Following submission of Maine’s School Improvement Grant (SIG) application, the MDOE will post grant information, the list of SIG eligible schools, and additional information regarding available technical assistance and needs assessment tools on the MDOE website. This information will also be disseminated by email to Superintendents, Title I coordinators and principals in districts with schools identified as eligible for SIG funding.

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

LEAs submitting an application for a Tier I and/or Tier II school will be asked to submit to the MDOE notification of their intent to apply for SIG funds. Each of these LEAs will be offered a \$3,000 needs assessment and planning grant, funded by Title I, Part A 1003(g) administrative funds. A Title I school improvement consultant will also be assigned to support the school through the planning process and to act as a liaison to the MDOE.

As part of the application process, LEAs will be notified that as a condition for accepting SIG funds, they will be required to report on the following indicators in progress reports and/or evaluations of the requirements:

- Number of minutes within the school year;
- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- Dropout rate;
- Student attendance rate;
- Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truants;
- Teacher HQT status;

- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system (when available); and
- Teacher attendance rate.

The MDOE SIG application will require each LEA to analyze data pertinent to each school and to clearly articulate the results of their needs assessment and the goals they have selected to best meet their needs. The LEA is required to review and analyze data from the following areas:

- student achievement
- curriculum and instruction
- professional development
- family and community involvement
- school context and organization

The MDOE will require LEAs to demonstrate that they have prioritized their needs assessment results in order to focus on improving their areas in need of improvement by leveraging their strengths and the strengths of others outlined in their plan. The ultimate goals stated by the LEA will have to relate to improving student achievement outcomes.

The application will also require one of the four intervention models to be identified and an explanation as to how the model was chosen as the best match to the improvement goals for the particular school. Data provided in the LEA application will be analyzed using the rubric in Appendix E.

(2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

In order to determine if the LEA/school has the capacity to use the SIG funds in a manner that will adequately maximize resources and support to successfully implement the selected intervention model fully and effectively in the given school(s), the MDOE will require LEAs to provide evidence of stakeholder support to enact policies that will allow the individual schools the autonomy needed to implement the chosen model effectively. This evidence must demonstrate that the LEAs has involved and received commitment to support from relevant stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, teachers' unions, parents, students, and community members in activities related to decision making, choosing an intervention model, and/or development of the model's design. Examples of stakeholder support may include narrative descriptions of meeting notes, surveys or other documentation.

The MDOE will also review the federal fund grant history for each LEA applicant (grant usage, timeliness of submission and reporting, appropriateness of funds used and noted concerns regarding supplanting, cash management or audit exceptions).

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

The MDOE will require applications to provide:

- a. A Three Year Action Plan (see Maine LEA SIG Application) that outlines **substantive** interventions and strategies which will be implemented to support full implementation of the selected school intervention model.
- b. Three Year School Budget Plans for identified schools and the LEA (see Maine LEA SIG Application)

that must align with the goals and parameters of the grant

- c. One Year Detailed Budget Narratives covering each year from SY2014-15 through SY2016-17 for identified schools and the LEA (see Maine LEA SIG Application), with supporting justification forms for any professional development, contracted services and equipment planned.

Reviewers, including the state Title I Director, will check to see if the budget aligns with proposed activities and includes staffing, consulting, contracts with partners, materials, substitute costs or stipends, costs for meeting the proposed improvement model, and matching or other funding sources to sustain strategies beyond the life of the grant.

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
- Align other resources with the interventions;
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The MDOE has included assurances (see Maine LEA SIG Application) within the LEA application that Superintendents must sign to ensure their commitment to complete the actions listed above. The MDOE has also included questions related to each of the components described in Part 1 (above) in the LEA Application. MDOE anticipates that LEAs will have been involved with preliminary work prior to receiving final approval for the grant funding. The LEA application specifically requires each LEA to respond to the following areas with relation to each Priority school it elects to serve:

- **Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.**
 - Each LEA will submit a letter of intent to apply for the grant by March 3, 2014.
 - Each LEA with eligible Priority schools will participate in technical assistance calls with the MDOE on March 10, 2014.
 - Each LEA application will be evaluated by an MDOE application review committee using the scoring rubric located in Appendix E. This tool was developed to evaluate the commitment and capacity of the LEA to implement the selected intervention model.
 - LEAs must obtain a minimum score of 93 out of 136 possible points to demonstrate the commitment and capacity needed to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected interventions in each identified school.
 - Technical assistance will be provided throughout the project by the Title I Office and the MDOE statewide system of support.
- **Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.**
 - The LEA is required to demonstrate that it has developed procedures to recruit, screen and select external providers. The process must include a variety of stakeholders. These procedures will be articulated in Section B1 (d) of the LEA application. Evaluation of the response submitted for this element is included in the MDOE scoring rubric.
- **Align other resources with the interventions.**
 - The LEA is required to submit a detailed budget narrative with their application. This will provide evidence of how other resources are aligned with the selected intervention. Additional

resources may include: State and local funding, Title I, Part A, Title II, Title III, Title I, 1003(a) funds.

