

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Maine



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



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

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. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

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 5 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 5 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). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) 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.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

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 School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 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 school improvement 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.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

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 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@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, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
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 December 3, 2010.

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.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.

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: ESEA Federal Programs Director Contact's Mailing Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333 Telephone: 207-624-6708 Fax: 207-624-6706 Email address: rachelle.tome@maine.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Stephen Bowen	Telephone: 207-624-6620
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
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.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver) <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

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: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III 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. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.</p>

Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here:

2010-11 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 2008-2010, 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 2008 to 2009, 2009 to 2010. This definition will be used to generate a list schools identified as

Tier I or Tier II schools eligible for school improvement funding through the Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) program authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Schools will be considered for eligibility under two categories, designated as Tier I and Tier II as follows;

Tier I 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 in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

Tier II schools are defined as any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

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

Tier III schools are defined as any remaining Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not identified as a Tier I school.

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.

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

EXAMPLE:

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.

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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 identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (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 identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

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:

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

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Part 1

Criteria the Maine Department of Education (MDOE) 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 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.

(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 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 describe evidence of each of the following elements, from all LEA applicants for each eligible Tier I and/or Tier II school:

- 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.

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools 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, including actions for pre-implementation, (see 2011 Maine LEA SIG Application *page 17*) 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, including costs for pre-implementation, for identified schools and the LEA (see 2011 Maine LEA SIG Application) that must align with the goals and parameters of the grant
 - c. One Year Detailed Budget Narratives, including costs for pre-implementation, covering each year from SY2011-12 through SY2013-14 for identified schools and the LEA (see 2011 Maine LEA SIG Application), with supporting justification forms for any professional development, contracted services and equipment planned.
- (4) 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

Actions the MDOE will take to assess LEA commitment to complete the following actions:

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

The MDOE has included assurances (see 2011 Maine LEA SIG Application *pages 30-31*) 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 Tier I and Tier II school it elects to serve:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.**
 - Each LEA will submit a letter of intent to apply for the grant by April 15, 2011.
 - Each LEA with eligible Tier I and Tier II schools will participate in technical assistance calls with the MDOE held during April and May 2011.
 - 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 101 out of 148 possible points to demonstrate the commitment and capacity needed to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I, and Tier II 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.

(2) 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 B2.2 of the LEA application. Evaluation of the response submitted for this element is included in the MDOE scoring rubric.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

- The LEA is required to submit a detailed narrative with their application to 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.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

- The LEA will provide evidence, such as minutes of meetings and local School Board agendas, or discussions with the local bargaining unit that will support the modification of policies or practices that will enable it to fully implement the intervention models effectively.

(5) 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:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 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? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:

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 2011 Maine LEA SIG application pages 17,19-21, 24-25)

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section C Capacity here:

For any eligible Tier I school the LEA has elected to NOT include in its application, the LEA will be required to explain the 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 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.

If an LEA claims that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the MDOE will evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. If it is determined that an LEA has more capacity to implement an intervention model in a given Tier I school than demonstrated by the LEA, the MDOE will discuss the capacity issues with the Superintendent and factor the information into the approval of the LEA application. The LEA may be required to implement an intervention model in the given school in order to receive approval for other schools within the LEA; otherwise the LEA application may be rejected completely.

D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Insert response to Section D (Part 1) Timeline here:

D1) LEA Application and Grant Approval Timeline:

- | | |
|---|---|
| April 1 st | Conference call with LEAs having eligible schools to review the process |
| April 15 th | LEA submits intent to apply and request for grant to support proposed planning activities (Planning grant is optional and funded with Administrative funds) |
| April 20 th – 22 nd | MDOE review and approval of LEA proposed planning grants |
| June 1 st | Complete LEA application due |
| June 6 th -17 th | Application review |
| June 20 th | LEA grants awarded following MDOE approval |
| Summer 2011 | LEA begins pre-implementation activities |
| Fall 2011 | LEA begins full implementation of grant and intervention model |

LEA application submitted by the June 1, 2011 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 101 out of 148 possible points to demonstrate the commitment and capacity needed to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I, and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected interventions. Applications with "Information not Provided" in any category will not be awarded funds.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools 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 in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) 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.

