U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335

APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

STRIVING READERS COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM
CFDA # 84.371C
PR/Award # S371C110011
Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10864109

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

Table of Contents

Forms

1. *Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)* e1
2. *Standard Budget Sheet (ED 524)* e5
3. *SF-424B - Assurances Non-Construction Programs* e7
4. *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities* e9
5. *427 GEPA* e10
   Attachment - 1 e11
6. *ED 80-0013 Certification* e12
7. *Dept of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424* e13

Narratives

1. *Project Narrative - (Abstract Narrative...)* e14
   Attachment - 1 e15
2. *Project Narrative - (Project Narrative...)* e17
   Attachment - 1 e18
3. *Project Narrative - (Other Narrative...)* e68
   Attachment - 1 e69
   Attachment - 2 e72
   Attachment - 3 e79
4. *Budget Narrative - (Budget Narrative...)* e83
   Attachment - 1 e84

This application was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this application. Some pages/sections of this application may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Application's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Application PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).

OMB Number: 4040-0004
Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

* 1. Type of Submission:
- [ ] Preapplication
- [x] Application
- [ ] Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:
- [x] New
- [ ] Continuation
- [ ] Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify)

* 3. Date Received: 05/06/2011

4. Applicant Identifier: N/A

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

* 5b. Federal Award Identifier:

State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State:

7. State Application Identifier:

8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name: Mississippi Department of Education

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): 64-6000758

* c. Organizational DUNS: 809399694

d. Address:

* Street1: P.O. Box 771
Street2: 359 North West Street
* City: Jackson
County: Hinds
* State: MS: Mississippi
Province:
* Country: USA: UNITED STATES
* Zip / Postal Code: 39205

e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name: MS Department of Education

Division Name: Curriculum and Instruction

f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix: Mrs.
* First Name: Trecina
Middle Name:
* Last Name: Green
Suffix:

Title: Director of Curriculum and Instruction

Organizational Affiliation: N/A

* Telephone Number: 601-359-2586
Fax Number: 601-359-2040

* Email: tgreen@mde.k12.ms.us

OMB Number: 4040-0004
Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424 Version 02

9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

A: State Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

*** 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Education

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

84.371

CFDA Title:

Striving Readers

*** 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

ED-GRANTS-031011-002

* Title:

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE); Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant Program CFDA Number 84.371C

13. Competition Identification Number:

84-371C2011-1

Title:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

The entire state of Mississippi will be affected by this project.

*** 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

Mississippi's Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Project

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments | Delete Attachments | View Attachments

OMB Number: 4040-0004
Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

16. Congressional Districts Of:

* a. Applicant: 2

* b. Program/Project: MS-all

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

Add Attachment | Delete Attachment | View Attachment

17. Proposed Project:

* a. Start Date: 10/03/2011

* b. End Date: 12/30/2016

18. Estimated Funding ($):

* a. Federal	29,870,000.00
* b. Applicant	0.00
* c. State	0.00
* d. Local	0.00
* e. Other	0.00
* f. Program Income	0.00
* g. TOTAL	29,870,000.00

*** 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

☐ a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on .

☒ b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.

☐ c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

*** 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)**

☐ Yes ☒ No

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

☒ ** I AGREE

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: Mrs. * First Name: Trecina

Middle Name:

* Last Name: Green

Suffix:

* Title: Director of Curriculum and Instruction

* Telephone Number: 601.359.2586 Fax Number: 601.359.2040

* Email: tgreen@mde.k12.ms.us

* Signature of Authorized Representative: Trecina Green * Date Signed: 05/06/2011

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424 (Revised 10/2005)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

*** Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUDGET INFORMATION

NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
Mississippi Department of Education

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1(a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	$ 146,496	$ 195,328	$ 195,328	$ 195,328	$ 195,328	$ 927,808
2. Fringe Benefits	$ 42,484	$ 56,645	$ 56,645	$ 56,645	$ 56,645	$ 269,064
3. Travel	$ 41,700	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 88,000	$ 88,000	$ 417,700
4. Equipment	$ 22,800	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 22,800
5. Supplies	$ 21,000	$ 0	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ 36,000
6. Contractual	$ 29,205,300	$ 29,150,550	$ 23,350,000	$ 20,959,000	$ 19,820,000	$ 122,484,850
7. Construction	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
8. Other	$ 187,600	$ 172,200	$ 111,000	$ 130,000	$ 103,000	$ 703,800
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$ 29,667,380	$ 29,674,723	$ 23,817,973	$ 21,433,973	$ 20,267,973	$ 124,862,022
10. Indirect Costs*	$ 202,620	$ 190,277	$ 182,027	$ 166,027	$ 132,027	$ 872,978
11. Training Stipends	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	$ 29,870,000	$ 29,865,000	$ 24,000,000	$ 21,600,000	$ 20,400,000	$ 125,735,000

***Indirect Cost Information *(To Be Completed by Your Business Office)*:**

If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

(1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? [X] Yes [ ] No
(2) If yes, please provide the following information:
Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 7/1/2010 To: 6/30/2011 (mm/dd/yyyy)
Approving Federal agency: [X] ED [ ] Other (please specify): _____
(3) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:
[ ] Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? or, [X] Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

ED Form No. 524

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUDGET INFORMATION

NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
Mississippi Department of Education

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1(a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
2. Fringe Benefits	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
3. Travel	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
4. Equipment	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
5. Supplies	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
6. Contractual	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
7. Construction	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
8. Other	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
10. Indirect Costs	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
11. Training Stipends	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0

OMB Approval No.: 4040-0007
Expiration Date: 07/30/2010

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C.§§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U. S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee- 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.

10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).

12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).

14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	* TITLE
Trecina Green	Director of Curriculum and Instruction
* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	* DATE SUBMITTED
Mississippi Department of Education	05/06/2011

Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97) Back

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C.1352

Approved by OMB
0348-0046

1. * Type of Federal Action:
- [ ] a. contract
- [x] b. grant
- [ ] c. cooperative agreement
- [ ] d. loan
- [ ] e. loan guarantee
- [ ] f. loan insurance

2. * Status of Federal Action:
- [ ] a. bid/offer/application
- [x] b. initial award
- [ ] c. post-award

3. * Report Type:
- [x] a. initial filing
- [ ] b. material change

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:

[x] Prime [ ] SubAwardee

** Name:* Mississippi Department of Education

** Street 1:* P.O. Box 771 *Street 2:* 359 North West Street

** City:* Jackson *State:* MS: Mississippi *Zip:* 39205

Congressional District, if known: 2

5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:

6. * Federal Department/Agency:

United States Department of Education

7. * Federal Program Name/Description:

Striving Readers

CFDA Number, *if applicable:* 84.371

8. Federal Action Number, *if known:*

N/A

9. Award Amount, *if known:*

$ 0.00

10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant:

Prefix: Mr. ** First Name:* Pete *Middle Name:*

** Last Name:* Smith *Suffix:*

** Street 1:* 359 North West Street *Street 2:* P.O. Box 771

** City:* Jackson *State:* MS: Mississippi *Zip:* 39205

b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a)

Prefix: Mr. ** First Name:* Pete *Middle Name:*

** Last Name:* Smith *Suffix:*

** Street 1:* P. O. Box 771 *Street 2:* 359 North West Street

** City:* Jackson *State:* MS: Mississippi *Zip:* 39205

11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

*** Signature:** Trecina Green

***Name:** *Prefix:* Mrs. ** First Name:* Trecina *Middle Name:*

** Last Name:* Green *Suffix:*

Title: Director of Curriculum and Instruction **Telephone No.:** 601.359.2586 **Date:** 05/06/2011

Federal Use Only:

Authorized for Local Reproduction
Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

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 **1894-0005**. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.5 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(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to**: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

Optional - You may attach 1 file to this page.

MS SRCL GEPA.pdf | Add Attachment | Delete Attachment | View Attachment

General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)

The Mississippi Department of Education's Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program is designed to provide all high poverty schools with the opportunity to apply for sub-grant funds. Approximately 140 school districts will be able to apply for a sub-grant based on the student population of at least 60 percent or more students who qualify for free or reduced lunch. To ensure that all high poverty schools have the opportunity to apply for a sub-grant under this program, the Mississippi Department of Education will notify all school districts regarding the SRCL grant. Information will be disseminated to superintendents via memorandum electronically and through regular mail. Information will also be posted on the MDE website. Technical assistance regarding the application process will be provided for all LEAs intending to apply for a sub-grant.

Any LEA receiving funds under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA).

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,00 0 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subjec t to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

* APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION	Mississippi Department of Education
* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
Prefix:	Mrs.
* First Name:	Trecina
Middle Name:	
* Last Name:	Green
Suffix:	
* Title:	Director of Curriculum and Instruction
* SIGNATURE:	Trecina Green
* DATE:	05/06/2011

Close Form

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
REQUIRED FOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANTS

1. Project Director:

Prefix:	* First Name:	Middle Name:	* Last Name:	Suffix:
Mrs.	Trecina		Green	

Address:

* Street1: P.O. Box 771
Street2: 359 North West Street
* City: Jackson
County: Hinds
* State: MS: Mississippi
* Zip Code: 39205
* Country: USA: UNITED STATES

* Phone Number (give area code) Fax Number (give area code)

601.359.2586 601.359.2040

Email Address:

tgreen@mde.k12.ms.us

2. Applicant Experience:

Novice Applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this program

3. Human Subjects Research

Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project Period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Are ALL the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

☐ Yes Provide Exemption(s) #:

☐ No Provide Assurance #, if available:

Please attach an explanation Narrative:

Add Attachment Delete Attachment View Attachment

Project Narrative

Abstract Narrative

Attachment 1:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1234-MS SRCL Application Abstract 5.5.11.pdf**

Mississippi's Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program application provides the state with the opportunity to begin implementation of its statewide literacy plan, *Mississippians Empowered Through Literacy (METL)*, in a number of school districts and early childhood centers. *METL* provides a comprehensible vision of evidence-based literacy instruction for individuals from birth through grade 12 that will propel increased literacy achievement in Mississippi, a state with very high literacy needs. Seven key areas provide the basis for *METL*. These key areas, as stated in the plan, are *educator preparation, professional growth, resources, leadership, instruction, intervention, and assessment data collection and use.* For Mississippi students to be successful in college and careers, all seven areas must work in harmony. Individually, each area is important; however, they must be integrated to create seamless and cohesive effective literacy instruction.

The primary objectives and key activities to be implemented through this SRCL program are: (a) provide professional development to increase educators' knowledge and skills in implementing research supported literacy instruction; (b) implement processes to ensure that the selection and use of literacy instructional materials are based on student needs and supported by evidence; (c) provide reliable and valid assessment data that will enable Literacy Leadership Teams to constantly improve literacy instruction and outcomes; (d) implement processes that will identify students who are struggling and provide evidence-based intervention strategies to promote and accelerate their achievement; (e) provide multiple resources and opportunities to create language and text-rich environments so children's language and literacy development is enhanced; and (f) provide support to Literacy Leadership Teams so that they are empowered to act upon data to continuously monitor and improve student achievement.

The objectives and key activities contained in Mississippi's application address the two Absolute Priorities (improving learning outcomes and enabling more data-based decision-making) and the Competitive Preference Priority (effective use of technology).

As a result of implementation of the *METL* plan, anticipated project outcomes are: increased language development and literacy readiness skills of children from Pre-K through age 5; increased literacy performance of students K-12; improved instruction as a result of teachers acquiring high levels of knowledge and expertise in implementing effective evidence-based literacy instruction; and increased capacity in schools and early childhood centers to ensure that the quality of literacy instruction and level of student performance continues to improve.

The eligibility factor for sub-grantees acknowledges the strong influence of poverty on student achievement. In Mississippi, approximately 140 school districts are eligible to apply for a sub-grant based on a student population of at least 60 percent or more students who qualify for free and reduced lunch. It is estimated that approximately 20 school districts will be funded, providing services to approximately 60 schools and 24,000 K-12 students. Mississippi estimates that approximately 60 participating Early Childhood Education centers will participate with approximately 3,000 Pre-K (3 and 4 year old) children. In all, Mississippi's project will impact approximately 1,515 educators and 27,000 Pre-K through grade 12 students who will be served in the highest poverty areas of Mississippi.

Project Narrative

Project Narrative

Attachment 1:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1240-MS SRCL Project Narrative FINAL 5-5-2011.pdf**

Part 4: Project Narrative Table of Contents

Priority 1: Improving Learning Outcomes....2

Priority 2: Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making....2

Competitive Preference Priority: Effective Use of Technology....3

A. Quality of State-Level Activities....3

(i) State-level activities and Additional Requirements....3

(ii) SEA goals....15

(iii) Technical assistance and support....18

(iv) Evaluation....19

(v) Dissemination....24

B. Quality of the State Subgrant Competition....26

(i) Rigorous, high-quality competition....26

(ii) Priority to high-poverty populations....32

(iii) Priority to evidence-based proposals....33

(iv) Review and judge evidence base and alignment....36

C. Project Management....37

(i) Management plan and timeline....37

(ii) Qualifications of key personnel....42

(iii) Diversity of perspectives....44

D. Adequacy of Resources....44

(i) Costs are reasonable....44

(ii) Plan to ensure subgrant allocations....46

(iii) Leverage other State and Federal funds....48

(iv) Subgrants are of sufficient size....49

Project Narrative

Priority 1: Improving Learning Outcomes. Mississippi Department of Education's (MDE) application for a grant under the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program (SRCL) addresses the priority of improving learning outcomes for all students, especially students who are considered disadvantaged. Mississippi has more than 70% of students participating in the free and reduced lunch program (MDE, 2010); 54% of children exist in low income and below situations as defined by the National Center on Poverty (2010). This SRCL grant is designed to impact the literacy achievement of these disadvantaged students. This SRCL grant proposal is based on the state's comprehensive literacy plan that provides a clear vision and an instructional model to provide effective, evidence-based literacy instruction to ensure all students, birth through grade 12, are achieving at high levels of literacy. MDE's plan focuses on measureable results that acknowledge the challenges confronting Mississippi while accepting no excuses for not providing the best literacy instruction for all students. [See A(i)(d) and A(ii)]

Priority 2: Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making. The MDE SRCL application emphasizes data-based decisions at every level – from the state to the classroom. All sub-grantees are required to establish Data Teams to continuously collect, analyze, and discuss data to make instructional decisions. Literacy Leadership Teams at the state, district, and school levels (which include participating ECE centers) are empowered to use a variety of data – from student outcomes to implementation data – to continuously improve their literacy programs. The continuous cycle of examining data and making instructional improvements is prevalent in this SRCL application. Additionally, mCLASS Wireless Generation (below) provides a seamless system for assessment and data-driven decision-making. [See A(i)(d); A(iv); A(iv)(3)]

Competitive Preference Priority: Effective Use of Technology. MDE will utilize Wireless Generation's mCLASS:DIBELS Next assessment for grades Pre-K-6 and mCLASS for grades 7-12. The Wireless Generation's ecosystem of solutions will drive the effective use of data in instructional practice by helping teachers understand the assessment data with reporting and analysis tools, translate class- and student-level reports into individualized instruction, diagnose students' ability to meet standards, manage the Response to Intervention (RtI) process, and provide targeted intervention for students in need. This instructional improvement system offers a coherent, aligned assessment system that provides real-time data and is consistent across the Pre-K through grade 12 continuum. In addition to using technology-based assessment systems, the MDE utilizes various media for technical assistance and professional development. [See A(i)(d); A(iv); D(iv)]

A. Quality of State-Level Activities

(i) *How the SEA will carry out the required State-level activities (Additional Requirements) and how it will align those activities with its Comprehensive State Literacy Plan.*

The MDE SRCL application meets ALL of the additional requirements as defined in the application notice and aligns all activities with the comprehensive state literacy plan (CSLP). The explanations below (a through d) describe how the MDE will meet the additional requirements described in this SRCL Request for Application.