- **Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.**
 - The LEA will provide minutes of meetings and local School Board agendas that will support the modification of policies or practices that will enable it to fully implement the intervention models effectively.
- **Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**
 - The LEA is required to provide a narrative describing how it will ensure that improvement efforts can be sustained once this funding ends. MDOE will consider the following when evaluating the LEA's response:
 - Actions that support the modification of policies or practices that will enable full and effective implementation of selected intervention models.
 - Commitment to align budgets toward efforts that are sustainable and willingness to allow MDOE to re-evaluate budgets throughout the grant period.
 - Extent to which professional development is ongoing and job-embedded.
 - Alignment of other resources, people, time and funding, to support the reform effort.

As part of the final review process, application review committee members will discuss any particular areas of concern. The assigned Title I school improvement consultant will work with the LEA as needed to provide technical assistance and to ensure compliance and commitment.

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

The LEA application will contain separate areas in the budget and action plan sections to describe any proposed pre-implementation activities and related costs. The application review team will evaluate and score these sections as part of the application review process, with attention to the budget and actions described. Evaluation will give consideration for whether sufficient funds have been included and whether the described activities are necessary, allowable, and align with the chosen intervention model. (See 2014 Maine LEA SIG application pages 9,11-12,16-18, 29).

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014-2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| February 24th | Conference call with LEAs having eligible schools to review the process |
| March 3rd | LEA submits intent to apply and request for grant to support proposed planning activities
(Planning grant is optional and funded with Administrative funds) |

March 3rd-7th MDOE review and approval of LEA proposed planning grants

May 16st Complete LEA application due

May 19th-30th Application review

June 1st LEA 3-year grants awarded following MDOE approval

Summer 2014 LEA begins pre-implementation activities

Fall 2014 LEA begins full implementation of grant and intervention model

LEA applications submitted by the, May 16, 2014 deadline will be evaluated by an MDOE application review committee using the scoring rubric located in Appendix E. This tool was developed to evaluate the completeness of the application and the commitment and capacity of the LEA to implement the selected intervention model.

LEAs must obtain a minimum score of 93 out of 136 possible points to demonstrate the commitment and capacity needed to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected interventions. Incomplete applications or applications with "Information not Provided" in any category will be disqualified and not be awarded funds.

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority schools, as applicable, and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools, or one or more priority schools, in at LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The MDOE will require all grant participants to complete an annual evaluation/progress report that will include an update on each component of the selected intervention model, an updated budget (including added detail for the upcoming year) and evidence of strategies implemented, successful outcomes or challenges that impeded progress towards established goals.

The MDOE will review the progress report submitted by LEAs for responses and evidence to support the following statements. Evidence provided will be used by MDOE school improvement team members in order to determine if funding for year two or three should be awarded:

- The LEA has provided evidence that the selected intervention model is being implemented appropriately, according to model descriptions/requirements.
- The schools receiving grant funding have made adequate progress towards previously established goals.
- Funds been utilized appropriately.
- There been no changes within the LEA that may impact the capacity to continue implementation of the intervention model.
- The LEA and/or school in good standing regarding school approval and federal and state program/accountability requirements.
- The LEA has submitted required data and reports in a timely fashion.
- The LEA has provided evidence of successful progress toward meeting goals established in the intervention

model.

Based upon responses provided for the questions listed above, including supporting evidence from the LEA, and a site visit report, MDOE will determine the LEA's capacity to ensure continued effective implementation of the selected intervention model, progress toward meeting goals, and subsequent renewal of the School Improvement Grant funds.

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

This is not applicable as ME is using its list of Priority schools approved in the State's ESEA flexibility request.

(3) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools, or the priority schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

The MDOE will assign a Title I school improvement consultant to each participating LEA. This consultant will act as a liaison to MDOE and will provide regular communication to the MDOE Title I School Improvement team. This represents an extension of Maine's current improvement process for supporting Title I schools. The appointed consultant may be an MDOE staff member or contracted service provider specializing in school reform. The liaison and/or contracted service provider will monitor each LEA's SIG grant implementation through various methods, including: onsite visits, desk audits, SIG team meetings, phone discussions, report reviews and quarterly meetings with LEA teams.

(4) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

Should sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools not be available and prioritization of School Improvement Grant be necessary, the following process will be employed:

- 1) All submitted applications will be reviewed and rated, based on the rubrics provided in Appendices E1 and E2 and on SEA of consideration of and LEAs capacity to effectively implement one of the required intervention models (See Section C).
- 2) For those LEAs demonstrating the capacity needed to effectively implement required intervention strategies, applications for Priority schools will be rank ordered. LEA applications with the highest points will receive priority for funding. LEA applications for Priority schools which do not achieve a minimum score of 93 will be removed from consideration.