(4) 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 the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) 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.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

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

(8) 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, 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.³

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.

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information here:

(D2) Process MDOE will use for reviewing annual LEA goals for student achievement for its Tier I, II, III schools and determination of whether to renew the LEA’s School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier I, II, III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The initial goals set by the LEA for its Tier I and Tier II schools will be approved within the LEA application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds. Goals will be evaluated on the extent to which they are SMART: sustainable, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound. In order to achieve an acceptable score on application section B5 (4 or better) Many LEAs have been involved with formative assessment initiatives and have a familiarity with SMART goals; however, MDOE will provide additional information and technical assistance to LEAs, as needed.

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 employs a review process that includes on-site visits twice a year. The on-site review process will include a progress report submitted by LEAs with responses and evidence to support the following statements. MDOE staff and improvement consultants will meet with school staff, through various means, on a regular basis throughout each year of the grant, providing opportunities for informal assessment. 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 described within the LEA SIG grant and district/school improvement grants and/or strategic plans.
- 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 statements listed above, including supporting evidence from the LEA, and results of two site visit reports, 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.

(D3) Process MDOE will use to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals.

The MDOE will utilize the same progress reporting and monitoring procedures for Tier III schools as

previously described in D2 for the Tier I and Tier II schools. If in reviewing the progress report the MDOE determines that the Tier III school is not meeting its agreed upon goals, the MDOE will meet with the LEA leadership to address the concerns. If the final determination is that the LEA cannot implement the interventions appropriately, the funding will be discontinued.

(D4) Process MDOE will use to monitor each LEA that receives a SIG funds to ensure full and effective implementation of the selected school intervention model in Tier I and Tier II schools.

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.

As outlined in section D2, the MDOE will employ an ongoing review process that includes on-site visits twice a year. The on-site review process will include a progress report submitted by LEAs with responses and evidence to support the following statements:

- 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 described within the LEA SIG grant and district/school improvement grants and/or strategic plans.
- 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.

MDOE staff and improvement consultants will meet with school staff, through various means, on a regular basis throughout each year of the grant, providing opportunities for informal assessment. Evidence provided via all methods described above will be used by MDOE school improvement team members in order to determine if the LEA is achieving full and effective implementation of the grant.

(D5) Process MDOE will use to prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools are not available.

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 an 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 Tier I schools will receive the highest priority for funding and thus, will be rank ordered first. LEA applications which have received the minimum score of 101 out of a possible 148 points or higher will be rank ordered. Applications receiving the highest points will receive priority for funding.
- 3) After all Tier I schools meeting the criteria in step 2 have been served, LEA applications with Tier II schools which have received a minimum score of 101 of a possible 148 points or higher will be rank ordered. LEA applications with the highest points will receive priority for funding. MDOE will evaluate the adequacy of proposed budgets in the attempt to provide sufficient SIG funds to serve eligible Tier I and Tier II schools.

(E6) Criteria MDOE will use to prioritize Tier III schools.

In addition to following Section II.B.4 of the USED SIG final requirements the MDOE will prioritize among approvable Tier III schools by awarding first to those that are willing to implement one of the four intervention models. Tier III schools requesting funds greater than \$50,000 will then be considered based on the ranking used to determine Tier I schools, with those having the lowest percentage of achievement considered first, as measured by statewide percentages for proficiency in reading and mathematics.

(E7) Criteria MDOE will use to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

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

(D8) School intervention models the MDOE will implement in the absence of a takeover.

MDOE will not provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover.

E. ASSURANCES

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.
- 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 that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school 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.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final 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.

Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:

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 directed 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 development of coordinated professional development opportunities directed at all participating schools, such as a “transformational Leadership Academy”, incorporating ideas from key leadership researchers, such as Philip Hallinger or Kenneth Leithwood and Doris Janzi. 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: The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including superintendents, NCLB coordinators, Title I Directors, school level administrators.

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.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here 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.

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 2010 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.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

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 2010 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.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here 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, and 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 4: School improvement timeline waiver

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 2011–2012 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 2011–2012 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.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

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

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.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here Maine requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver 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 improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

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

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - 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 its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

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

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

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, 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; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

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

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

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (*e.g.*, a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” [‡]	Title I eligible [§] elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ^{**}	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two years.

[‡] “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

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

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

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

[§] For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

^{**} Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

STATE:Maine

		Schools served with FY 20
LEA Name	LEA NCES ID	School Name
	Number	
Bangor School Dept.	2302820	Fairmont School
Biddeford School Dept.	2303150	Biddeford Middle School
Brunswick School Dept.	2303780	Coffin School
Calais School Dept.	2303870	Calais Elementary School
Deer-Isle Stonington C.S.D.	2304895	Deer Isle-Stonington High School
Five Town C.S.D.	2300053	Camden Hills Regional High School
Great Salt Bay CSD	2306160	Jefferson Village School
Greenville School Dept	2306250	Greenville Middle/High School
Jay School Dept	2306840	Jay Middle School
Lewiston School Dept	2307320	Montello School
Lewiston School Dept	2307320	Lewiston Middle School
Medway School Dept	2308160	Medway Middle School
Mt. Desert C.S.D.	2308500	Mt. Desert Island High School
Portland School Dept	2309930	East End Community School
Portland School Dept	2309930	Lincoln Middle School
RSU 10	2314795	Buckfield Jr-Sr High School
RSU 10	2314795	Meroby Elementary
RSU 12	2314780	Chelsea Elementary School
RSU 13	2314780	Georges Valley High School
RSU 13	2314787	South School
RSU 19	2314785	Nokomis Regional High School
RSU 19	2314785	Somerset Valley Middle School
RSU 24	2314790	Ellsworth High School
RSU 24	2314790	Mountain View School
RSU 25	2303810	Bucksport Middle School
RSU 25	2303810	Miles Lane School

RSU 34	2314782	Leonard Middle School
RSU 39	2314794	Caribou Middle School
RSU 39	2314794	Limestone Community School
RSU 39	2314794	Teague Park School
RSU 4	2314783	Oak Hill High School
RSU 89/SAD 25	231104	Katahdin Elementary School
RSU/SAD 11	2310590	River View Community School
RSU/SAD 17	2310770	Oxford Elementary School
RSU/SAD 27	2311100	Fort Kent Community High School
RSU/SAD 27	2311100	Fort Kent Elementary School
RSU/SAD 29	2311160	Houlton Junior High School
RSU/SAD 29	2311160	Houlton Southside
RSU/SAD 36	2311400	Livermore Falls Middle School
RSU/SAD 41	2311580	Milo Elementary School
RSU/SAD 49	2314330	Lawrence High School
RSU/SAD 53	2314610	Vickery School
RSU/SAD 54	2314590	Canaan Elementary School
RSU/SAD 54	2314590	Margaret Chase Smith School
RSU/SAD 55	2314190	Sacopee Valley Middle School
RSU/SAD 59	2314560	Madison Area High School
RSU/SAD 59	2314560	Madison Elementary School
RSU/SAD 60	2314700	Noble Middle School
RSU/SAD 60	2314700	North Berwick Elementary School
RSU/SAD 68	2314761	Se Do Mo Cha Middle School
RSU/SAD 70	2314762	Hodgdon High School
Sanford School Dept.	2310500	Willard School
So Aroostook C.S.D	2312410	So. Aroostook CSD School

So Portland School Dept.