(a) Update and Improve Comprehensive State Literacy Plan (CSLP). "*Mississippians Empowered Through Literacy*" *(METL*) is the title of the CSLP that was developed using the SRCL Formula Grant funds and was submitted to the US Department of Education (USDE). The CSLP will continue to be revised and improved based on evaluation data as SRCL action steps are implemented. This SRCL application is based on the ***METL* CSLP**.

(b) Align Federal and State funds and programs in SEA and LEAs, including Title I, Title II-A, Title III, Head Start Act, IDEA, Carl D. Perkins to support coherent funding for disadvantaged students. The MDE management team will align funding sources to ensure that no overlapping of services occurs to promote a cohesive funding mechanism that supports disadvantaged students' literacy achievement and success. A Committee of Practitioners that includes representatives from all federal programs, Head Start, and Early Childhood Education Centers that receive federal and state funding from child care block grants will safeguard that all funding sources are USDE in a unified and consistent manner.

(c) Subgrant applications process and review are publicly available, including judging evidence base for alignment with standards, curricula, and materials. The MDE has experience with and a rigorous and transparent process for subgranting federally funded grants. The process for awarding the MS SRCL subgrants and the criteria for judging the quality of the applications will be made available using various methods (i.e., Webinars, MDE website, technical assistance meetings for potential subgrant applicants). Once the subgranting process is complete, the MDE will post all applications and results on the MDE website. During the application process, LEAs and Early Childhood Education (ECE) providers will be required to link all activities and materials to the evidence base as defined in the SRCL application. LEAs and ECE providers will be required to show how curricula and materials referenced in their SRCL subgrant applications align with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) that were adopted by the Mississippi State Board of Education in August 2010, the *Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework* for 3 to 5 year old children, and the *2010 Mississippi Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers*. (See Section B for more extensive information about subgranting.)

(d) Implement a comprehensive and coherent literacy program birth through grade 12 that includes effective literacy instruction. This application is based on the draft CSLP ***METL*** that provides a comprehensible vision that requires educators to implement effective, evidence-based literacy instruction throughout the state. As a result, literacy instruction for individuals from birth through grade 12 will be of uniformly high quality and of sufficient quantity to result in a measureable difference in literacy achievement statewide. This focus on measureable results is driven by a comprehensive, clear, and well-implemented plan that will provide the impetus to propel increased literacy achievement in Mississippi.

Seven key areas provide the basis for *METL*. These key areas, as stated in the plan, are: *educator preparation, professional growth, resources, leadership, instruction, intervention, and assessment data collection and use.* For Mississippi students to be successful in college and careers, all seven areas must work in harmony to support literacy instruction. Individually, each area is important; however, they must be integrated to create seamless and cohesive effective literacy instruction.

The state contracted with Dr. Ray Reutzel to develop the Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model (MCLIM) that includes all components of research-based effective literacy instruction and a complete learning design for individuals from birth through grade 12. Dr. Reutzel is a renowned reading researcher who has tremendous knowledge about designing a comprehensive literacy instructional model and about Mississippi's student population. The learning design components for K-12 are based on explicit/systematic instruction that is developmentally appropriate and provides students with instruction in the following: expanding oral language, developing phonemic awareness, expanding vocabulary, understanding grammar, and academic language development; learning to decode; reading texts with fluency; establishing

purposes for reading and comprehending various text structures and synthesizing information from a variety of sources and formats; reading and writing with motivation; and writing for various purposes, audiences, disciplines, and formats to communicate ideas and strengthen comprehension. MCLIM defines effective early literacy instruction from birth to age five to support children's early language and literacy development through explicit, evidence-based, systematic instruction that is developmentally appropriate and provides students expressive and receptive language skills, alphabet knowledge, book knowledge, print awareness, phonological awareness, emergent writing skills, rich vocabulary development, and comprehension. ***METL*** will be implemented through this SRCL application through these following components:

Professional Development. *METL's* "professional growth" is a primary focus area designed to assist educators in meeting the literacy instructional needs of all students, including disadvantaged students. Professional growth is key to developing and sustaining the capacity of teachers and leaders in K-12 and ECE settings. Every student is entitled to effective teachers and leaders who are serious about their own learning. Enhancing teachers' knowledge of effective practices will help to close the knowledge gap in the education profession and can help eradicate the achievement gaps that exist among groups of students (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 2005). Quality teaching and learning will ensure that each student receives effective academic experiences every day of the student's academic career.

***METL* Goal**: Increase educators' knowledge and skills in implementing research supported literacy instruction through the following core actions.

1. Develop and implement Summer Literacy Academies for educators (Pre-K- Grade 12). To allow for modeling evidence-based practices, these academies will be held during summer school or extended year sessions where students are present. The focus of the academies is

to ensure common and coherent evidence-based content knowledge and instructional practices to improve student achievement.

2. Utilize existing technology-supported professional learning modules for K-12 and ECE educators as follow-up and reinforcement to the summer academies. These would be selected based on individual teacher and school/district needs as evidenced by data (teacher observation, student achievement, progress monitoring, RtI).
3. Employ the use of K-12 and ECE literacy coaches to reinforce and support the application of evidence-based content knowledge that is an integral part of the METL.
4. Establish data teams to analyze and use data to inform instruction and make professional learning decisions.
5. Implement literacy leadership teams at district and school levels to provide leadership in developing, implementing, and monitoring the district and school literacy plans. ECE educators from the subgrantee feeder pattern will be included on the teams.
6. Establish a school leader mentoring program to support building level administrators with implementing the school literacy plan.
7. Establish an ECE Director mentoring program.
8. Collaborate with Institutions of Higher Education and Community Colleges for educators (ECE and K-12) to obtain licensure credentials and to continue their education.
9. Provide opportunities for Literacy Coaches to obtain a Master's degree and certification.

Curriculum and instructional materials aligned with Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Birth to Age Five Standards. *METL* provides for alignment of curriculum and instructional materials with the CCSS (adopted 2010). Curriculum and instructional materials for 3 – 5 year olds will align with *Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework.*

Curriculum and instructional materials for birth to 2 will align with the *MS Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers*.

***METL* Goals**: Improve the selection and use of literacy instructional materials, and the use of effective, scientific-based instruction to meet students' needs. The core actions are below.

1. Provide all students with explicit, systematic, and intentional instruction to address the components of effective literacy instruction defined in the MCLIM. This is applicable for all ECE and K-12 curriculum and instructional materials.
2. Use current textbook adoption guidelines and procedures to review core materials to guarantee alignment to the CCSS and to ensure that vendors provide the evidence base to support the materials being proposed for the "MDE-approved" list.
3. Review supplemental and intervention program materials to create an "MDE-approved list."
4. Use the current "MDE-approved" List of Instructional Materials list for Pre-K (3 and 4 year old) programs.
5. Require subgrantees (K-12 and participating ECE centers) to choose materials from the MDE-approved lists described in items 2, 3, and 4 above.
6. Provide specific, non-negotiable literacy instruction time requirements for each age group or grade band that is appropriate for Tier 1instruction, Tier 2 intervention, and Tier 3 intervention; require participating ECE centers and K-12 schools to adhere to requirements.
7. Collaborate to provide services to medical facilities within the LEA subgrantee communities for birth to 5 populations through the Reach Out and Read program.
8. Ensure that the *Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework* (3 to 5 year olds) is implemented with fidelity in participating ECE centers and that curriculum and assessment materials align with the framework and are supported by evidence base.

9. Ensure that the *2010 Mississippi Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers* and the curriculum guide, *Learning in a Baby's World: Using the Mississippi Early Learning Guidelines; A Complete Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers* are implemented in participating ECE centers.

Coherent Assessment System. This plan is centered in a coherent and cohesive assessment system that is aligned with both the CCSS and the learning standards for birth to age 5. The assessment system includes valid and reliable measures for screening, progress monitoring, diagnosis, and summative assessments. For assessment to have merit, the data collected must be USDE to make decisions about instruction, interventions, professional development, and program improvement at the school, district, and state levels. To accurately and reliably assess disadvantaged students, accommodations must be defined and utilized in ways that ensure these students are not marginalized. Collecting and using data ensures system-wide accountability, evaluates systemic progress, and develops responsive comprehensive instructional approaches (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, 2005). Assessments USDE to collect student, teacher, and system literacy achievement data will be valid, reliable, and evidence-based.

***METL* Goal:** Improve literacy achievement through assessment and data utilization. The core state actions include the following.

1. Define the components of kindergarten readiness and identify an assessment tool that aligns with the definition and with CCSS. The tool must include a data reporting mechanism for early childhood centers to determine readiness for children who complete the ECE program and to better inform decisions about improving the program.

2. Provide ongoing professional learning in assessment administration; data gathering procedures and data utilization; and analyzing student data results to differentiate instruction.
3. Develop a progress report checklist for parents and caregivers for children from Pre-K to age 5 based on the *Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework.*
4. Partner with Wireless Generation to use mCLASS DIBELS Next for Pre-K-Grade 6 as a screener, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment instrument and mCLASS for grades 7-12 that is aligned with the Common Core State Standards. This coherent, cohesive, and systematic instructional improvement system will give teachers, schools, districts, and the MDE real time data for making the most appropriate instructional decisions for students and teachers across the Pre-K through grade 12 continuum.
5. Institutionalize Data Teams at the school and district levels to analyze data for making decisions, which through careful analyses will allow a comparison to teachers' data analysis at the classroom level. This intensive analysis provides a second layer of analysis for determining the accuracy and appropriateness of instruction.

Interventions. The *MS RtI Model Best Practices Handbook* provides a firm foundation for addressing the needs of all K-12 students. In MS, the K-12 RtI process has decreased the number of student referrals to special education services while challenging those students who master material before their peers. The selection and adoption of effective, research-based intervention programs are critical to meeting students' needs (Hill & Flynn, 2006; McCardle & Chhabra, 2004; Vaughn & Klinger, 2007). High-quality intervention practices include attention to the quality of instructional personnel, such as parents/caregivers, superintendents, principals, classroom teachers, teacher assistants, literacy coaches, library media specialists, and speech/language pathologists (Haager & Mahdavi, 2007; Kamil, Borman, Dole, Kral, Salinger &

Torgeson, 2008). Instructional personnel support must be coordinated so that the interventions align with Tier 1 or classroom instruction to provide maximum instructional support for students (Wonder-McDowell, Reutzel, & Smith, in press). To effectively monitor interventions, progress monitoring assessments are imperative (Echevarria, Short, & Vogt, 2008; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2007).

***METL* Goal:** Improve the quality of instructional interventions. The core state actions follow.

1. Require subgrantees to offer options for extended instructional time for (a) below proficient students who have not mastered material, (b) proficient student who need to be challenged to master material at the advanced level, and (c) advanced students who master the material before their peers.
2. Require a kindergarten readiness assessment designed to identify at-risk students early so as to provide immediate intervention services.
3. Follow the guidelines in the MCLIM for using data to group students for optimal instructional benefit, including flexible grouping.
4. Develop and implement an Individual Learning Plan Template based upon Wireless Generation student goal trajectories and Pre-K-age 5 assessment data.
5. Employ an early intervention system to identify students who are considered at-risk and provide a Pre-K-age 5 vocabulary and listening comprehension intervention program that is evidence-based for at risk students.
6. Provide intervention for struggling middle and high students to promote and accelerate literacy achievement to maximize their college and career readiness success.
7. Provide intensive, consistent, and rigorous professional development to ensure that all teachers provide all students, including English Language Learners and Special Education

Learners, with appropriate instructional strategies such as slower-paced instruction, repetition, smaller groups, and individual instruction.

Language-and Text-Rich Classrooms, Schools, and Early Learning Program Environments

Because language acquisition and literacy experiences begin at birth, students lacking previous experiences with skills such as the function of language, print awareness, alphabetic principle, and phonemic awareness need a strong language and text-rich environment to ensure they do not lag behind their peers. A language and text-rich environment provides opportunities for students to participate in language and literacy activities that are the foundational understandings about the utility and function of oral and written language. The literacy rich environment emphasizes the importance of speaking, listening, reading, and writing and negotiating meaning through language. According to Gunn, Simmons, and Kameenui (1995), "through exposure to written language (e.g., storybook reading and daily living routines) many children develop an awareness of print, letter naming, and phonemic awareness…through exposure to oral language, preschool children develop listening comprehension, vocabulary, and language facility" (p. 3).