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

This is not applicable as ME is using its list of Priority schools approved in the State's ESEA flexibility request.

(6) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, or any priority schools, as applicable, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

Maine law currently not does allow the MDOE or state board of education to take control of the daily operations of any public school.

(7) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, or for priority schools, as applicable, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

At the time of the submission of this application, it has not yet been determined whether the MDOE will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover. If there is a decision to provide such services at a later date, the MDOE will amend this application to provide the required information.

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each

Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.

Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

The MDOE intends to use the SIG Title I, Part A 1003 (g) funds to hire additional staff and Title I school improvement consultants, to act of liaisons from MDOE to the SIG grantees. In keeping with Maine’s differentiated model for school improvement support, these consultants will provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs and individual schools and will also assist in ongoing data collect and evaluation of grant activities. These consultants will also assist in the organization and development of coordinated professional development opportunities directed at all participating schools, such as a “transformational principals’ network”, incorporating ideas from key leadership researchers, such as Redding, Marzano, Fullan or and Sergiovanni. Funds will be used to increase monitoring and technical assistance for participating LEAs and to broaden the school reform perspective and experience level of the MDOE and LEA staff.

MDOE intends to use administrative funds to contract with outside providers, such as the International Center for Leadership in Education, to provide key supports for school administration and staff. One possible option is to provide leadership training for school teams through a “Leadership Academy”. Funds will also be used to send school teams to various school improvement/model school conferences, in order to broaden their understanding of comprehensive school reform, learn effective strategies to support their local efforts, and provide exposure to key resources, such as the Center for Innovation and Improvement.

The MDOE also plans to provide \$3000 planning grants to each LEA that submits an “Intent to apply” for the SIG grant. The purpose of the grant is to defray costs incurred in the preparation of the grant submission, such as staff and community meetings, data analysis, and additional staff costs for writing and preparing the grant.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

By checking this box, the SEA assures that it has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

Maine requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013

competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Assurance

The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of “priority schools” in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Assurance

The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority schools, approved through its ESEA

flexibility request, provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State's lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Maine requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the requirement in section 1116(b) of the ESEA to identify schools for improvement through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to "start over" their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report

that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the schoolwide poverty threshold through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

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 participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

I. ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS

The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

A copy of the notice sent to superintendents is provided. There were no comments. Here is the link to the public notice: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/sig/>



Maine Department of Education

Title I, Part A Section 1003(g) of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

2014 Maine LEA School Improvement Grant Application



Intent to Apply Due: March 3, 2014

Full Application Due: May 16, 2014

*Maine Department of Education
23 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333
Attn: Rachelle Tome*

Purpose of the Program

Title I 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 demonstrating 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 meet annual measurable objectives and to exit priority status. Under the final requirements published in the Federal Register in December 2009, school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools, identified as Priority status under Maine's approved ESEA Accountability plan. In the Title I Priority 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 Maine Department of Education (DOE) has applied and been approved to receive a Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG). The Maine DOE must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements. The Maine DOE may retain an amount not to exceed five percent for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Availability of Funds

FY 2014 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2017. Maine has requested a waiver of the period of availability to permit the LEAs to obligate the funds through September 30, 2017.

School Improvement Grant Guidance

In order to receive a SIG each participating LEA must:

- receive Title I, Part A funds and have one or more schools that qualify under the MDOE definition of a Priority school;
- serve each Priority school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each Priority school, in which case the LEA must indicate the Priority schools that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a Priority in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of the Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants;
- determine a budget for each Priority school it commits to serve consisting of an amount which is of sufficient size and scope to ensure that the LEA can implement one of the rigorous interventions identified in section I.A.2 of the Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants. 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;
- ensure that each Priority schools it serves receives all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the school improvement funds;
- meet the requirements with respect to ESEA accountability requirements outlined in Maine's approved ESEA accountability plan.

Additional grant requirements and guidance can be found at the following USED 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>

USED School Improvement Grant PowerPoint: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html#ppts>

School Improvement Grant LEA Application Process

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

Step 1: Application Review:

A Maine DOE review team, comprised of Maine DOE staff and Title I school improvement consultants knowledgeable about school improvement/reform with no conflicts of interest, will review applications submitted by the posted due date (May 16, 2014). The reviewers will read each application and score it independently. Reviewers will use appropriate scoring rubrics (see Maine LEA SIG Application Appendix E page 25-45 to determine both compliance with the Title I 1003(g) SIG guidance, and whether or not sufficient description and evidence has been provided. They will meet and provide additional feedback based on consensus. Application scores and feedback will be provided to the LEA within ten days of the submission.

Step 2: Awarding of Grants:

Applications will be placed in order of priority based on the USED guidance and, if necessary, rank ordered based on points earned on the submitted application and any clarifying information that may have been provided in step 1. All applications considered for funding must demonstrate consistent strength throughout their entire application and all scoring rubric sections. The review team will recommend to the Maine Commissioner of Education which LEAs have been approved for funding based on the priority ranking and funds available.

LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

D1) LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

February 24 th	Conference call with LEAs having eligible schools to review the process
March 3 rd	LEA submits intent to apply and request for grant to support proposed planning activities (Planning grant is optional and funded with 1003(g) Administrative funds)
March 3 rd -March 7 th	MDOE review and approval of LEA proposed planning grants
May 16 th	Complete LEA application due
May 19 th -30 th	Application review
June 1 st	LEA grants awarded following MDOE approval
Summer 2014	LEA begins pre-implementation activities
Fall 2014	LEA begins full implementation of grant and intervention model

Application Submission Information

Paperwork Required:

- Submit an intent to apply (page a) and planning grant template (page b) by March 3rd.
- Submit a complete application electronically to janice.bunnell@maine.gov and one hard copy to the ESEA/NCLB Clearinghouse office (address below) by May 16th.

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 Maine DOE by 4:00 pm no later than March 3, 2014.
- Complete grant applications must be received at the Maine DOE by 4:00 pm no later than May 16, 2014.

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

**ESEA/NCLB Clearinghouse
Attn: Rachelle Tome
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333**

Additionally, electronic copies should be sent to: janice.bunnell@maine.gov

Eligible LEAs/Schools

The USED guidance required Maine DOE to identify “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 USED SIG guidance, each Maine school’s annual New England Comprehensive Assessment Program (NECAP), Maine High School Assessment (MHSA), and Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio (PAAP) results for Reading and Math were reviewed for the “All Students” group. A percentage of proficiency, based on the students tested compared to those with an achievement level of “meets the standard” or “exceeds the standards” was calculated for Reading, and then for Math. These two percentages were then averaged to create an annual percentage of proficiency. An annual percentage of proficiency was calculated for the assessment years 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13 with a 3-year average percentage of proficiency produced. A determination of progress was then determined by calculating the change in the rate of proficiency for Reading and Math combined from 2010-11 to 2011-12 and from 2011-12 to 2012-13. The two rates were then totaled. All schools in the state were then rank ordered by the rate of progress to determine the state median. Schools meeting the criteria set by USED were then reviewed for eligibility. See *Appendix A* for an overview of the school selection process.

Eligibility for the Title I, Part A 1003(g) School Improvement Grants is not impacted by or does not eliminate eligibility for Title I, Part A 1003(a) improvement grants awarded to Maine Title I Priority Schools. The grants described within this document are additional grants awarded through a prescribed application process. If an LEA chooses not to participate in this Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant, the decision will not impact their eligibility for regular Title I, Part A 1003(a) improvement grant funding.

Required Intervention Models for Priority Schools

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

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 Maine 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 Maine 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 USED SIG guidance);
- Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.
- 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 graduation 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 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 USED 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 Rachelle Tome at rachelle.tome@maine.gov or 207-624-6705.

Intent to Apply & Planning Grant Application 2014

LEA/District:

District Mailing Address:

Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail:

Superintendent Name:

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

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

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

ELIGIBLE SCHOOL NAME	Planning to Apply

Name of 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>

Planning funds (\$3,000) are available for any LEA that has at least one eligible Priority school and plans to submit a complete Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant application.

Activity	Person Responsible	Benchmark/Evidence of Accomplishment	Start Date	Completion Date	Expenditures or Required Resources

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



**Title I, Part A Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act
2014 School Improvement Grant Application**

NAME OF UNIT _____
City, Town, SAD or CSD

UNIT ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____

FAX # _____

E-MAIL _____

NAME OF APPLICATION _____
CONTACT PERSON _____
SCHOOL/DISTRICT OFFICE _____
ADDRESS _____
TELEPHONE # _____
FAX # _____
E-MAIL _____

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this plan has been developed by an appropriate planning team and has received support of the school board of the unit named above. I have been authorized, as its representative, to submit this plan.

Signature, Superintendent of Schools

Date

For Information Call:
Title IA Office 624-6705
Contact: *Rachelle Tome*

Return Original To:
Maine Department of Education
ESEA/ NCLB Clearinghouse
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0023
Attn: Rachelle Tome
Email copy to: Janice.bunnell@maine.gov

Intent to Apply Due: March 3, 2014
Full Application Due: May 16, 2014

LEA Improvement Planning Committee Members	
Name	Group representing (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED:

Identify each of the Title I Priority schools this LEA commits to serve with School Improvement Grants and identify the model that will be used in each school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	INTERVENTION MODEL			
		turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Complete each sections B-C for each Title I Priority school to be served.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION/EVIDENCE OF COMMITMENT				
SCHOOL NAME:	INTERVENTION MODEL			
	turnaround	restart	closure	transformation
<p>Section B1.1-For each school to be served with 1003 (g) School Improvement Funds, clearly describe in narrative form:</p> <p>a) The analysis of needs for this school, including information from the following areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student achievement • curriculum and instruction • professional development • family and community involvement • school context and organization <p>b) The rationale for the specific intervention selected;</p>				