2312330

Waldo T. Skillin
Elementary School

Waterville School Department

2313350

Albert Hall School

2010 SIG Funds

School NCES ID Number	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Identified
230282000050			X		
230315001017			X		
230378000097			X		
230387000105			X		
230489500127			X		
230005305014			X		
230616000175			X		
230625000422			X		
230684000174			X		
230732000193			X		
230732000191			X		
230816000220			X		
230850000061			X		
230993000279	X				
230993000275			X		
231479501053			X		
231479500823			X		
231478000120			X		
231478000708		X			
231478700530			X		
231478500729		X			
231478500552			X		
231479000270	X				
231479000566			X		
230381000685			X		
230381001027			X		

231478200246			X
231479400113			X
231479400200			X
231479401010			X
231478300320	X		
23110400398			X
231059000024			X
231077001051			X
231110000405	X		
231110000406			X
231116000301			X
231116000035			X
231140000459			X
231158000492			X
231433000695		X	
231461000763			X
231459000746			X
231459000751			X
231419001057			X
231456000998		X	
231456000500			X
231470000783			X
231470001001			X
231476100794			X
231476200795		X	
231050000764			X
231241000590	X		

231233000033

x

231335000605

X

STATE:Maine

Schools served with FY 2009 SIG Funds

LEA Name	LEA NCES ID	School Name	School NCES ID	Tier	Tier
	Number		Number	I	II
Lewiston School Dept	2307320	Governor James Longely	230732000194	X	
Portland School Dept	2309930	Riverton School	230993000286	X	
RSU 24	2305730	Sumner High School	230573000148	X	
RSU/ S.A.D. 36	2311400	Livermore Falls High School	231140000458		X
RSU/ S.A.D. 61	2314210	Lake Region High School	231421000673		X
RSU/ S.A.D. 74	2314767	Carrabec High School	231476700954		X

Tier	Grad
III	Rate



Maine Department of Education

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

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

2011 Maine LEA School Improvement Grant Application



Intent to Apply Due: April 15, 2011

Full Application Due: June 1, 2011

*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 identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements 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 in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring ("Tier I schools") and, at an LEA's option, persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds ("Tier II schools"). An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools ("Tier III schools"). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

State and LEA Allocations

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

Availability of Funds

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012. Maine has requested a waiver of the period of availability to permit the LEAs to obligate the funds through September 30, 2014.

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 Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school;
- serve each Tier I school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity (which may be due, in part, to serving Tier II schools) to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each Tier I school, in which case the LEA must indicate the Tier I schools that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a Tier I or Tier II school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of the Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants;
- determine a budget for each Tier I and Tier II 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 Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools it serves receives all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the school improvement funds;
- apply to serve at least one or more Tier I schools located in this district and not apply only for a grant to serve only Tier III schools.
- meet the requirements with respect to adequate yearly progress in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

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 MDOE 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 MDOE LEA SIG application review and approval process will include the following three steps:

Step 1: Application Review:

An MDOE review team, comprised of MDOE 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 (June 1, 2011). The reviewers will read each application and score it independently. Reviewers will use appropriate scoring rubrics (see Maine LEA SIG Application Appendix E page 38-45 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 (including Tier I and Tier II schools receiving priority over Tier III schools) and, if necessary, rank ordered within each tier 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:**

April 1 st	Conference call with LEAs having eligible schools to review the process
April 15 th	LEA submits intent to apply and request for grant to support proposed planning activities (Planning grant is optional and funded with Administrative funds)
April 20 th – 22 nd	MDOE review and approval of LEA proposed planning grants
June 1 st	Complete LEA application due
June 6 th -17 th	Application review
June 20 th	LEA grants awarded following MDOE approval
Summer 2011	LEA begins pre-implementation activities
Fall 2011	LEA begins full implementation of grant and intervention model

Application Submission Information

Paperwork Required:

LEAs submitting with Tier I and Tier II schools-

- Submit an intent to apply (page a) and planning grant template (page b) by April 15th.
- Submit a complete application electronically to janice.bunnell@maine.gov and one hard copy to the ESEA/NCLB Clearinghouse office (address below) by June 1st.