In addition to addressing the specific classroom language and text-rich environment component, MDE is addressing the issue of language-deprived home environments because of the high poverty in the state. Research indicates the tremendous toll that poverty takes on cognitive and language development. Receptive and expressive language development is critical to children's literacy success.

***METL* Goal:** Provide language and text-rich environments. The core state actions follow.

1. Provide strong professional learning for ALL educators (ECE and K-12) that emphasizes the importance of language and text-rich environments, particularly that teachers must facilitate

oral language development, engage students in the language process, and stress the functions and importance of writing.

2. Provide increasingly complex texts that demand comprehension growth across the grade bands to the point that students are college and career ready as defined in the CCSS.
3. Utilize writing tasks that focus on the writing-reading connection where all students (Pre-K-age 5 and Grades K-12) are required "to draw upon and write about evidence from literary and informational texts" in increasingly complex ways. (CCSS, 2010, p. 8).
4. Provide multiple opportunities for speaking and listening for all students (Pre-K-age 5 and Grades K-12) where "students develop a range of useful oral communication and interpersonal skills," that include opportunities to work cooperatively, "express and listen to ideas, integrate information from oral, visual, quantitative, and media sources, evaluate what they hear, use media and visual displays, and adapt speech to context and task" (CCSS, 2010, p. 8).
5. Utilize evidence-based learning opportunities that specifically address the negative impact of poverty on learning development in ways that all students (Pre-K-5 and K-12) can master the conventions, effective use, and vocabulary of the English language, as well as the academic language specific for educational success.
6. Provide professional development for content area teachers to emphasize the use of engaging and motivating resources and materials (particularly digital) other than textbooks that are increasingly more complex as required in the CCSS.
7. Require coaching based on educator observation data in the area of classroom interaction, particularly for ECE teachers, to promote and enhance oral language development.
8. Use i-Pads and other technological tools for students to increase their media literacy.

9. Conduct parent education seminars and publications about literacy and language engagement in the home and also include home visits utilizing Department of Health and Human Services funding and private foundation funding.
10. Provide books to medical facilities within the LEA subgrantee communities for birth to 5 populations through the Reach Out and Read program.

Continuous Improvement by Monitoring Program Implementation and Outcomes.

To provide continuous improvement, the following core state actions will be taken to monitor program implementation and outcomes.

1. Use multiple data sources (i.e., real time data at the state, district, school, teacher, and student level; external evaluation data; budgetary data) for the SEA Leadership Team to make improvements to program implementation and outcomes.
2. Analyze real time data from a reporting system (Wireless Generation) at the state, district, school, teacher, and student level to ensure program effectiveness and to make continuous program improvements.
3. Analyze data from the Pre-K to age 5 assessment system at the ECE center level, teacher level, and student level to ensure program effectiveness and to make continuous program improvements.
4. Conduct periodic, onsite visits to all subgrantees to collect data for monitoring effective implementation.
5. Adjust professional development based on effectiveness data (Section A (iv)).
6. Meet periodically with the Committee of Practitioners and the State Literacy Team to receive updates of effectiveness from the External Evaluator and to make recommendations for changes or modifications based upon the data and relevant research or evidence.

7. Continuously monitor the MS SRCL project implementation and outcomes. See section C of this application.

(ii) *SEA's goals for improving student literacy outcomes for all students (e.g., limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities), including a description of the data that the SEA has considered or will consider and the creation of a clear and credible path that the SEA will take to achieve these goals with the support of its LEAs.*

Strong literacy skills are critical for Mississippi students to succeed academically and to prosper in this global economy. Students must be able to read, write, and think at increasingly higher levels of complexity, creativity, and sophistication to prepare for college and career pathways (Zhao, 2009). Unfortunately, the majority of Mississippi K-12 students do not attain these higher levels of literate activity that facilitate educational success and economic upward mobility. Mississippi assessment results depict unacceptably high numbers of students in K-12, particularly disadvantaged students, failing to read proficiently. Mississippi does not have a coherent data system for reporting birth-age 5 populations; thus there are no data for these ages.

Percentage Scoring Proficient or Above on Mississippi Curriculum Test, 2nd Ed. 2010								
Grade Level	**All Students**	**Stud. W/Disabl.**	**ELL**	**Econ. Disadv.**	**Non-Econ. Disadv.**	**Black**	**White**	**Hispanic**
3	49	26	38	39	69	37	62	46
4	53	24	37	43	72	40	67	49
5	51	18	37	41	70	38	65	52
6	53	16	25	42	72	39	67	52
7	52	12	26	42	70	40	65	50
8	46	8	16	34	63	32	59	43
	Mississippi English II High School Subject Area Test							
10-12	51	8	31	38	68	35	68	57

To complicate Mississippi's situation, many of its students live in abject poverty. The data for 2009-2010 indicate that 70.7% of Mississippi's 492,621 students participated in the free and reduced lunch program. According to the National Center on Poverty, 30% of Mississippi's children live in poverty with 24% classified as low income. Thus, 54% of Mississippi's children

can be classified as low income. Current research (Hernandez, 2011) paints a despondent picture of the effects of living in poverty and not reading on grade level by third grade. Hernandez (2011) describes how poverty and reading at basic and below basic achievement levels "account for 70% of all children who never graduate from high school" (p. 8). Based on the reams of research related to the challenges that these children face in learning to read, MDE acknowledges the huge task in preparing our children for the 21st Century.

Goals for K-12. Based upon several years of data, the MDE created projections for grades 3, 5, 8, and English II to establish annual targets to ultimately reach the State Board of Education goal of all students scoring proficient or above on the English Language Arts (ELA) MCT2 by the year 2020. Since 2008, the state has failed to meet these target goals. ***The goal of this evidence-based, comprehensive, sustained, literacy project is for students in participating schools and ECE centers to meet or exceed the annual percent proficiency target goals established by the state.*** Below are these annual percent proficiency targets for each grade.

	Grade 3 ELA	Grade 5 ELA	Grade 8 ELA	Grades 10-12 English II
2013	71.4	69.9	67.5	70.1
2014	75.5	74.3	72.1	74.4
2015	79.5	78.7	76.8	78.6
2016	83.6	83.1	81.4	82.9
2017	87.7	87.5	86.1	87.2

Additionally, this evidence-based, comprehensive, sustained, literacy project sets the goal for closing the achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students. With approximately a 30% difference between the two groups, the target is to reduce the gap by 1% at the end of the first year of implementation and incrementally increasing the reduction each year to ultimately reduce the gap by 10% by end of the project. By addressing the achievement gap of economic groups, we anticipate a positive

impact on addressing the disparity between the two largest ethnic groups (Black and White). Hispanic enrollment in MS is 2%; Asian is 1%; and Native American is less than 1%.

Goals for Pre-K to 5. Recognizing that MS is lagging behind in obtaining consistent Pre-K to age 5 assessment data, the MS SRCL project will require the use of consistent assessment tools across all subgrantees. For the purposes of this project, MS will use PPVT-4 and PALS-Pre-K, as well as Wireless Generation. The PPVT-4 is a valid and reliable measure of oral language and PALS-Pre-K provides a reliable measure of phonological awareness—both important for later success. Wireless Generation provides a system for administering and scoring DIBELS-Next, analyzing the data, delivering reports for teachers, schools, districts, and the state to make data-driven decisions. ***The goals for all participating Pre-K-age 5 students are (a) score at or above the developmental age range for each subtask on the PALS-Pre-K; (b) show an increase of 4 points or greater on the Standard Scores for the PPVT-4; and (c) score "on target" or above for the subtasks in Wireless Generation at appropriate age levels***.

Evidence of isolated success does exist in Mississippi schools. In schools where capacity building is cultivated through strong leadership combined with strong professional development that includes job-embedded support, student achievement at high levels is possible. In a small school in the Mississippi Delta, approximately 95% of students are classified as economically disadvantaged. Yet, the results for the 2009-2010 MCT2 for fourth graders in this school are phenomenal - 91% of the fourth graders performed at proficient or advanced levels (state average is 53%), and 9% performed at basic (state average is 34.7%), and not a single student scoring in the minimal category (state average is 12.3%). This school substantiates that Mississippi students, regardless of their economic situation, can perform at proficient and advanced levels.

This school's success offers abundant optimism that with this SRCL grant, other disadvantaged students will be afforded the opportunity to achieve high levels of literacy.

(iii) *How the SEA will provide technical assistance and support to its SRCL sub-grantees (and, at its discretion, to other LEAs or early childhood education providers) to enable them to implement a high-quality comprehensive literacy program and to improve student achievement in core academic subjects.*

The MDE will provide technical assistance (TA) and support to LEA and ECE subgrantees, as well as other LEAs or ECE providers who participate in the SRCL activities using their own funding mechanisms. However, first priority is limited to subgrantees. During the application process, TA will consist of face-to-face application training days at the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) sites across the state, information posted on the MDE website, and webinars. For ECE providers, TA will follow the same format as for K-12 entities except face-to-face application training will be held at the MDE in Jackson, MS.

For subgrantees, on-going TA and support will be provided at the state level via SRCL Project Bureau Director and other staff; at the regional level via RESAs, and Regional Resource and Referral Centers; and at the local level via LEA SRCL project directors and literacy coaches. During the summer months, a rigorous planned program of professional development will provide subgrantees with the content knowledge to deliver effective instruction that is designed specifically for the various educators' roles in the sub-grantee school or agency (i.e., K-12 teacher, literacy coach, ECE center teacher, ECE director, etc.). These TA activities will be required as a part of the subgrant process and will include summer literacy academies, summer literacy leadership team summits, and summer data team summits. During the summer literacy leadership team summits and summer data team summits, districts and schools will be provided

with templates for developing district/school "Continuous Growth Plans" that folds all of the current MDE plans (Professional Development, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.) into one plan that will include literacy as the primary component. This "Continuous Growth Plan" focuses all efforts on a comprehensive, cohesive plan versus the current "silo" approach where multiple plans are written. SRCL funds will provide the state with an opportunity to pilot this approach before implementing statewide.

During the academic year, electronic versions of TA will include regularly scheduled telephone conference calls for follow-up and questions, follow-up online professional learning, webinars, and an electronic LISTSERV. On-site TA will be given to subgrantees as needed by the MDE SRCL personnel. In addition, subgrantees will travel to a site for regularly scheduled professional learning days during which an additional ½ day will be devoted to TA. Finally, MDE SRCL personnel will review progress reports and data to formulate differentiated technical assistance plans for sub-grantees.

For LEAs and early childhood centers not receiving SRCL subgrants, the MDE will provide information via the MDE website and webinars. When space allows and topic is deemed appropriate, the MDE will permit non-subgrantees to join professional learning opportunities. The MDE will disseminate the state's comprehensive literacy plan, *METL,* so that other LEAs and early childhood centers can implement the plan through other funding. The MDE is committed to making all information available to all stakeholder groups.

(iv) *How the SEA will evaluate the State's progress in improving achievement in literacy for children and youth from birth through grade 12, including disadvantaged students:*

The evaluation plan for the Mississippi SRCL project is designed to assess the effectiveness of the project by insuring that activities are completed in a timely and high quality manner and that the project goals are achieved as explained in this application.

(1) The evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator whose role in the project is limited solely to conducting the evaluation. This will ensure that the evaluation process is fair, objective, and produces valid and reliable information. Following state procurement policy, MDE will solicit proposals through an RFP process. To ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and useful evaluation that can lead to continuous improvement of the project, the MDE secured the assistance of a consultant with thorough knowledge of evaluation to assist in the design of this application's evaluation plan. The plan will provide data to make comparisons between the different LEA and participating ECE centers by utilizing a matched-school design (ensuring excellent implementation data) to determine which subgrantees' components (programs, materials, extended school year, etc.) are most effective with Mississippi's high poverty student population. This plan will be the basis of the MDE Request for Proposals (RFP) that the MDE will issue and will include criteria related to the external evaluator's experience in such large-scale literacy projects.

(2) The evaluation will use methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the objectives of the proposed project. The evaluation focuses on four broad goals of the project: (a) increasing literacy performance of students K-12; (b) increasing language development and literacy readiness skills of Pre-K children; (c) improving literacy instruction that results in teachers acquiring a high level of knowledge and expertise in implementing effective evidence-based literacy instruction; and (d) building capacity in schools and early childhood centers to ensure that the quality of literacy instruction and level of student performance continues to

improve beyond the duration of the grant. The evaluation calls for a variety of both quantitative and qualitative methods to address the major research questions. Data sources will include student assessments and outcome measures, participant attendance and feedback of professional development activities, observations of instructional practices to assure fidelity of use, surveys to confirm level of implementation, and interviews and focus groups to obtain perceptions of project effectiveness.

The major research questions to be answered by this evaluation and methods are:

Question 1. Over the duration of the project, what is the percentage of participating students who show improvement in literacy based upon written assessments and state level achievement?

- What is the percentage of participating four-year old children achieving significant oral language skills as measured by PPVT-4 and PALS-Pre-K assessments? (GPRA measure)
- What is the percentage of participating students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed proficiency on the Mississippi Curriculum Test, 2nd Edition (MCT2) - Language Arts assessments? (GPRA measure at grades 5 and 8)
- What is the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the Mississippi English II High School Subject Area Test? (GPRA measure at high school)

Achievement of oral language skills for four-year old children will be based on the PPVT-4, which will be administered as a pre-test/posttest and Standard Scores will be calculated for comparison purposes. An increase in Standard Scores of four points or greater will indicate significant gains. The PALS-Pre-K assessment will be administered as a pre-test/posttest and the percentage of students scoring at or above the subtasks' developmental ranges will be calculated.

Change in student performance for grades K-8 will be analyzed: (a) establishing pre-test baseline literacy performance by grade/age level at the start of the project and comparing students' performance to the appropriate grade/age level baseline, (b) within-cohort change as each grade/age-level cohort progresses through subsequent grades to measure growth over time; and (c) among grade/age-level cohort to examine the effectiveness of instructional programming over time on groups of students at given grade levels.