LEA NARRATIVE (Insert response here):

SCHOOL NAME:
<p>Section B1.2- Capacity</p> <p>Describe evidence to substantiate the LEA’s capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Title I Priority school in order to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. For any eligible Tier I school the LEA has elected to NOT include in its application, please complete Section C.</p> <p>Evidence should address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment of key stakeholders groups, including the school board, to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices that will support the intervention models; • Support from the school community and teachers’ union in regards to staffing and teacher and administrator evaluation requirements outlined in the intervention models;

- Ability and process to recruit new principals that can effectively implement the turnaround or transformation model, when applicable;
- The ability to implement the basic elements of the chosen intervention model by the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year;
- History of capacity to implement school improvement plans; and
- An identified LEA SIG Coordinator who will work the MDOE and the assigned Title I school improvement consultant and will participate in technical assistance opportunities provided by MDOE for SIG applicants and approved LEAs.

This evidence must demonstrate that that the LEA has involved and received commitment to support from relevant stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, teachers' unions, parents, students, and community members in activities related to decision making, choosing an intervention model, and/or development of the model's design. Examples of stakeholder support may include narrative descriptions of meeting notes, surveys or other documentation.

LEA CAPACITY:

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B2- Lack of Capacity(If applicable)

For any eligible Priority 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). Evidence should address the following:

- Commitment of key stakeholders groups, including the school board, to eliminate barriers and change policies and practices that will support the intervention models;
- Support from the school community and teachers' union in regards to staffing and teacher and administrator evaluation requirements outlined in the intervention models;
- Ability and process to recruit new principals that can effectively implement the turnaround or transformation model, when applicable;
- The ability to implement the basic elements of the chosen intervention model by the beginning of the 2014-15 school year;
- History of capacity to implement school improvement plans; and
- An identified LEA SIG Coordinator who will work the MDOE and the assigned Title I school improvement consultant and will participate in technical assistance opportunities provided by MDOE for SIG applicants and approved LEAs.

LEA LACK OF CAPACITY (If Applicable)

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B2- For each school the LEA is committed to serve, provide a brief (no more than one page) summary that describes actions the LEA has taken, or will take, to—

2.1 Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Include detail for the following:

- a) **The process the LEA will use to recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround;**

2.2 Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. Include detail for the following

2.3 Align other resources with the interventions, including federal, state, and local funding;

2.4 Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

Include detail for the following:

- a) **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; and**

2.5 Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. Include detail for the following:

- a) **Actions that support the modification of policies or practices that will enable full and effective implementation of selected intervention models.**
- b) **Commitment to align budgets toward efforts that are sustainable and willingness to allow MDOE to re-evaluate budgets throughout the grant period.**
- c) **Extent to which professional development is ongoing and job-embedded.**
- d) **Alignment of other resources, people, time and funding, to support the reform effort.**

LEA NARRATIVE

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B4- Timeline

For each Priority school served by this grant, provide a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

SCHOOL NAME:

B5 Annual goals

Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that the LEA has established in order to monitor Priority schools receiving school improvement funds.

ANNUAL GOALS

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B6- Consultation with Stakeholders

Describe how the LEA will consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Priority schools.

CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS:

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Action Plan <i>(Please complete one per school)</i>						
School Name:						
Goal						
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 type="checkbox"/> Transformation model					
Proposed Pre-implementation Activities for Summer 2014	Resources	Timeline	Oversight	Monitoring (Implementation)	Monitoring (Effectiveness)	Title I School Improvement Funds
<i>Describe the activities to be implemented prior to the start of school in 2014, designed to support full implementation of the selected intervention model in Fall 2014.</i> <i>(Add rows as needed.)</i>	<i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	<i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	<i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation?</i> <i>How often and by whom?</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness?</i> <i>How often and by whom?</i>	<i>Include amount allocated to this activity if applicable. Provide the requested detail on the Budget Narrative Form.</i>

2014 Maine LEA School Improvement Grant Application

February 2014

Proposed Activities for 2014-2017	Resources	Timeline	Oversight	Monitoring (Implementation)	Monitoring (Effectiveness)	Title I School Improvement Funds
<i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve the desired outcome. Provide sufficient detail so that reviewers will understand the purpose and proposed implementation of each activity.</i>	<i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	<i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	<i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation? How often and by whom?</i>	<i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often and by whom?</i>	<i>Include amount allocated to this activity if applicable. Provide the requested detail on the Budget Narrative Form.</i>

SCHOOL NAME:

C. BUDGET INFORMATION

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

- 1 Implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve; and**
- 2 Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Priority school.**

Note: The LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. 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. Also, pre-implementation activities are considered part of the Year 1 budget. The total Year 1 budget, including any pre-implementation activities, may not exceed \$2,000,000.