LEAs submitting with Tier III school only-

- Submit an intent to apply (page a) by April 15th.
- Submit a complete application electronically to janice.bunnell@maine.gov and one hard copy to the ESEA/NCLB Clearinghouse office (address page 5) by June 1st.

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 MDOE by 4:00 pm no later than April 15, 2011.

2011 Maine LEA School Improvement Grant Application

April 2011

- Complete grant applications must be received at the MDOE by 4:00 pm no later than June 1, 2011.

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 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 USED SIG guidance, each Maine school’s annual Maine Educational Assessment (MEA), 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 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 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 2007-08 to 2008-09, and from 2008-09 to 2009-10. 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) CIPS Grants awarded to Maine Title I CIP 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) CIPS grant funding.

Required Intervention Models for Tier I and Tier II Schools

Tier I and Tier II schools **must** implement one of the following four models outlined by the 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 MDOE, 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 MDOE 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; andIn 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

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	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	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 (School staff, district staff, parents, or outside expert/facilitator)

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

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 2011 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: April 15, 2011
Full Application Due: June 1, 2011

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 Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools this LEA commits to serve with School Improvement Grants and identify the model that will be used in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Complete each sections B-C for each Tier I, II, or III schools to be served.

SCHOOL NAME:							
B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION/EVIDENCE OF COMMITMENT							
SCHOOL NAME:	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
				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:

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

LEA LACK OF CAPACITY (If Applicable)

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B3- For each school the LEA is committed to serve, a provide a brief (no more than one page) summary was provided that describes actions the LEA has taken, or will take, to—

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

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

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

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

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

Include detail for the following:

3.4.1 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

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

3.5.1 Actions that support the modification of policies or practices that will enable full and effective implementation of selected intervention models.

3.5.2 Commitment to align budgets toward efforts that are sustainable and willingness to allow MDOE to re-evaluate budgets throughout the grant period.

3.5.3 Extent to which professional development is ongoing and job-embedded.

3.5.4 Alignment of other resources, people, time and funding, to support the reform effort.

LEA NARRATIVE

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B4- Timeline

For Tier I and Tier II schools, 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 Tier I and Tier II schools receiving school improvement funds. Goals should be SMART: sustainable, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.

ANNUAL GOALS

SCHOOL NAME:

B6 Tier III Services

For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).

TIER III SERVICES:

SCHOOL NAME:

B7 Tier III Accountability

For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA will describe the goals established to hold Tier III schools accountable.

Tier III ACCOUNTABILITY

SCHOOL NAME:

Section B8- 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 Tier I and Tier II 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Tier III proposed model _____ (if not choosing one of the four US ED models)					
Proposed Pre-implementation Activities for Summer 2011	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 2011, designed to support full implementation of the selected intervention model in Fall 2011.</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>

Proposed Activities for 2011-2014	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 Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;**
- 2 Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II school; and**
- 3 Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each identified Tier III school.**

2011 Maine LEA School Improvement Grant Application

April 2011

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 2011-2014**

SCHOOL NAME: <i>(Complete one per school)</i>	TIER I TIER II TIER III <i>(Circle tier applicable to this school)</i>					
Account Category 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.	Year 1 General Budget Description Includes pre-implementation costs	Year 2 General Budget Description	Year 3 General Budget Description	Year 1 Costs	Year 2 Costs	Year 3 Costs
Salaries and Benefits <i>Include name and title of employee if possible. Include wages by hour/week etc. Detail benefits</i>						
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 2011-2014 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)