For grades 9-12, the Mississippi English II High School Subject Area Test will be USDE as the outcome measure for high school students and is administered at the end of grade 10. Progress monitoring to determine vocabulary and comprehension skills will occur quarterly and be reported annually for all high school students participating in the project.

Question 2. How effective have state and district professional development initiatives been in increasing the knowledge and expertise of educators and to what extent are they implementing high quality, evidence-based literacy programs?

Written knowledge assessments will be administered to all educators attending professional development to ascertain their level of knowledge of evidence-based literacy instruction and their expertise in implementing instructional practices as described in the MCLIM. Attendance data will be collected and reported. Educators' perceptions of utility, relevance, and quality of professional development will be collected by electronic surveys and analyzed so that adjustments can be made to professional development. To assure fidelity of use of professional development activities, classroom observations will be conducted and data will be analyzed to determine teachers' areas of ineffective implementation practices.

Question 3. To what extent did sub-grantees implement evidence-based literacy programs as proposed in their applications, and how have they utilized human and material resources to build capacity to ensure the ongoing improvements?

Each sub-grantee will be required to submit semi-annual reports indicating the stage of implementation. The SRCL staff, SEA Leadership team, and the external evaluator will review these reports. Each year, the external evaluator will conduct site visits to a sample of schools to collect implementation data. During each site visit, classrooms will be observed for evidence of instructional use that is consistent with the principles established in the subgrantee's application. During these visits, the subgrantee site leaders (principals, School Literacy Team, center directors, etc.) will be interviewed to gather information about how the elements of the project are being coordinated and implemented. These data will be USDE to identify strengths and weaknesses of implementation and to determine technical assistance needs. Subgrantees will submit a report documenting alignment of funding sources supporting the literacy plan.

(3) The SEA will use evidence to inform and continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities. The evaluation is designed to provide specific feedback to the SEA and subgrantees so that needed adjustments can be made if there is a lack of progress toward achieving the project goals. The evaluation plan includes both formative and summative evaluation approaches. The formative approach will continuously track and monitor the project's ability to accomplish critical benchmarks by the targeted dates. Analyses of the previously noted data will provide regular feedback to the SEA leadership team and the State Literacy Team to inform their decisions in the ongoing shaping of the project. Such feedback reports and/or oral discussion will occur a minimum of four times annually and more often if needed for individual subgrantees. In turn, the SEA will use this information to identify professional development and

technical assistance needs to subgrantees that are not making progress toward improving student outcomes for all students. This continuous cycle of assess, analyze, plan, and implement will be USDE by all levels to examine data to make well-informed decisions.

Summative reports covering the end-of-year analyses of student outcomes, professional development participation and knowledge data, classroom observation data, and subgrantee survey data will be prepared annually for review by the SEA leadership team. These annual reports will provide the data necessary for reporting the GPRA measures as required.

The multifaceted, integrated data collection described above is designed to address the three broad research questions. The data are focused on the fundamental components of learning and result in gathering information about student, teacher, program, and longitudinal student performance in literacy. Recognized and accepted means for data gathering will include using strategies such as reliable and valid tests, surveys, content knowledge assessments, observational instruments, and interviews. This rigorous plan provides MDE with rich quantitative and qualitative data to make sound decisions to evaluate and improve the efficacy of the project.

(v) *How the SEA will disseminate information on project outcomes, disaggregated by student subgroup, and in formats that are easily understood by, and accessible to, the public, and how the SEA will make that information useful to varied groups (such as families, educators, researchers, other experts, early childhood education providers, and State leaders).*

MDE issues annual school and district report cards that provide disaggregated MCT2 data for grades 3-8 and for the Mississippi English II High School Subject Area Test by student subgroups (Students with IEPs, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, and Racial groups). Student outcomes for three- and four-year olds and students K-2 will be disaggregated by these same student subgroups. The disaggregated data will be incorporated into

the external yearly evaluation. The annual external evaluation report will be shared with a diversity of individuals that will necessitate a variety of formats to make the information meaningful. Targeted audiences for dissemination include all Mississippi districts and schools, the State Board of Education, Committee of Practitioners, State Literacy Team, MDE Leadership teams representing various offices, early childhood centers, colleges and universities, families, and community groups. Each of these audiences will require some adaptations of the evaluation reports. For example, the State Board of Education is more interested in implications for policy, so the summary that is prepared for them will highlight those practices and organizational structures that seem most effective in improving student literacy. Early childhood centers will be more interested in examining the language and pre-school practices that increase the predictability of success in the early grades. Families and community groups will require information that informs them of how well their local schools are performing. Colleges and universities will have interest in examining the professional development and programs that lead to student success. Each of these reports will be tailored to the specific audience and available electronically and when feasible, available in hard copy.

To reach these various audiences, the State Leadership Team will use an assortment of dissemination methods. For participating schools and districts, a series of webinars to explain the results, with a focus on their own achievements, will be conducted. A powerpoint template will be developed so that participating ECE providers, schools, and districts can insert their individual results to share with families and at meetings such as PTA and various community groups. For the State Board of Education, the SEA SRCL Project Bureau Director will make an annual presentation to inform them of progress and results. This presentation will be posted on the MDE website and viewed by non-participating schools and districts, as well as the general

population. The entire evaluation report will be posted on the MDE website and notices sent to colleges and universities so they can retrieve the document. During the summer months and throughout the school year, there are various state conferences and training events where presentations will be made, as well as preparing written reports to appear in journals and conference proceedings. MDE is committed to sharing the impact and components of this project and will actively seek out additional opportunities to disseminate its success.

B. Quality of the State Subgrant Competition.

In Mississippi, subgrant awards will be highly competitive and incorporate a funding model that will ensure adequate resources while institutionalizing and building LEA capacity to sustain the project. In the past, Mississippi's efforts around literacy were fragmented and disorganized. *METL*, the comprehensive state literacy plan, was developed from the "ground up" and is the foundation for the subgrantee applications.

(i) Rigorous, high-quality competition for sub-grants, including review and judge

MDE has a policy for awarding competitive grants and it must be followed for this subgrant competition. An evaluation committee comprised of a minimum of 5 individuals must be formed. The program office coordinating a grant is responsible for selection of the evaluation committee using qualified internal staff and/or external reviewers who have knowledge or expertise of the grant requirements. In the case of this SRCL subgrant process, the State Literacy Team, external literacy consultants, and MDE staff will serve on the evaluation committee to evaluate the grant proposals and make the recommendations for funding awards. Each evaluator must sign a Conflict of Interest form and a Statement of Confidentiality form. The MDE policy requires the program office to develop criteria for evaluating proposals and to review these criteria with the evaluation committee prior to the review of proposals. In the case of the SRCL

subgrant competition, the criteria are delineated in the SRCL proposal and will be made available to the evaluation committee. Once the evaluation committee recommends subgrantees, the recommended subgrantees are presented to the State Board of Education for approval. To ensure that the procurement policies and procedures are followed, the Office of Procurement will designate one staff member to supervise the process.

In addition to following the Office of Procurement policy, LEA top scoring applicants will be interviewed by a small team of MDE staff and external reviewers. Based upon the results of this interview round, interviewers will determine which LEA proposals should be included in the final round of the application process - LEA and school site visits. The LEA and school site visits will consist of a small team of MDE staff visiting with LEAs and school sites leadership teams, faculty, and LEA identified ECE participating centers to discuss level of commitment and capacity. Based upon the results of the LEA and School Site Visit, recommended LEA proposals will be submitted for State Board of Education approval.

The MDE will hold two subgrant competitions to ensure equitable distribution of the 15% for Pre-K to age 5, 40% for grades K-5, and 40% for grades 6-12. The first competition will be held for LEAs to ensure that there is equitable distribution between grades K-5 and grades 6-12 with equity between middle and high schools in grades 6-12. Once LEAs are awarded subgrants through the review process, a second subgrant competition will be held for ECE providers that accounts for 15% of the MDE SRCL budget. The ECE provider competition will require them to partner with the LEA sub-grantees to design and implement an early childhood program that feeds into the LEA sub-grantee's elementary schools.

The LEA Review will be based on specific criteria envisioned to be the following. A sample rubric for scoring the LEA applications is on page 34.

LEA Criterion A: LEA demonstrates capacity to implement the components of the SRCL application. [Addresses Section B (i) (a) of the USDE RFA]

1. Provides evidence of administrator and teacher support.
2. Provides a technical assistance plan outlining LEA support to ensure each school is successful.
3. Communicates a clear plan for monitoring student achievement by individual classrooms.
4. Provides evidence of past successful experience in using state and federal grant funds.

LEA Criterion B: LEA meets the requirements of comprehensive and coherent literacy program. [Addresses Section B (i) (b) (1) and (2) of the USDERFA]

1. Describes how needs of disadvantaged students are addressed with supporting data.
2. Indicates why the selected schools are in the best position to be a successful SRCL participant with supporting data showing progress toward narrowing the achievement gap.
3. Conducts a comprehensive needs assessment at each site designed to improve teaching and learning that includes, but is not limited to, state assessment data; trend data; demographics; teacher observation data; parent, community, and stakeholder surveys; professional learning needs analyses; self-assessment matrix; and funding streams.

LEA Criterion C: LEA involves other agencies, families, community-based organizations in the application process. [Addresses Section B (i) (b) (3) of the USDE RFA]

1. Provides evidence of convening a Literacy Leadership Team at the district and school level.
2. Secures letters of commitment from feeder ECE centers to participate in the SRCL activities.
3. Has a clear process for involving families and the community.

LEA Criterion D: LEA implements effective literacy instruction. The following components are in Section A(i)(d) and reflect the CSLP. The indicators include, but are not limited to, the

following: [Addresses Section B (i) (b) of the US Dept of Ed RFA]

1. Professional Development (PD): Describes district and school based PD that includes the use of coaches, literacy leadership team, and data team to provide feedback and support that is intensive, focused, sustained, and of sufficient duration to impact classroom practice.
2. Curriculum and Materials: Provides assurance to select and fully implement an evidence-based comprehensive literacy program that is included on the "MDE-approved" list of core, supplemental, and intervention programs that are aligned with CCSS and assures implementation of the MCLIM.
3. Coherent Assessment System: Provides assurance that districts and schools will implement the screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic, and outcome assessments that are required by the SRCL proposal and describes how the Data Team will use data to improve instruction.
4. Interventions: Describes a schedule for providing extended instructional time that utilizes flexible grouping options and describes the evidence-base for intervention programs.
5. Literacy Environments: Provides evidence of utilizing a variety of materials and resources (including technology) to motivate and engage literacy learning, agrees to implement a classroom interaction observation tool to promote effective oral language development.
6. Continuous Improvement: Describes process for District/School Literacy Leadership Teams and Data Team to use multiple data sources (including professional development, teacher evaluation/observation, etc.) for improving instruction and implementation at all levels.

LEA Criterion E: LEA demonstrates a coherent strategy to improve literacy instruction that aligns SRCL subgrant activities with literacy instruction supported by other Federal funds. [Addresses Section B (i) (c) on page 37 of the USDE RFA]

1. Provides assurance to implement a "Continuous Growth Plan" that integrates all funding.

2. Describes LEA program personnel's roles and responsibilities in supporting the SRCL grant.
3. Lists the financial resources and the amounts allocated to support the SRCL grant (e.g., local, state and federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate) and describes how each of the financial resources listed will support the requirements of the SRCL grant.

THE ECE REVIEW will be based on specific criteria delineated through the subgrant process. These criteria and indicators are envisioned to be the following. A sample rubric is on page 35.

ECE Criterion A: ECE Provider demonstrates capacity to implement the components of the SRCL application. [Addresses Section B (i) (a) of the USDE RFA]

1. Signs assurance to partner with ECE centers identified by the LEA subgrantee.
2. Provides evidence that staff members are well qualified and have experience with successful ECE literacy improvement efforts.
3. Demonstrates record of success by providing evidence of progress in working with disadvantaged children and families.
4. Describes capacity to provide professional development for all center personnel.
5. Provides assurance to offer coaching to center directors and staff to reinforce and support the application of evidence-based instructional knowledge.
6. Provides plan for technical assistance to ensure success at each center.
7. Communicates a clear plan for monitoring student achievement by individual classrooms.
8. Provides evidence of successful experience of using state, federal, and/or private grant funds.

ECE Criterion B: ECE Provider meets the requirements of comprehensive and coherent literacy program. [Addresses Section B (i) (b) (1) and (2) of the USDE RFA]

1. Describes how centers will address the needs of disadvantaged students and includes supporting data.

2. Provides evidence that they are best positioned to be a successful MS SRCL provider.
3. Describes the process for conducting a comprehensive needs assessment at each site designed to improve teaching and learning that includes, but is not limited to, state assessment data; trend data; demographics; teacher observation data; parent, community and stakeholder surveys; professional learning needs analyses; self-assessment matrix; and funding streams.

ECE Criterion C: ECE Provider involves other agencies, families, community-based organizations in the application process. [Addresses Section B (i) (b) (3) of the USDE RFA]

1. Provides assurance of participation in the LEA and School Literacy Leadership Teams.
2. Develops a clear plan for involving and educating families and the community.

ECE Criterion D: ECE Provider implements effective literacy instruction. The following components are in Section A (i)(d) and reflect the CSLP. The indicators include, but are not limited to, the following. [Addresses Section B (i) (b) of the USDE RFA]

1. Professional Development: Describes plan that includes the use of coaches and other personnel to provide feedback and support that is intensive, focused, sustained, and of sufficient duration to impact center and classroom instructional practice.
2. Curriculum and Materials: Provides assurance to fully implement an evidence-based comprehensive literacy program that is aligned with CCSS and the MCLIM.
3. Coherent Assessment System: Provides assurance that the ECE provider and individual partner centers will implement the screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic, and outcome assessments that are required within the SRCL application and describes how the ECE provider and centers will use these data to improve instruction.
4. Interventions: Describes a process for providing research-based intervention programs for children Pre-K to age 5 in partner centers.