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

School Name	Year 1 Pre-implementation Budget	Year I Budget	Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	School Budget Total
Total LEA Yearly Budgets					

**SCHOOL BUDGET SECTION
THREE YEAR SCHOOL BUDGET PLAN 2014-2017**

SCHOOL NAME: <i>(Complete one per school)</i>						
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
Please note: Pre-implementation activities are considered part of the Year 1 budget. The total Year 1 budget for LEA and schools combined, including any pre-implementation activities, may not exceed \$2,000,000.	Includes pre-implementation costs					
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits</i>						
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>						
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>						
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>						
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 (Appendix D, page 34) must be completed.</i>						
Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>						
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>						
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>						

Indirect Costs						
Total						

ONE YEAR DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVES

Use this form to provide sufficient detail regarding proposed expenditure for *each year* of the 2014-2017 project periods. One template should be created for each year. Pre-implementation costs are detailed separately. Complete all appropriate justification forms (Appendix C and D)

YEAR ONE DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE: PRE-IMPLEMENTATION		
SCHOOL YEAR: 2014-2015 <u>Pre-Implementation costs must be included in total costs for Year 1</u>		
SCHOOL NAME: <i>(Complete one per school)</i>		
INTERVENTION MODEL: Transformation Turnaround Restart Closure <i>(Circle tier applicable to this school)</i>		
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>		
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>		
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>		
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>		
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 (Appendix D, page 34) must be completed.</i>		

<p>Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i></p>		
<p>Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i></p>		
<p>Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i></p>		
<p>Indirect Costs</p>		
<p>Total</p>		

ONE YEAR DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE		
SCHOOL YEAR: 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017 (Circle Appropriate year)		
Please note: Pre-implementation activities, while detailed separately above, are considered part of the Year 1 budget. The total Year 1 budget for LEA and schools combined, including any pre-implementation activities, may not exceed \$2,000,000.		
SCHOOL NAME <i>(Complete one per school)</i>		
INTERVENTION MODEL: Transformation Turnaround Restart Closure <i>(Circle model applicable to this school)</i>		
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>		
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>		
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>		
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>		
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 (Appendix D, page 34) must be completed.</i>		
Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>		
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>		

2014 Maine LEA School Improvement Grant Application

February 2014

Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>		
Indirect Costs		
Total		

**LEA BUDGET SECTION
THREE YEAR LEA BUDGET PLAN 2014-2017**

LEA NAME:						
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
Please note: Pre-implementation activities are considered part of the Year 1 budget. The total Year 1 budget for LEA and schools combined, including any pre-implementation activities, may not exceed \$2,000,000.	Includes pre-implementation costs					
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits</i>						
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>						
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>						
Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>						
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 (Appendix D, page 34) must be completed.</i>						
Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>						
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>						
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>						

Indirect Costs						
Total						

ONE YEAR DETAILED LEA BUDGET NARRATIVES

Use this form to provide sufficient detail regarding proposed expenditure for each year of the 2014-2017 project periods. One template should be created for each year. Pre-implementation costs are detailed separately. Complete all appropriate justification forms (Appendix C and D)

<p>ONE YEAR DETAILED LEA BUDGET NARRATIVE SCHOOL YEAR: 2014-2015 <u>Pre-implementation costs</u></p> <p>Please note: Pre-implementation activities, while detailed separately, are considered part of the Year 1 budget. The total Year 1 budget for LEA and schools combined, including any pre-implementation activities, may not exceed \$2,000,000.</p>		
<p>LEA NAME:</p>		
<p>Account Category</p>	<p>Budget Detail</p>	
	<p>Narrative</p>	<p>Total Costs</p>
<p>Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits.</i></p>		
<p>Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i></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>Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i></p>		
<p>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 (Appendix D, page 34) must be completed.</i></p>		

Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>		
Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i>		
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>		
Indirect Costs		
Total		

ONE YEAR DETAILED LEA BUDGET NARRATIVE SCHOOL YEAR: 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017 (Circle Appropriate year) Please note: Pre-implementation activities, while detailed separately, are considered part of the Year 1 budget. The total Year 1 budget for LEA and schools combined, including any pre-implementation activities, may not exceed \$2,000,000.		
LEA NAME:		
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>		
Contracted Services <i>Include name and title, contracted time, hourly/daily compensation and activities to be delivered. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i>		
Supplies and Materials <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i>		

<p>Books <i>Detail your purchases. Explain the connection between what you wish to purchase and the activities in your plan.</i></p>		
<p>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 (Appendix D, page 34) must be completed.</i></p>		
<p>Professional Development Activities <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs. A Professional Development & Contracted Services Justification Form (Appendix C, page 33) must be completed</i></p>		
<p>Travel <i>Summarize your activities including the number of days, people involved and associated costs.</i></p>		
<p>Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i></p>		
<p>Indirect Costs</p>		
<p>Total</p>		

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 Maine Department of Education (MDOE) and the United States Department of Education (USED).