ONE YEAR DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE		
SCHOOL YEAR: 2011-2012 <u>Pre-Implementation costs (Must be included in total costs for Year 1)</u>		
SCHOOL NAME: <i>(Complete one per school)</i>	TIER I	TIER II
	<i>(Circle tier applicable to this school)</i>	
INTERVENTION MODEL: <i>(Circle tier applicable to this school)</i>	Transformation	Turnaround
	Restart	Closure
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>		
Administration <i>Include other costs associated with supporting plan implementation.</i>		
Indirect Costs		
Total		

ONE YEAR DETAILED SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE		
SCHOOL YEAR: 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 (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.		
SCHOOL NAME: <i>(Complete one per school)</i>	TIER I	TIER II TIER III <i>(Circle tier applicable to this school)</i>
INTERVENTION MODEL: <i>(Circle tier applicable to this school)</i>	Transformation	Turnaround Restart Closure
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>		

**LEA BUDGET SECTION
THREE YEAR LEA BUDGET PLAN 2011-2014 (Tier I and Tier II schools only)**

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 (Tier I and Tier II Schools Only)

Use this form to provide sufficient detail regarding proposed expenditure for each year of the 2011-2014 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)

ONE YEAR DETAILED LEA BUDGET NARRATIVE (Tier I and Tier II Schools Only)

SCHOOL YEAR: 2010-2011 Pre-implementation costs

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>		
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 NARRATIVE (Tier I and Tier II Schools Only) SCHOOL YEAR: 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 (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>		

THREE YEAR LEA BUDGET PLAN (Tier III schools only)

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 (Tier III Schools Only)

<p>SCHOOL YEAR: 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 (Circle Appropriate year)</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>		
Account Category	Budget Detail	
	Narrative	Total Costs
<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>		
<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>		

Total		
-------	--	--

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 Tier I and Tier II 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 Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or tier II 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, 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.

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

- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II 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 Maine Educational Assessment (MEA), 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 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10, 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 2007-08 to 2008-09 and from 2008-09 to 2009-10. 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.

Tier I Schools

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

- (1) *The school is within the five percent, or five (whichever is greater) of the persistently lowest-achieving Title I Schools (CIPS) 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 CIP Schools in the state.*
 - Total number of Title I CIP schools in 2009-10 = 49
 - 5% of 49= 2; the guidance requires that a minimum of 5 schools be identified.
 - Rank order the Title I CIP schools from low to high, based on the 3-year average percentage of proficiency.
 - Identify the 5 lowest ranked schools also demonstrating a rate of progress less than 4.18 (State median)
 - Five Tier I eligible schools identified under Condition 1.(see Eligible Schools Table)

Identification of Tier I Schools (Condition 2)

- (2) *The school is a high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years.*
 - There are no Maine high schools that meet the criteria.

Appendix A (cont.):**Tier II Schools**

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

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

Identification of Tier II Schools (Condition 1)

- *The school is Title I-eligible and is within the lowest-achieving five percent of high schools or the five lowest-achieving, whichever number is greater.*
- Rank order all high schools, not currently receiving Title I funds; n=95.
- 5 % of 95 = 4 schools. The guidance requires that a minimum of 5 schools be identified.
- Identify the 5 lowest ranked schools also demonstrating a rate of progress less than 4.18 (State median)
- Five Tier II eligible schools identified under Condition 1.(see Eligible Schools Table)

Identification of Tier II Schools (Condition 2)

- (1) *The school has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years.*
- As noted in the identification of Tier I schools, there are no high schools meeting Condition (2).

TIER III Schools

Schools categorized as Tier III must meet the following conditions:

- (1) *The school is a Title I CIP School that did not meet the Tier I criteria, OR*

Identification of Tier III Schools (Condition 1)

- (1) *The school is a Title I CIP School that did not meet the Tier I 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 2007-2009, 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 2007 to 2008, 2008 to 2009. This definition will be used to generate a list schools identified as Tier I or Tier II schools eligible for school improvement funding through the Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) program authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Schools will be considered for eligibility under two categories, designated as Tier I and Tier II as follows;

Tier I 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 in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

Tier II schools are defined as any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years. Tier III schools are defined as any remaining Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not identified as a Tier I school.