5. Literacy Environments: Provides evidence of utilizing a variety of materials and resources (including technology) to motivate and engage literacy learning and agrees to implement a classroom interaction observation tool to promote effective oral language development, awareness of how language functions, and the connective features of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.
6. Continuous Improvement: Describes process for using multiple data sources (including professional development, teacher evaluation/observation, student assessments, etc.) for improving instruction and SRCL implementation at all levels.

ECE Criterion E: ECE Provider demonstrates a coherent strategy to improve literacy instruction that aligns SRCL subgrant activities with literacy instruction supported by other Federal funds. [Addresses Section B (i) (c) on page 37 of the USDE RFA]

1. Provides an assurance to develop and implement a Facility Enhancement Plan.
2. Describes how provider personnel will collaborate to support the SRCL grant.
3. Describes process of how center personnel will collaborate with provider and the LEA subgrantees to support the SRCL grant.
4. Lists the financial resources and the amounts allocated to support the SRCL grant (e.g., local, state and federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate) and describes how each of the financial resources listed will support the requirements of the SRCL grant.

(ii) Priority to applicants who serve high-poverty population

LEAs will be eligible to apply if 60% or more of their students qualify for free and reduced lunch. Preliminary data analyzed by the MDE indicate that approximately 140 districts will be eligible. From the initial pool of eligible LEAs, invitations to apply will be extended. Once LEAs are eligible to apply, they will identify the schools most in need based upon poverty and student

academic proficiency. Feeder patterns must be established so that elementary, middle, and high schools serve the same attendance or community zone within an LEA regardless of grade configuration of schools (i.e., Pre-K-1, 2-4, 5-8, 9-12 or Pre-K-8, 9-12). The rationale behind a feeder pattern configuration is to have a larger impact for students who will transition from early childhood settings to elementary to middle to high school within the same community or attendance zone, as well as to ensure that successful transitions occur for students between grade levels and grade bands.

ECE provider priority will be given to providers that have evidence of success (i.e., student outcome data, changes in parental practices, community data) in working with high poverty birth to age 5 populations. The ECE provider must partner with early childhood centers identified by the LEAs as feeder centers to the participating elementary schools. As a result, the centers will meet the high-poverty priority.

(iii) Priority to applicants with evidence-based proposals

Each of the components within the state literacy plan, *METL*, is based upon the most recent and rigorous research available. The State Literacy Team researched and reviewed evidence for *METL* to support components detailed in the plan. The MCLIM provides an evidence-based instructional model that is required for this grant. To ensure that the subgrantee applications demonstrate that they have provided the strongest evidence to support being awarded a subgrant, the MDE will evaluate each application using a rubric that includes all of the criteria in Section B(i) and is weighted to emphasize the importance of a given criterion. The draft rubrics below provide guidance for reviewing the LEA and ECE provider applications.

Draft Rubric for Evaluating LEA Subgrant Evidence				
Criterion	**Evidence**	**Points**	**No Evidence/ Comments**	**Max Pts.**
A: Capacity	• Signed stakeholder commitments • Staff qualifications • TA plan • Monitoring plan • Fiscal success record	4 4 4 4 4		20
B: Need Based, Coherent Literacy Program	• High % disadvantaged students not proficient • Data sources documenting progress in narrowing the achievement gap • Comprehensive needs assessment with multiple data sources	5 5 5		15
C: Involvement	• Documentation of Literacy Leadership planning • ECE letters of commitment • Documentation of family involvement in planning and reviewing application	4 4 4		12
D. Literacy Instruction	• Professional development plan focuses on teaching and learning • Signed assurance to choose curriculum and materials from approved list • Signed assurance to use selected assessments • School schedules showing extended instructional time • List of varied materials and resources • Protocols for data team and literacy leadership team meetings	7 7 6 7 7 7		41
E: Fund Alignment	• Signed assurance to implement Continuous Growth Plan • Roles and responsibilities of LEA personnel • Budget indicating funding sources • Budget showing 40% funds to elementary and 40% equally to middle and high schools	3 3 3 3		12
			Total Points	**100**

Draft Rubric for Evaluating ECE Provider Sub-grant Evidence				
Criterion	**Evidence**	**Points**	**No Evidence/ Comments**	**Max Pts.**
A: Capacity	• Signed assurance with ECE centers in approved LEA • Staff qualifications • Experience with high poverty students • Adequate staffing • Signed assurance to provide coaching • TA plan for each center • Student achievement monitoring plan • Fiscal responsibility for state, federal, and/or private funds	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		32
B: Need Based, Coherent Literacy Program	• High % disadvantaged students • Commitment of selected centers • Comprehensive needs assessment with multiple data sources	3 3 3		9
C: Involvement	• Documentation of participating in Literacy Leadership Teams at LEA and school(s) levels • Family/community involvement plan	3 3		6
D. Literacy Instruction	• Professional development plan focuses on teaching and learning • Curriculum and materials from approved list or evidence-based is given • Signed assurance to use selected assessments • Process to identify students in need of intervention and plan to address • List of varied materials and resources to support oral language development • Protocols for using data	7 7 6 7 7 7		41
E: Fund Alignment	• Assurance to develop Facility Enhancement Plan based on data • Roles and responsibilities of provider personnel • Roles and responsibilities of ECE center personnel • Budget indicating funding sources	3 3 3 3		12
			Total Points	**100**

(iv) SEA process to review and judge evidence base and alignment of curricula and materials and make review publicly available.

The MDE will make the SRCL sub-grant applications process, review, and results publicly available on the MDE website. The MDE has a policy for the textbook adoption process that follows the MDE Office of Procurement guidelines. For supplemental and intervention programs, the MDE will also follow the textbook adoption process.

To specifically address the alignment of curricula and materials to CCSS and the evidence base supporting those curricula and materials, MS is taking a different approach from past grant initiatives. In the past, MDE allowed LEAs and schools flexibility in choosing core, supplemental, and intervention programs for various grants. Allowing this flexibility was not successful because LEAs and schools often made choices that were not evidence-based and resulted in a disjointed literacy effort. This flexibility resulted in a lack of consistency within LEAs and even within individual schools. Thus, this SRLC project will require that LEAs and participating ECE centers select core, supplemental, and intervention programs from an "MDE-approved" list and be consistent within the LEA to allow smooth transitions between grades. To be included on the "MDE-approved" list, vendors will submit programs for a rigorous MDE vetting process using evidence-based guidelines. For other materials, subgrantees must purchase only materials that complement and enhance core, supplemental, and intervention program materials—not layer on top of those program materials. With that caveat, the materials for the entire comprehensive literacy program will be based on evidence. It is imperative that districts provide strong professional development and job-embedded support to teachers and staff in order to effectively use the materials in ways that support the MCLIM and *METL*.

C. Project Management

(i) Adequacy of management plan to achieve objectives on time, within budget, clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones…

To ensure strong management of this project, the MS SRCL project will have four full-time staff to ensure that objectives are met. The project will be housed under Trecina Green, Director of the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, who reports to Dr. Lynn House, Deputy State Superintendent for Instructional Enhancement and Internal Operations at the MDE. Both Mrs. Green and Dr. House will provide frequent updates to Dr. Tom Burnham, State Superintendent of Education. The State Board of Education will receive annual updates on the project.

These four **full-time positions** have been established for the project: SRCL Bureau Director (BD), SRCL Division Director (DD), and two SRCL Regional Service Officers (RSOs).

The **SRCL Bureau Director (BD)** will be responsible for the overall fiscal and personnel management of the project. She will oversee the development of the professional learning modules, approve and provide guidance to key consultants, review all subgrantee reports, review evaluation data, monitor the implementation of the project, and be responsible for USDE reports. The BD will meet regularly with the director of the Office of Curriculum and Instruction (Trecina Green) and the deputy state superintendent of Instructional Enhancement and Internal Operations (Dr. Lynn House). The role of the **SRCL Division Director (DD)** is to provide technical assistance to literacy coaches, conduct regional meetings and webinars, and perform functions assigned by the BD. The role of the **two SRCL Regional Service Officers (RSO)** is to work with the subgrantee literacy coaches and provide on-site technical assistance with budgets, instructional practices, progress monitoring, and interventions. They will also provide demonstration teaching for school sites.

The timeline below provides evidence that project objectives will be met. Shaded areas indicate major milestones.

Projected Timeframe	**Year 1 Activities**	**Responsible Person**
August 2011	Develop Request for Proposals (RFP) for LEA SRCL sub-grants	Green
August 2011	Request State Board of Education (SBoE) approval of RFP scoring rubric to award the SRCL sub-grant to LEAs	Green
September 2011	Disseminate RFP for LEAs	Green
September 2011	Begin the MDE Textbook Adoption Process	Green
October 2011	Hire BD, DD, RSOs	Green and House
October 2011	Develop the process for reviewing Supplemental and Intervention Programs	BD, DD, RSOs
October 2011	Finalize Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model (MCLIM) and present to SLT	BD, DD, RSOs
October 2011	Set up budget for SRCL funds available to awarded states	BD, DD
October 2011	Provide technical assistance to LEAs intending to submit an application	BD, DD, RSOs
October 2011	Begin development of professional learning module for summer literacy academies (Pre-K-grade 3)	BD, DD
November 2011	Request SBoE approval of the MCLIM	SBoE
November 2011	SLT reviews supplemental and intervention programs	BD, DD, RSOs
December 2011	Log in LEA applications submitted to the SEA	DD
December 2011	Conduct LEA application review	BD, DD, RSOs
December 2011	Meet with the State Literacy Team to review LEA applications	BD, DD
January 2012	Conduct interviews and on-site visits of top LEA applicants	BD, DD
January 2012	Post results of the application review to the MDE website	BD, DD
January 2012	Develop RFP for the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Provider sub-grantee	BD, DD, RSOs
January 2012	Develop RFP for external evaluator	BD, DD, RSOs
January 19-20, 2012	Request SBoE approval of recommended LEA applicants and make awards	BD
January 19-20, 2012	Request SBoE approval of RFP scoring rubric to award the ECE provider sub-grant	BD
January 19-20, 2012	Request SBoE approval of RFP scoring rubric to award funds to SRCL external evaluator	BD
January 19-20, 2012	Seek SBoE approval to publish the list of core, supplemental, and intervention programs.	BD
February 2012	Conduct orientation for all LEA SRCL subgrantees	BD, DD, RSOs

February 2012	Post RFP for ECE Providers and advertise	BD, DD
February 2012	Provide technical assistance to ECE providers intending to submit an application	BD, DD, RSOs
February 2012	Post RFP for SRCL external evaluator to the website and advertise	BD, DD
March 2012	Log in ECE provider applications submitted to SEA	BD, DD
March 2012	Log in external evaluator applications submitted to SEA	BD, DD
March 2012	LEA subgrantees participate in webinar related to managing human capital (hiring for next academic year and more specifically hiring literacy coach)	BD, DD, RSOs
April 2012	Conduct ECE provider application review	BD, DD, RSOs
April 2012	Conduct interviews of top ECE provider applicants	BD, DD
April 2012	Conduct external evaluator application review	BD, DD, RSOs
April 2012	Conduct interviews of top external evaluation applicants	BD, DD, RSOs
May 2012	Request SBoE approval of recommended ECE provider(s) and make award(s)	BD
May 2012	Request SBoE approval of recommended external evaluator and make award	BD
May 2012	Conduct orientation for LEA SRCL sub-grantees, participating ECE center directors, ECE provider, external evaluator, and State Literacy Team	BD, DD, RSOs
June-July 2012	Convene the Literacy Coach Work Group to develop literacy coach licensure	BD
June-July 2012	Launch summer literacy academies based on Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model (MCLIM) for participating ECE centers and LEA sub-grantees (Pre-K-grade 3) during summer school or extended school year sessions (when students are present)	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2012	Conduct Wireless Generation professional development	BD, DD, RSOs Wireless Generation
July 2012	Conduct a preliminary training with the literacy leadership teams that includes ECE sub-grantees	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2012	Meet with State Literacy Team to update and revise Mississippians Empowered Through Literacy (*METL)*—the comprehensive state literacy plan and Committee of Practitioners to receive input and recommendations for the SRCL project	BD, DD, RSOs

Projected Timeframe	**Year 2 Activities**	**Responsible Person**
August 2012	Develop or identify online follow-up training modules	BD, DD
August 2012	Literacy Coach course work for licensure begins	BD, IHEs

August 2012	Hire mentors for sub-grantee LEA leaders	BD, DD, RSOs
Aug-Sept 2012	Complete student screening assessments at LEA and participating ECE sites	DD, RSOs
Oct-Nov 2012	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits	RSOs
Oct-Nov 2012	Identify or develop training for literacy leadership teams summit and data teams summit that includes LEAs and participating ECEs	
Oct-Nov 2012	Begin development of professional learning module for summer literacy academies (grades 4-12) for Reading, English Language Arts, as well as content areas	BD, DD
Dec 2012	Review first external evaluation report; meet with State Literacy Team, Committee of Practitioners, and MDE Leadership; submit report to USDE; and revise *METL*	BD, DD, RSOs
Jan 2013	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct progress monitoring	RSOs
Jan - Feb 2013	Conduct online follow-up training (LEA and ECE flexibility) based on LEA and ECE data such as teacher observation, student progress monitoring, etc.	BD, DD, RSOs
March 2013	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits, prepare monitoring reports, and determine sub-grantee continuation awards	BD, DD, RSOs
March 2013	Conduct training with LEA and ECE literacy leadership teams that assists with writing the district/school literacy plan within the "Continuous Growth Plan."	BD, DD, RSOs
Apr–May 2013	Conduct training with LEA and ECE data teams that assists with using data to make instructional decisions.	BD, DD, RSOs
May 2013	Conduct outcome assessments at LEA and ECE sites	RSOs
June-July 2013	Conduct summits for ECE and LEA literacy leadership teams and data teams	BD, DD, RSOs
June-July 2013	Conduct a two-day session with returning LEA and ECE teachers and administrators	BD, DD, RSOs
June-July 2013	Launch summer literacy academies based on Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model (MCLIM) for LEA sub-grantees (grades 4-12) during summer school or extended school year sessions (when students are present)	BD, DD, RSOs
June-July 2013	Conduct the summer literacy academies for new Pre-K-grade 3 LEA and ECE teachers and administrators	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2013	Meet with State Literacy Team and Committee of Practitioners	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2013	Using evaluation information, develop sustainability plan for SRCL activities	BD, DD
Projected Timeframe	**Year 3 Activities**	**Responsible Person**
Aug-Sept 2013	Conduct student screening assessment at LEA and ECE	DD, RSOs
Oct-Nov 2013	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits	RSOs