This LEA provides an assurance that—

- School Improvement Grant funds will be used to fully and effectively implement an intervention in each Priority school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- All schools within the LEA that are participating in the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 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 Priority school that it serves with school improvement funds;
- If it implements a restart model in a Priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements,
- Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding, and
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

Superintendent Signature

Date

E. WAIVERS

The MDOE has requested that waivers be granted by the USED regarding requirements to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. Check each waiver that this LEA intends 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.

- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Priority Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.**

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

The USED guidance required MDOE to identify “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 Department of Education Guidance for the Title I School Improvement Grant, each Maine school’s annual New England Assessment Program (NECAP), Maine High School Assessment (MHSA), and Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio (PAAP) results for Reading and Math were reviewed for the “All Students” group. A percentage of proficiency, based on the students tested compared to those with an achievement level of “meets the standard” or “exceeds the standards” was calculated for Reading, and then for Math. These two percentages were then averaged to create an annual percentage of proficiency. An annual percentage of proficiency was calculated for the assessment years 2010-11, 2011-12 and, 2012-2013 with a 3-year average percentage of proficiency produced. A determination of progress was then determined by calculating the change in the rate of proficiency for Reading and Math combined from 2010-11 to 2011-12, and from 2011-12 to 2012-2013. The two rates were then totaled. Schools meeting the criteria set by USED were then reviewed for eligibility. Maine’s Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools definition, as approved by the United States Department of Education (USED) on February 22, 2010. This definition is also approved to identify Title I Priority schools.

Priority Schools

Schools categorized as Priority schools 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 the state; OR*
- (2) *The school is a high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years; OR*

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 the state and is identified as Priority status.*
 - Total number of Title I schools in 2012-13 = 112
 - 5% of 112= 6; the guidance requires that a minimum of 5 schools be identified.
 - Rank order the Title I schools from low to high, based on the 3-year average percentage of proficiency.
 - Identify the 6 lowest ranked schools also demonstrating a rate of progress less than 1.31 (State median)
 - Six Title I Priority eligible schools identified under Condition 1.(see Eligible Schools Table)

Identification of Priority 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 Maine high schools that meet the criteria.

Appendix B: DEFINITION OF PERSISTENTLY LOWEST-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS**DEFINITION OF PERSISTENTLY LOWEST ACHIEVING SCHOOLS:**

Maine defines “persistently lowest-achieving schools” as those schools ranking the lowest, based on a three year average of proficiency for the “All Students” group in Reading and Math combined from 2010-2013, and also demonstrating a level of progress less than the median rate of progress of all schools ranked. The level of progress is determined by calculating the change in the yearly averages for proficiency for the “All Students” group in Reading and Math from 2010-11 to 2011-12, and from 2011-12 to 2012-2013. This definition will be used to generate a list schools identified Priority schools under Maine’s approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) accountability system and eligible for school improvement funding through the Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) program authorized by section 1003(g) of ESEA. Schools will be considered for eligibility identified as Priority as follows;

Priority schools are defined as any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools or the lowest-achieving five Title I 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 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

It should be noted that graduation rates, based on Maine’s transition rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b), have been reviewed and there are currently no secondary schools having a graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years.

Appendix D: Equipment Justification Form

Item Description:		
Number to be purchased:	Approximate cost per item: include per student or per teacher information	Total Cost:
Location: Where will the equipment be used?		
Purpose: Detail the following: How will it support the program? Who will use it? And How many students/staff will use it?		
Reasonableness: Justify the need; and Explain how it is not otherwise available through the district.		
Storage: Where will the equipment be located/stored		
Inventory and Tracking: Identify the person responsible the following: Entering equipment on Title I Equipment Inventory Report Tracking equipment if moved from above location Signing equipment in and out if equipment is approved for student use Storing equipment over the summer		

Appendix E LEA Application Scoring Rubrics						
Rubric to be used for any LEA applying to serve at least one Priority school.						
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	
A - Schools to be served:						
1) The name(s) of all schools in the LEA applying for funds was provided and all fields were completely filled in.	0	0	0	0	0	
B - Descriptive Information – Evidence for each Priority school						
B1.1a) Described the results of the needs assessment conducted for each Priority school the LEA proposes to serve with data and analysis addressing each of the following areas:						
a) student achievement	0	1	2	4	6	
B1.1a) Needs assessment –continued:						
b) curriculum and instruction	0	1	2	4	6	
B1.1a) Needs assessment –continued:						
c) professional development	0	1	2	4	6	