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 Tier I and/or Tier II (LEA may or may not also apply to serve a Tier III 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 Tier I and Tier II school						
B1.1a) Described the results of the needs assessment conducted for each Tier I and Tier II 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 Tier I and Tier II 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. 3.4.1 Include detail regarding 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	0	1	2	4	6	

<p>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: 3.5.1) Actions that support the modification of policies or practices that will enable full and effective implementation of selected intervention models;</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B3.5) Sustain the reforms-Continued: 3.5.2) 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: 3.5.3) Extent to which professional development is ongoing and job-embedded;</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B3.5 Sustain the reforms-Continued: 3.5.4) 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 Tier I and Tier II 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 Tier I and Tier II school included in this application, provided the LEA’s annual student achievement goals in Reading and Mathematics for each Tier I and Tier II school’s state assessment results. Goals should be SMART: sustainable, measurable, attainable, results-driven, and time-bound.</p>	0	1	2	4	6	
<p>B6) Described the intervention model proposed for each Tier III school the LEA has committed to serve. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).</p>	0	1	2	4	6	

B7) Described the goals the LEA has established (subject to approval by the MDOE) in order to hold accountable the Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	2	4	6	
B8) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	
Action Plan Year 1 Action Plan is complete including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Resources • Timeline • Oversight • Monitoring of implementation • Monitoring of effectiveness • Funds needed The model chosen is clearly connected to the activities chosen in the Action Plan.	0	1	2	4	6	
C. Budget						
1) Completed the 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 a One Year (2010-2013) Detail School Budget Narrative and justification forms (if applicable) for each of the three years of the grant period- 3 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 a One Year (2010-2013) Detail LEA Budget Narrative and justification forms (if applicable) for each of the three years of the grant period- 3 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	
Application to serve Tier III schools only.						

District Name: _____					Total # of Schools Applying: _____	
Reviewer Name: _____					District Score: _____	
Directions: Circle the appropriate point values and total each column	Information Not Provided	Lacks Sufficient Information	Marginal: requires clarification or additional information	Good: clear & complete; all areas addressed	Exemplary: well conceived & thoroughly developed	Reader Comments
1) LEA has submitted a completed district cover page and listed the names and titles of SIG coordinator and committee members.	0	0	0	1	2	
<i>A - Schools to be served:</i>						
1) The name(s) of all schools in the SAU applying for funds was provided and all fields were completely filled in.	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>B - Descriptive Information – Evidence for each Tier I and Tier II school</i>						
1) Described the intervention model proposed for each Tier III school the LEA has committed to serve. (Note: Priority in terms of grant approval and funding will be given to Tier III schools proposing to implement one of the four Intervention Models required for Tier I and Tier II schools).	0	1	2	4	6	
2) Described the goals the LEA has established (subject to approval by the MDOE) in order to hold accountable the Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	2	4	6	
3) Described how the LEA consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of SIG intervention models.	0	1	2	4	6	

<p>Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1 Action Plan is complete including: • Goal • Strategy • Activities target the needs identified in the needs assessment and will have the greatest impact on student achievement. • Resources • Timeline • Oversight • Monitoring of implementation • Monitoring of effectiveness • Funds needed <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>						
Completed the Overview Budget grid	0	0	0	1	1	
Completed the Three Year School Budget Plan (1 per school)	0	0	0	0	1	
Completed a One Year (2010-2013) Detail School Budget Narrative and justification forms (if applicable) for each of the three years of the grant period- 3 budget pages. <i>Include in comments section remarks as to the reasonableness of the expenses as presented.</i>	0	0	0	0	1	
<i>D - Assurances</i>						
Signed Assurance page	0	0	0	0	1	
<i>E - Waivers</i>						
Is the LEA applying for any waivers?	0	0	0	0	0	

Maine Department of Education

Screen shot of Public notice of for SIG. No comments were received regarding this notice.