Dec 2013	Review second external evaluation report; meet with State Literacy Team, Committee of Practitioners, and MDE Leadership; submit report to USDE; and revise *METL*—the comprehensive state literacy plan	BD, DD, RSOs
Jan 2014	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct progress monitoring	RSOs
Feb 2014	Conduct online follow-up training (LEA and ECE flexibility)	BD, DD
Feb 2014	Conduct SRCL Conference	BD, DD, RSOs
March 2014	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits, prepare monitoring reports, and determine subgrantee continuation awards	BD, DD, RSOs
April – May 2014	Conduct spring technical assistance with LEA and ECE literacy leadership teams and data teams	BD, DD, RSOs
May 2014	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct outcome assessments	RSOs
June-July 2014	Conduct a two-day session with returning LEA and ECE teachers and administrators	BD, DD, RSOs
June-July 2014	Conduct the summer literacy academies for new LEA and ECE teachers and administrators	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2014	Meet with State Literacy Team and Committee of Practitioners	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2014	Using evaluation information, continue sustainability plan for SRCL activities	BD
Projected Timeframe	**Year 4 Activities**	**Responsible Person**
Aug – Sept 2014	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct student screening assessments	DD, RSOs
Oct–Nov 2014	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits	RSOs
Dec 2014	Review third external evaluation report; meet with State Literacy Team, Committee of Practitioners, and MDE Leadership; and submit report to USDE; and revise *METL*—the comprehensive state literacy plan.	BD, DD, RSOs
Jan 2015	Have ECEs and LEAs conduct progress monitoring	RSOs
Feb 2015	Conduct online follow-up training (LEAand ECE flexibility)	BD, DD
Feb 2015	Conduct SRCL Conference	BD, DD, RSOs
March 2015	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits, prepare monitoring reports, and determine subgrantee continuation awards	BD, DD, RSOs
April – May 2015	Conduct spring technical assistance with LEA and ECE literacy leadership teams and data teams	BD, DD, RSOs
May 2015	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct outcome assessments	RSO
June-July 2015	Conduct a two-day session with returning LEA and ECE teachers and administrators	BD, DD, RSOs
June-July 2015	Conduct the summer literacy academies for new LEA and ECE teachers and administrators	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2015	Meet with State Literacy Team and Committee of Practitioners	BD, DD, RSOs
July 2015	Using evaluation information, continue sustainability	BD

	plan for SRCL activities	
Projected Timeframe	**Year 5 Activities**	**Responsible Person**
Aug – Sept 2015	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct student screening assessments	DD, RSOs
Oct-Nov 2015	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits	RSOs
Dec 2015	Review fourth external evaluation report; meet with State Literacy Team, Committee of Practitioners, and MDE Leadership; submit report to USDE; and revise *METL*—the comprehensive state literacy plan	BD, DD, RSOs
Jan 2016	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct progress monitoring	RSOs
Feb 2016	Conduct online follow up training (LEA and ECE flexibility)	BD, DD
Feb 2016	Conduct SRCL Conference	BD, DD, RSOs
March 2016	Conduct LEA and ECE site visits and prepare monitoring reports	BD, DD, RSOs
April – May 2016	Conduct spring technical assistance with ECE and LEA literacy leadership teams and data teams	BD, DD, RSOs
May 2016	Have LEAs and ECEs conduct outcome assessments	RSOs
Sept - Dec 2016	Review final external evaluation report; meet with State Literacy Team, Committee of Practitioners, and MDE Leadership; submit report to USDE; and revise *METL*—the comprehensive state literacy plan	BD, DD, RSOs
December 2016	Using evaluation information, continue sustainability plan for SRCL activities	BD

(ii) Qualifications of key personnel

Dr. Lynn House serves as Deputy Superintendent for Instructional Enhancement and Internal Operations at the MDE. Dr. House was the Louisiana Board of Regents' Deputy Commissioner of Academic and Student Affairs. Her previous experience in Mississippi includes service as the Assistant Commissioner for Academic and Student Affairs for Mississippi's Public University System and work as a teacher, principal, and program director in the P-12 environment. She has 35 years of experience as an educator. In addition to her K-12 work, she has served as a college professor, program director, chair, and dean in both public and private university settings.

Trecina Green, director of Curriculum and Instruction, has experience working with federal grants and state initiatives such as the Mathematics Funds for the Improvement of Education,

Mathematics and Science Partnership, Reading First, Advanced Placement Incentive Program, Advanced Placement Test Fee, Foreign Language, Even Start, and Character Education. She has been with the SEA for nine years. Major state initiatives that she has worked with include curriculum framework revisions, Response to Intervention, Common Core State Standards, and development of the State Literacy Plan. She has been involved with providing oversight of professional development for teachers and school leaders.

The SRCL Bureau Director will be Dr. Angela Rutherford who is currently the Director of the Center for Excellence in Literacy Instruction and Associate Professor at the University of Mississippi. Dr. Rutherford has experience teaching at the K-12 level and higher education level, coordinating grant projects, supervising individuals within grant and other projects, managing budgets for grants, leading major curriculum revision efforts, and coordinating a graduate program and undergraduate courses. She serves as the Co-Chair of the MS Literacy Team; as a National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)/International Reading Association (IRA) Program Reviewer; as Chair of the NCATE Annual Report and Preconditions Committee; on the MS Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development; as Graduate Program Coordinator for the M.Ed. in Literacy Education; affiliate site director for Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS); as a regional trainer for the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL); and as a regional trainer for LETRS. She taught every grade throughout K-12 except first, second, and third. She provides literacy professional development for teachers and leaders throughout the state. She has co-authored an early literacy assessment book, authored and co-authored numerous research publications in peer reviewed journals, written several grants, and presented at regional,

national and international conferences on topics related to literacy education. She will devote 100% of her time to this project.

The Division Director and two Regional Service Officers will be hired after receiving the award. Qualifications for these positions will ensure strong literacy backgrounds and experience in coaching and management.

(iii) Diversity of perspectives in design and implementation of project, including families, teachers, ECE professionals, and other agencies

The SEA will ensure a diversity of perspectives in the design and implementation of the proposed project by collaborating with the State Literacy Team that developed the state literacy plan. Members of the SLT include LEA teachers and administrators, Institutions of Higher Education faculty, Community College faculty, Head Start representatives, and early childhood representatives. The SEA will collaborate with the MDE Title I Committee of Practitioners that reviews processes and updates of the Title I programs to ensure coordination between Title I and SRCL activities. Additional members will be added to the Committee of Practitioners to include ECE directors, other Head Start representatives, parents, and MS Library Commission representatives. Lastly, the SEA will work closely with the State Early Childhood Advisory Council (SECAC) to provide updates on the project and discuss how the objectives of the SRCL project fit with the goals of the SECAC. Other organizations that the MS SRCL project will provide with updates and discuss objectives are Reach Out and Read, Mississippi Center for Education and Innovation, Higher Education Literacy Council, and the MS Reading Association.

D. Adequacy of Resources

(i) Costs are reasonable in relation to objectives, design, and significance.

The proposed project is significant because it will provide the opportunity to implement components of the State Literacy Plan as discussed in Section A(i)(d). The SRCL grant opportunity will allow the MDE to pilot various *METL* action steps to determine impact and effectiveness to increase disadvantaged student achievement for the LEAs and ECE subgrantees to encourage a statewide, systematic effort to reach all disadvantaged students.

The costs described in the MS SRCL budget are reasonable in relation to the number of objectives and design and potential significance. The MDE will require that LEAs address a feeder pattern in the subgranting application process that is designed to provide services to a continuum of students within the grant project timeframe, rather than a fragmented, silo approach. The consistency of this design will also assist students with transitioning between ECE center sites, school sites, within grade bands, and across grade bands. [See the timeline in section C of the Project Narrative and see the Budget Narrative.]

The SEA will ensure that 95% of the funds are allocated to provide direct services for children. Eligible LEAs must have at least 60% of students considered high poverty (free or reduced lunch). In addition, the percentage of funds USDE for each budget category significantly increases teachers' and leaders' capacity to meet the needs of disadvantaged students, and provides educators with the tools they need to deliver data-driven, evidence-based instruction. Estimated percentages of the subgrantees' total budget allocated to each budget category are below.

a. Personnel. Literacy coaches at each school will provide the job-embedded professional development that is necessary to ensure fidelity of implementation. Teacher effectiveness is significantly increased when literacy coaches provide the support needed to build teacher capacity and confidence. (18% of budget)

b. Professional Development. Educators must continuously expand their professional learning. This proposal includes Summer Literacy Academies, Literacy Leadership Team and Data Team Summits, Tuition for Literacy Coach Master's Program, and Wireless Generation Assessment System. Instructional Materials will provide the professional learning that educators need to provide effective, evidence-based literacy instruction to meet the individual needs of disadvantaged students. (9% of budget)

Assessment Materials—In order to meet the needs of individual students, educators must assess in meaningful ways with valid and reliable instruments. (3% of budget)

Instructional Materials—Materials must address the instructional needs of students; be evidence-based; and be implemented with fidelity. Once core, supplemental, and intervention materials are purchased the first year of implementation, subgrantees will purchase technological tools, such as student i-Pads. (67% of budget)

Technology—To provide real-time data for educators to make data-driven decisions, Wireless Generation will be utilized. This system allows for immediate reporting of student progress so that educators can make judicious decisions about students' instructional needs. Each teacher will receive the hardware to administer, score, and generate reports for their students. (3% of budget)

(ii) Plan to ensure sub-grant funds are allocated: 15% to serve children birth through age five; 40% to serve students in kindergarten through grade five; 40% to serve students in middle and high school, through grade 12, including equitable distribution between middle and high schools

Mississippi's plan to ensure that subgrant funds are allocated according to the statute is to issue two requests for proposals (RFP) in the subgranting process. The first RFP requires eligible LEAs to write a proposal that addresses the appropriate distribution of funds - 40% to serve

students in kindergarten through grade five and 40% to serve students in middle and high school with equal distribution between the two. The second RFP will be issued for ECE providers once the LEA subgrantees are awarded. This RFP is specifically for ECE provider(s) to support participating ECE centers identified by the LEA in the LEA's grant proposal. The ECE sub-grantee(s) will be provided with 15% of the SRCL grant funds to serve Pre-K (age 3 and 4 year old) students. With this subgranting process, Mississippi ensures that 15% of the state's SRCL funds serve students Pre-K to age 5, that 40% of the state's SRCL funds serve kindergarten through grade 5, and that 40% of the state's SRCL funds serve middle and high school with equal distribution between the two.

In addition to the sub-granting process, the MDE has a protocol for monitoring all grant projects where the issuing office continuously checks the subgrantees' budget records to ensure that funds are spent in a timely fashion and according to the subgrantees' budget proposal. The subgrantees will receive training and TA on this monitoring protocol that includes budgets, timelines, and schedules.

At the end of each grant year, the SEA leadership team, State Literacy Team (SLT), and Committee of Practitioners will review the subgrantee progress reports. In this review, the SEA Leadership Team will determine continuation awards based upon recommendations from the SLT and the Committee of Practitioners. All LEA and ECE subgrantees must make sufficient progress in order to receive continuation funds. While conducting regularly scheduled site visits to subgrantees for monitoring and TA purposes, TA will be provided for projects that are not making sufficient progress toward reaching the annual targets of expending funds according to the SRCL statute guidelines and the MDE's subgranting process guidelines.

(iii) SEA will use grant to leverage other State and Federal funds to maximize impact and to develop plan for sustaining funding after end of the sub-grant.

The MDE is committed to the implementation of the state literacy plan, *METL*. Within *METL*, a new structure for literacy leadership is proposed to support and sustain the plan. The new structure requires that representatives from stakeholder groups (Governor, Legislators, IHEs, Private Foundations, Businesses, Community Organizations, etc.) form a partnership under the auspices of the MDE that is designed to sustain funding for *METL*. Dr. Tom Burnham and Dr. Lynn House will lead this effort, as well as Trecina Green and Dr. Angela Rutherford. As the evaluation data support that the Mississippi SRCL project is successful, the effort to expand *METL* activities to other LEAs and ECE centers not served by SRCL funding will increase using this unique literacy funding structure.

The Mississippi Legislature is committed to literacy as a priority for funding efforts. Recently in the dire economic state funding situation, the Legislature approved funds of two full-time, literacy positions. These two new positions (early childhood literacy and adolescent literacy) will assist in the MDE's literacy efforts with the hiring process beginning after July 1, 2011 (the beginning of Mississippi's fiscal operating year). In addition to approving these new positions, the Mississippi Legislature also funds a K-2 assessment for LEAs to assist with monitoring student progress toward reading on grade level by the end of grade three. In previous years, the Mississippi Legislature showed its commitment to literacy through the Mississippi Reading Sufficiency Act (RSA). As the SRCL project proves to be successful, the MDE will have the data to request funding from the Legislature, as well as other entities, to sustain and expand the MS SRCL project and to continue with the implementation of *METL*.

In addition to state funds, the MDE will use other funding mechanisms to provide professional development, materials, personnel, and technical assistance to LEAs and ECEs that do not receive SRCL funds. Subgrantees are required to address integrating funds to support the SRCL project during the subgranting process. The draft review rubric in Section B designates an indicator where applicants must show integration of other funding sources. The MDE will assist and support LEAs and ECE centers to utilize all funding sources by providing TA during the Literacy Leadership Teams summits and during other TA meetings. It is imperative that the MDE, its LEAs, and ECE centers, utilize all funding sources to maximize their resources.

(iv) Subgrants are of sufficient size to support and improve instruction for a significant number of students in high-need schools or ECE programs.

The sample school budget summary below provides evidence that the LEA subgrantees will have adequate resources to make a difference in the literacy achievement of disadvantaged students. The average estimated cost per student for the LEA subgrantees is $838.40 across five years.