B1.1a) Needs assessment –continued: d) family and community involvement	0	1	2	4	6	
B1.1a) Needs assessment –continued: e) school context and organization	0	1	2	4	6	
B1.1b) Described the relationship of the results of the needs assessment to the selection of the Intervention Model indicated in Section A.	0	1	2	4	6	
B1.2) Overall Capacity: Provided evidence of the LEA’s capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority school to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Intervention Model selected for each school.	0	1	2	4	6	
B1.2) Stakeholder support: Provided evidence that the LEA has involved and received commitment to support from relevant stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, teachers’ unions, parents, students, and community members in activities related to decision making, choosing an intervention model, and/or development of the model’s design and to enact policies that will allow the individual schools the autonomy needed to implement the chosen model. Examples of stakeholder support may include narrative descriptions of meeting notes, surveys or other documentation.	0	1	2	4	6	
<i>MDOE review of federal grant funds history for each LEA applicant (grant usage, timeliness of submission and reporting, appropriateness of funds used and noted concerns regarding supplanting, cash management or audit exceptions). This review will assist in consideration of the LEA’s capacity.</i>	0	0	0	1	1	

B2) Lack of Capacity (if applicable): 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).	0	0	0	0	0	
B3) For each school the LEA is committed to serve, a brief (no more than one page) summary was provided that describes actions the LEA has taken, or will take to:	0	1	2	4	6	
B3.1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final SIG requirements;						
B3.1a) Described the process the LEA will use to recruit a new principal for the purpose of effective implementation of the turnaround or transformation model;	0	1	2	4	6	
B3.2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.	0	1	2	4	6	
B3.3) How the LEA will align other resources with the interventions, including federal, state, and local funding;	0	1	2	4	6	
B3.4) How the LEA will modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable the school to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and	0	1	2	4	6	
B3.5) How the LEA and school will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and the extent to which the following information is provided:	0	1	2	4	6	
B3.5a) Actions that support the modification of policies or practices that will enable full and effective implementation of selected intervention models;						

<p>B3.5) Sustain the reforms-Continued: B3.5b) Commitment to align budgets toward efforts that are sustainable and willingness to allow MDOE to re-evaluate budgets throughout the grant period;</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B3.5 Sustain the reforms-Continued: B3.5c) Extent to which professional development is ongoing and job-embedded;</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B3.5 Sustain the reforms-Continued: B3.5d) Alignment of other resources, people, time and funding, to support the reform effort.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B4) Provided a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Priority school identified in the LEA application.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B5) As part of the LEA’s plan to monitor progress in each Priority school included in this application, provided the LEA’s annual student achievement goals in Reading and Mathematics for each Priority school’s state assessment results.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B6) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of SIG intervention models.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

<p>Action Plan Year 1 Action Plan is complete including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Resources • Timeline • Oversight • Monitoring of implementation • Monitoring of effectiveness • Funds needed <p>The model chosen is clearly connected to the activities chosen in the Action Plan.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
--	---	---	---	---	---	--

<i>C. Budget</i>						
1) Completed the LEA Overview Budget grid	0	0	0	1	1	
2) Completed the Three Year School Budget Plan (1 per school)	0	0	0	1	1	
3) Completed Pre-Implementation and One Year (2014-2017) Detail School Budget Narratives and justification forms (if applicable) for each of the three years of the grant period- 4 budget pages. <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	1	1	
4) Completed the Three Year LEA Budget Plan	0	0	0	1	1	
5) Completed Pre-Implementation and One Year (2014-2017) Detail LEA Budget Narratives and justification forms (if applicable) for each of the three years of the grant period- 4 budget pages. <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	1	1	

6) Provided evidence of the LEA’s stakeholder support of proposed budgets and to enact policies to that will allow the LEA and individual schools to implement the chosen model effectively.	0	0	0	1	1	
<i>MDOE review of federal grant funds history for each LEA applicant (grant usage, timeliness of submission and reporting, appropriateness of funds used and noted concerns regarding supplanting, cash management or audit exceptions). This review will assist in consideration of whether the proposed LEA/school budgets include sufficient funds for full and effective implementation of selected intervention models.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
D – Assurances						
Signed Assurance page	0	0	0	1	1	
E - Waivers						
Is the LEA applying for any waivers?	0	0	0	0	0	

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY
RSU 44/MSAD 44	2311670	Andover Elementary School	00505	X
Harmony Public Schools	2306330	Harmony Elementary	00167	X
RSU 19	2314785	Hartland Consolidated School	00725	X
South Portland Public Schools	2312330	James Otis Kaler Elementary School	00716	X
RSU 50	2314806	Katahdin Middle/High School	00397	X
RSU 39	2314794	Limestone Community School	00200	X
RSU 40/MSAD 40	2311550	Miller School	00484	X
RSU 03/MSAD 03	2311520	Monroe Elementary School	00471	X
RSU 83/MSAD 13	2310650	Moscow Elementary	00341	X
RSU 10	2314795	Mountain Valley Middle School	00502	X
Robbinston Public Schools	2310190	Robbinston Grade School	00299	X
Eastport Public Schools	2305360	Shead High School	00138	X
Auburn Public Schools	2302610	Washburn School	00021	X