Sample Annual Budget Summary for a School of approximately 400 students	**Year 1 LEA Mar 2012 July 2012**	**Year 2 LEA Aug 2012 July 2013**	**Year 3 LEA Aug 2013 July 2014**	**Year 4 LEA Aug 2014 July 2015**	**Year 5 LEA Aug 2015 July 2016**
Personnel - Literacy coach • Salary • Fringe benefits (29%)	Prorated $12,500 $3,625	 $50,000 $14,500	 $52,500 $15,225	 $55,125 $15,986	 $57,881 $16,786
Professional Development • Stipend $200 per day for 5 days of summer training ($1000 x 17 people) • Travel expenses to attend training ($500 x 19 people) • Literacy Coach Tuition	 $17,000 $9,500 $0	 $17,000 $9,500 $3,500	 $17,000 $9,500 $3,500	 $17,000 $9,500 $3,500	 $17,000 $9,500 $0
Assessment • Assessment materials ($20 per student x 400	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000

students)					
Instructional Materials • Approved Core program and ancillary materials (400 students)	$190,000 ($475 per student)	$150,000 ($375 per student)	$130,000 ($325 per student)	$104,800 $262 per student)	$94,000 ($235 per student)
• Approved supplementary materials (400 students)	$80,000 ($200 per student)	$80,000 ($200 per student)	$30,000 ($75 per student)	$30,000 ($75 per student)	$30,000 ($75 per student)
• Approved intervention materials (100 students)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)
• Language and text-rich materials (400 students)	$32,000 ($80 per student)	$32,000 ($80 per student)	$20,600 ($50.50/ student)	$16,000 ($40 per student)	$12,000 ($30 per student)
Technology: Wireless Generation (Grades K-6) and 7-12 Assessment System • Training (19 people x 2 days of summer training) Hardware ($1,000 x teachers)	$3,642 $17,000	$3,700 $5,000	$3,675 $5,000	$3,089 $0	$1,833 $0
Estimated Total (cost per student)	**$398,267 ($996)**	**$398,200 ($996)**	**$320,000 ($800)**	**$280,000 ($720)**	**$272,000 ($680)**

Using the same budget categories as above, the average estimated cost per student for the participating ECE centers is $1,227.20 per student across the five years. The higher average cost per student can be attributed to increased costs of assessment materials and instructional materials which are primarily consumable. The budget narrative provides itemized costs for the ECE provider for each project year.

Project Narrative

Other Narrative

Attachment 1:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1237-Indirect Cost Agreement.pdf**

Attachment 2:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1238-Angela Rutherford vita 5.5.11.pdf**

Attachment 3:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1239-Trecina Green Vita 5.5.11.pdf**

INDIRECT COST RATE AGREEMENT
STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

COPY

ORGANIZATION:

Mississippi State Department of Education
Post Office Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205-0771

DATE: August 26, 2010

AGREEMENT NO. 2010-101

FILING REFERENCE: This replaces previous Agreement No. 2009-205 dated November 9, 2009

The purpose of this Agreement is to establish indirect cost rates for use in awarding and managing of Federal contracts, grants, and other assistance arrangements to which Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 applies. The rates were negotiated by the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to the authority cited in Attachment A of OMB Circular A-87.

This agreement consists of four parts: Section I - Rates and Bases; Section II - Particulars; Section III - Special Remarks; and, Section IV -Approvals.

Section I - Rate(s) and Base(s)

	Effective Period				Coverage	
TYPE	From	To	Rate	Base	Location	Applicability
Fixed Programs	07-01-10	06-30-11	15.7%	1/	All	All

1/ Total direct cost less: capital expenditures, alterations, renovations, flow-through funds, and the portion of each sub-award in excess of $25,000.

Treatment of Fringe Benefits: Fringe benefits applicable to direct salaries and wages are treated as direct costs. However, in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87, Attachment B, Paragraph 8.d.(3), payments to separating employees for unused leave are treated as indirect costs and are not charged directly to federal programs.

Capitalization Policy: Non-consumable, non-expendable items with a minimum acquisition cost of $1,500 are capitalized and charged through depreciation.

Section II - Particulars

SCOPE: The indirect cost rate(s) contained herein are for use with grants, contracts, and other financial assistance agreements awarded by the Federal Government to the organization and subject to OMB Circular A-87.

LIMITATIONS: Application of the rate(s) contained in this agreement is subject to all statutory or administrative limitations on the use of funds, and payment of costs hereunder is subject to the availability of appropriations applicable to a given grant or contract. Acceptance of the rate(s) agreed to herein is predicated on the conditions: (A) that no costs other than those incurred by the State Education Agency were included in indirect cost pools as finally accepted, and that such costs are legal obligations of the State Education Agency and applicable under the governing cost principles; (B) that the same costs that have been treated as indirect costs are not claimed as direct costs; (C) that similar types of information which are provided by the State Education Agency, and which were used as a basis for acceptance of rates agreed to herein, are not subsequently found to be materially incomplete or inaccurate; and (D) that similar types of costs have accorded consistent accounting treatment.

ACCOUNTING CHANGES: Fixed or predetermined rates contained in this agreement are based on the accounting system in effect at the time the agreement was negotiated. When changes to the method of accounting for cost affect the amount of reimbursement resulting from the use of these rates, the changes will require the prior approval of the authorized representative of the cognizant negotiation agency. Such changes include, but are not limited to, changing a particular type of cost from an indirect to a direct charge. Failure to obtain such approval may result in subsequent cost disallowances.

FIXED RATE: The negotiated rate is based on an estimate of the costs which will be incurred during the period to which the rate applies. When the actual costs for such period have been determined, an adjustment will be made in a subsequent negotiation to compensate for the difference between the cost used to establish the fixed rate and the actual costs.

NOTIFICATION TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES: Copies of this document may be provided to other Federal agencies as a means of notifying them of the agreement contained herein.

AUDIT: If a rate in this Agreement contains amounts from a cost allocation plan, future audit adjustments which affect this cost allocation plan will be compensated for during the rate approval process of a subsequent year.

COPY

Section III - Special Remarks

1. This agreement is effective on the date of approval by the Federal Government.

2. Questions regarding this Agreement should be directed to the Negotiator.

3. Approval of the rates(s) contained herein does not establish acceptance of the Organization's total methodology for the computation of indirect cost rates for years other than the year(s) herein cited.

Section IV - Approvals

For the State Education Agency:

Mississippi State Department of Education
Post Office Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205-0771

Signature

Gracie J. Sanders
Name

Budget + Planning Director
Title

9/8/10
Date

For the Federal Government:

U.S. Department of Education
OCFO/FIPAO/ICG
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202-4450

Signature

Mary Gougisha
Name

Director, Indirect Cost Group
Title

August 26, 2010
Date

Mary Gougisha
Negotiator

(202) 245-8035
Telephone Number

RECEIVED
SEP - 8 2010
BUDGET OFFICE

Dr. Angela S. Rutherford

(b)(6)

Education

2003 Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama
Ph. D. in Reading Education

1993 University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi
M. Ed. In Educational Administration and Supervision

1988 University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi
B.S. in Elementary Education (K-8), Highest Honor Graduate

1983 Quitman High School, Quitman, Mississippi
Diploma

Professional Experience

Current
The University of Mississippi
Director, Center for Excellence in Literacy Instruction and Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, EDRD 615, EDEL 416, EDEL 417, EDRD 350, EDRD 500, EDRD 356, EDRD 400, EDSE 625, EDLT 602, EDLT 605, EDLT 606, EDLT 607, EDLT 608, EDLT 609

Mississippi University for Women
Assistant Professor of Reading, ED 361, ED 500, ED 534, & ED 527, 7/03 to 8/04.

Developmental and College Prep Reading teacher, Beauregard High School, Lee County Schools, Opelika, Alabama (served as administrative assistant principal for 3 years during one block period of academic day). 8/97 to 5/03.

Instructor, CTRD 571 & CTRD 6710 (Adjunct Position), Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, Spring Quarter 2000, Fall Semester 2000, Summer Semester 2001, and Fall Semester 2002

Fifth and Sixth-grade, Mathematics teacher, Sanford Middle School, Lee County Schools, Opelika, Alabama. 8/96 to 5/97.

Special Education/Learning Disabled teacher, Beauregard High School, Lee County Schools, Opelika, Alabama. 1/96 to 5/96.

Reading Instructor, RDNG 003 (Adjunct Position), Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, Louisiana. 8/95 to 12/95.

Student Athlete Academic Monitor, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. 9/94 to 7/95.

Eighth-grade Mathematics/History teacher, Opelika Middle School, Fourth-grade teacher, West Forest Intermediate, Opelika, Alabama (extended substitute). 9/94 to 6/95.

Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth-grade Mathematics teacher, Farmstead Junior High School, Jasper, Alabama. 11/93 to 6/94.

Seventh and Eighth-grade Mathematics teacher, Summer School Program, Hattiesburg High School, Hattiesburg Mississippi. 6/93 to 7/93.

Graduate Internship in Administration and Supervision, Dr. Ann Harsh, Early Childhood Coordinator, Hattiesburg, Mississippi. 1/93 to 5/93.

Seventh and Eighth-grade Mathematics teacher, Summer School Program, Hattiesburg High School, Hattiesburg, Mississippi. 1/92 to 7/92.

Seventh and Eighth-grade Chapter Mathematics teacher, Rowan Junior High, Hattiesburg, Mississippi. 8/91 to 5/92.

Seventh-grade Mathematics teacher, Summer School Program, Hattiesburg High School, Hattiesburg, Mississippi (Dropout Prevention). 6/91 to 7/91.

Kindergarten teacher, W.H. Jones Elementary School, Hattiesburg, Mississippi. 8/88 to 5/91.

Curriculum Development

Development of new Master's of Literacy Education Degree Program, The University of Mississippi

Development of Early Literacy Course (EDRD 355-6 hour course) and Development of Other Literacy Course (EDRD 400), The University of Mississippi

Revision of Master's Reading/Literacy Degree Program, Mississippi University For Women, 2004

Wrote Program Report for the Preparation of Reading Education Professionals, IRA/NCATE, Mississippi University For Women, 2004

Homestyle Learning Math Program for parents and students of three (K-4) centers, Hattiesburg Public School District, Internship

Administration and Supervision

Director, Center for Excellence in Literacy Instruction (CELI), The University of Mississippi, supervise 2 instructors and graduate assistants

Coordinator of Reading Education Courses at The University of Mississippi, 10-15 sections per semester and 6-10 instructors per semester

Supervised and evaluated student teachers/interns at The University of Mississippi and Mississippi University for Women

Duties as part-time assistant principal, Beauregard High School

Supervised practicum students from University of Southern Mississippi at W. H. Jones Elementary

Supervised kindergarten assistant teachers at W.H. Jones Elementary School

Grants Received

Center for Excellence in Literacy Instruction (with Dr. Tom Burnham), Hearin Foundation, Awarded Fall 2006. ($1.5 million)

Teacher Quality Grant. (cooperative with other faculty members) State of Mississippi Institutes of Higher Learning. Awarded 2006.

CISCO Systems (with Dr. Tom Burnham), ($29,000)

Delta Literacy Initiative Grant, US Congressional Grant, Awarded Fall 2005 ($233,200)

Teacher Quality Grant. (cooperative with other faculty members) State of Mississippi Institutes of Higher Learning. Awarded 2005.

Woodcock-Johnson III Diagnostic Reading Battery: Awarded 2004, The Woodcock-Munoz Foundation ($1500)

Reading for Enjoyment: Awarded 1999, ARISE Foundation ($500)

Recycling Grant: Awarded 1999 & 2000 for Beauregard High School, Weyerhaeuser Corporation ($2000 each year)

Language Development: Awarded 1991, South Central Bell ($500)

Science and Whole Language: Awarded 1990, Hattiesburg Area Education Foundation ($500)

Creative Dramatics: Awarded 1989, Hattiesburg Area Education Foundation ($500)

Other Grant Experiences

Teacher Quality Grant. (cooperative with other faculty members) State of Mississippi Institutes of Higher Learning, Institute for U.S. History Teachers, not awarded.

U.S. Department of Education, Striving Readers Grant, Fall 2005, Mississippi Striving Readers Project, approximately $19 million, not awarded

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Summer 2000, Auburn University, United States Department of Education, Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology Capacity Building Grant Program----"Building A Technology-Supported, Problem-Centered Teaching And Learning Curriculum For Preservice Teacher Education"

Teacher, January-May, 2000, Member of the Reading Education division of the above grant, Planning and implementing a problem-centered teaching and learning model unit in a reading classroom.

Committee Service

National Level

Chair, Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Co-Editor, *Affective Reading Education Journal*, sponsored by the Concern for Affect in Reading Education, Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association

Member, International Reading Association Professional Standards and Ethics Committee (invited)

Member, Special Program Review Team, International Reading Association and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

State Level

Co-Chair, Statewide Literacy Team, Mississippi Department of Education

Member, Mississippi Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development

Member, State Process Review Team: State of Mississippi Board of Education

Member, Mississippi Higher Education Literacy Council, State of Mississippi

School Level

Member, The University of Mississippi, Chancellor Inauguration Service Events Committee (2009-2010 only)

Member, The University of Mississippi, Task Force To Study Alternately Formatted Courses/Programs (2009-2010 only)

Member, The University of Mississippi, Judicial Council, Undergraduate Council

Member, The University of Mississippi, Athletic Committee (2008-2009 only)

Chair, Enrollment Committee, University of Mississippi; Co-Chair, Follow-up Graduate Survey Committee (NCATE)

Member, Faculty Enhancement; Faculty Recruiting and Retention; School of Education Resource Center; Academic Admissions, University of Mississippi; Member, Teacher Education Committee; Elementary Education Faculty Committee; Graduate Faculty Committee; Doctoral Admission Revision Committee University of Mississippi

Member, Faculty Library Advisory Committee; Teacher Education Faculty Committee; Graduation Education Faculty Committee Mississippi University for Women

Member, College of Education Core Advisory Group, Auburn University

Member, BBST Committee (student support team), Beauregard High School

Chairperson, Measures of Success Committee, Beauregard High School

Member, SACS Steering Committee, Beauregard High School

Member, School Improvement Council, Rowan Junior High School

Member, Discipline Committee, Rowan Junior High School

Member, Climate Committee, W.H. Jones Elementary School

Professional Presentations

Mott, M.S., Sumrall, W.J., Rutherford, A.R., Sumrall, K., & Vails, T. (2011). Designing Interactive Whiteboard and Response System Experiences, Creating Futures Through Technology Conference, March 2-4, Biloxi, Mississippi.

Brenner, D. & Rutherford, A. (Accepted but not presented, 2010). Changing preservice teachers' knowledge of phonics instruction: The complexities of implementing a statewide teacher education policy, American Educational Research Association, May 1, Denver, Colorado.

Rutherford, A. (2010). IRA/NCATE: A partnership for reading professional quality and performance. Institute Presentation, International Reading Association, April 25, Chicago, Illinois

Rutherford, A. (2009). IRA/NCATE: A partnership for reading professional quality and performance. Institute Presentation, International Reading Association, May 2, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Rutherford, A., Carter, L., & Chessin, D. (2009). Taking a stand on environmental issues. National Science Teachers Association, March 19, New Orleans, Louisiana

Rutherford, A. (2009). IRA/NCATE: A partnership for reading professional quality and performance. Institute Presentation, International Reading Association, February 22, Phoenix, Arizona

Rutherford, A., Lee, K., Love, F., Hillmer, T. (2009). Forging innovative partnerships to strengthen undergraduate literacy methods courses for impacting K-6 student learning. Conference Presentation, American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, February 8, Chicago, Illinois

Rutherford, A., Hillmer, T., Parker, A., Kramer, M., & Siebert, S. (2008). Promoting intrinsic reading: Implementing literature circles with intermediate-grade students and pre-service teachers. The Sixth International Conference on the Book, October 25, Washington, DC

Rutherford, A. (2008). Opportunities and tools for online learning. Presentation at Provost's Faculty Development Luncheon Workshop. The University of Mississippi, April 22, University, Mississippi

Rutherford, A. (2008). Utilizing private money to build and strengthen literacy education programs and to support literacy education in P-12 settings. Conference Presentation, American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, February 8, New Orleans, Louisiana

Rutherford, A. (2007). What do students really want? Conference Presentation at the Southwest International Reading Association Regional Conference, November 15, Little Rock, Arkansas

Raines, A. (2006). Content area literacy: Strategies for promoting student engagement. Conference Presentation at the Mississippi Department of Education Summer Conference, June 6, Oxford, Mississippi

Raines, A. (2006). Content area literacy strategies. South Tippah Schools, February 13, Ripley Mississippi

Raines, A. (2005). Let's ask the students: A study of high school students' instructional preferences for literacy works of art. Research Poster Session at International Reading Association Annual Conference, May 3, San Antonio, Texas.

Raines, A. (2005). What do students really want? Students' literary instructional preferences. Conference Presentation at the International Reading Association Annual Conference, May 3, San Antonio, Texas.

Raines, A. (2005). NCATE/IRA Program Review Institute. Panel Discussion at International Reading Association Annual Conference, May 1, San Antonio, Texas

Raines, A., Ferguson, B., Henke, K., & Pate, H. (2005). Comprehension instruction. Panola County Schools, April 11, Como, Mississippi.

Raines, A. (2005). Top ten comments overheard by beginning teachers about teaching reading. University of Mississippi, April 8, Oxford, Mississippi.

Raines, A. (2005). Reading comprehension strategies. Panola County Schools, February 10, Sardis, Mississippi.

Raines, A. (2005). Scientifically-based reading research: Programs and assessment. Mississippi Department of Education, February 9, Oxford, Mississippi.

Raines, A. (2004). Reading Comprehension strategies in grades 6-12. DeSoto County Schools, September 21, Hernando, Mississippi.

Raines, A. (2004). The magic of reading aloud. Presentation at Mississippi Early Childhood Conference (local chapter), January 19, Columbus, Mississippi.

Raines, A. (2003). The aesthetic stance: High school students choose a bridge to freedom when reading literary works of art. Presentation at the Alabama Reading Association Annual Conference, October 10, Montgomery, Alabama.

Brabham, E., Villaume, S., Hall, J., & Raines, A. (2001). For the love of reading: Jazz up engagements and enjoyment for expository texts with literature circles. Presentation and Microworkshop at the International Reading Association Annual Convention, May 1, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Villaume, S., Brabham, E., Brandt, S., Hall, J. Hines, K., & Raines, A. (2001). Spreading the magic of literature circles to informational texts. Presentation at the National Council for the Teachers of English Spring Conference, March 31, Birmingham, Alabama.

Brabham, E. Murray, B., & Raines, A. (2000). Launching probes for truth: A technology-supported, problem-centered mission to critical literacy. Presentation at the Alabama Reading Association Conference, October 12, Huntsville, Alabama.

Brabham, E., Villaume, S., Raines, A. & Warmack, W. (1999). Developing engaged stances: Teachers' transactions with research readings using a literature discussion group approach. Action Research presented at the Alabama Reading Association Conference, October 7, Birmingham, Alabama

Professional Conferences Attended

United States Department of Education Reading Institute, Anaheim, California, July 2010

Achieve, American Diploma Project Network: Supporting College-and-Career-Ready Graduation Requirements Convening, June 2010

International Reading Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois, April 2010

International Reading Association Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 2009

International Reading Association Conference, Phoenix, Arizona, February 2009

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, Illinois, February 2009

International Reading Association Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, May 2008

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 2008

College Reading Association Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 2007

International Reading Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois, May 2006

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, San Diego, California, January, 2006

International Reading Association Conference, San Antonio, Texas, May 2005

International Reading Association Conference, One-Day Institute for Writing/Reviewing IRA/NCATE Program Review, San Antonio, Texas, May 2005

Mississippi Department of Education, State Board of Examiners' Training Conference, June 2004 and December 2004

International Reading Conference, Reno, Nevada, May 2004

International Reading Conference, One-Day Institute for Writing NCATE Program Review, Reno, Nevada, May 2004

International Reading Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, May 2001

Mid-South Reading and Writing Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, 1999

Southern Early Childhood Association, Biloxi, Mississippi, 1993

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Nashville, Tennessee, 1992

Honors

2009-2010, Southeastern Conference Academic Consortium (SECAC) Academic Leadership Development Program Fellow

2007, Cambridge Who's Who Registry

2006, Outstanding Teacher of the Year, School of Education, University of Mississippi

2006, Nominee, Frist Faculty/Staff Service Award, University of Mississippi

2006, Invitation, Oxford Roundtable, Summer 2006, England (declined participation)

2005, Invitation, People to People Ambassador Programs, U.S.-China Joint Education Conference, Reading and Literacy Education Delegation (declined participation)

2000, Who's Who Among American High School Teachers

2001, Community Service Award, Lee County Schools

2001, Outstanding Achievement, Lee County Schools

1999, Creative/Innovative Award, Lee County Schools

Publications

Mott, M.S., Sumrall, W.J., Chessin, D., Rutherford, A.S., & Moore, V.J. (In Press). Assessing student scientific expression using media: The MESPR-Media enhanced science presentation rubric. *Journal of STEM Education: Innovations & Research.*

Mott, M.S., Sumrall, W.J., Rutherford, A.R., Sumrall, K., & Vails, T. (2010). "Lecture" with interaction in an adult science methods course-session: Designing interactive whiteboard and response system experiences. *Journal of Literacy and Technology, 11*(4). DOI: http://www.literacyandtechnology.org.

Mott, M. S. & Rutherford, A. S. (2010). *Assessment of Phonological Sensitivity*. Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.

Rutherford, A. & Mott, M. (2010). A call for change: Engaging students in Rosenblatt's aesthetic stance to promote lifelong reading. *Concern for Affect In Reading Education, 25*, 34-39.

Rutherford, A., Carter, L., Hillmer, T., Siebert, S., Kramer, M., & Parker, A. (2009). Promoting intrinsic reading: Implementing literature circles with intermediate-grade students and preservice teachers. *The International Journal of the Book, 6*, 43-49.

Rutherford, A., Carter, L., Wolff, L., & Blackwell, S. (2009). Student teachers' early literacy concepts. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 13*(1), 60-69.

Rutherford, A. (2009). Literacy opportunities: Encouraging and supporting independent reading. *The Mississippi Reading Journal, 8(*1), 14-17.

Raines, A., Brabham, E., & Aycock, A. (2007). High schools students' instructional preferences when reading literary works of art. *The Reading Matrix, 7*(2), 97-116.

Raines, A. & Holmes, K. (2007). Assisting students to adopt purposes for reading transactions to promote more meaningful comprehension and enjoyment. *Florida Reading Quarterly, 43*(3), 12-16.

Holmes, K. & **Raines, A**. (2006). Reading Comprehension: The neglected reading skill. *Florida Reading Quarterly, 42,* 10-15.

Oliphant-Ingham, R. & **Raines, A.** (2006). A brief history of civil rights through literature. *Mississippi Reading Journal, 6*(1), 10-14.

Raines, A. (2005). Louise Rosenblatt: An advocate for nurturing democratic participation through literary transaction. *Talking Points, 17*(1), 28-31.

Raines, A. (2004). Improving comprehension instruction: Rethinking research, theory, and classroom practice. [Review of the book]. *Childhood Education: Infancy Through Early Adolescence, 80(5*), 276-277.

Raines, A. & Brabham,E. (2002). Journeys Toward Understanding the Role of Gender in Literature Discussions. *WILLA: Journal for Women's Issues in Literacy and Life Assembly of the National Council of Teachers of English,11.*

Dissertation: The study was grounded in Louise Rosenblatt's Transactional Theory of the Literary Work of Art. Specifically, the study emphasizes her ideas involving the aesthetic and efferent stances readers take when transacting with a text. The purpose of this study was to determine which instructional method high school students actually prefer-a method promoting students to approach a literary work of art honoring an aesthetic stance or a method promoting students to approach a literary work of art honoring an efferent purpose. An additional purpose was to determine how readers' concepts of reading (the readers' own theory about reading) and how readers' attitudes toward reading (the readers' tendency to react or have a feeling or emotion) influence their instructional preference.

Professional Memberships

International Reading Association

Phi Delta Kappa

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

The National Council of English Teachers

TRECINA A. GREEN

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS:

- MDE Office of Curriculum and Instruction Bureau Director II
- MDE Office of Curriculum and Instruction Division Director II
- MDE Mathematics Curriculum Specialist
- Elementary Teacher
- Middle School Mathematics Teacher

EDUCATION:

1986-1990	Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi
1998-1999	Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi
1999-2000	Mississippi College, Clinton, Mississippi
2010-present	Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi

CERTIFICATION:

Secondary Education, Mathematics, Chemistry, and Biology

CURRENT POSITION:

2006 – Present **Bureau Director II**
Mississippi Department of Education
Office of Curriculum and Instruction
Jackson, Mississippi

Duties

- Provide direction in planning and coordinating the revision process of Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks.
- Provide technical assistance to local school districts on the usage of the Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks.
- Provide oversight of office programs involving advanced placement, gifted, visual & performing arts, foreign language, library media, mathematics, reading, early childhood, language arts, science, social studies, response to intervention, and textbooks.
- Provide technical assistance to local school districts on Cumulative Folders and Permanent Records.
- Coordinate the Advanced Placement Test Fee Grant, Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant, and Even Start Grant.
- Coordinate the Approved Courses for Secondary Schools Listing.
- Conduct curriculum audits.
- Prepare Request for Proposals (RFPs), grants for specified services, and contracts for various programs.

- Coordinate the developmental course and correspondence course process.
- Coordinate proposal review for various programs.
- Coordinate logistics for meetings.
- Recruit personnel, approve budgeting activities, and approve expenditures.
- Coordinate the development and implementation of training modules.

PREVIOUS EXERIENCE:

2003 – 2006 **Division Director II**
Mississippi Department of Education
Office of Curriculum and Instruction
Jackson, Mississippi

2001 – 2003 **Mathematics Specialist**
Mississippi Department of Education
Office of Curriculum and Instruction
Jackson, Mississippi

1999 – 2001 **Mathematics Teacher**
Jackson Public School District
Chastain Middle School
Jackson, Mississippi

1997 – 2001 **Consultant**
The Mathematical Connection Consulting Firm
Ridgeland, Mississippi

1996 – 1999 **Elementary Teacher**
Family Life Christian Academy
Brandon, Mississippi

1990 – 1991 **Teacher**
Jackson Public School District
Jackson, Mississippi

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Board Member, Mississippi Council of Teachers of Mathematics
Member and 2007 Conference Program Committee and *2009 Regional Conference Program Committee*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
Member, National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics
Member, Association of State Supervisors of Mathematics
Member, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Incorporated
Member, Mississippi Association for Gifted Children

Kindergarten Mathematics Process and Standards Chair, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards and Curriculum: A View from the Nation

Co-chair, Mississippi Department of Education's Mississippi Mathematics Leadership Summit
Co-chair, Mississippi Department of Education's 2nd Conference Celebrating Healthy Choices for Youth

National Conference Presenter, "*Mississippi Mathematics Assessment Tool of Benchmark Understanding (MATH-U)"*, National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 2004

Trainer, *"Mississippi Mathematics Instructional Intervention Supplement Beyond Benchmarks Training grades K-8"*
Trainer, "*Implementing Mathematics Using Technology and Emphasizing Literature (IMTEL) grades 6-8 Training"*
Trainer, *"Algebra I Instructional Intervention Guide Training"*
Trainer, "*K-8 Mississippi Mathematics Instruction Training"*
Trainer, "*Assistant Teacher Mathematics Training"*
Trainer, *"Integrating Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction Training"*
Trainer, "*Mississippi Mathematics Assessment Tool of Benchmark Understanding (MATH-U) Training"*

Presenter, "*Building Units of Study for Understanding Mathematics grades 6-8"*, Delta Rural Systemic Initiative, Mississippi Leadership Institute, Biloxi, MS, May 2001

Presenter, "*Mathematics Content Improvement Session grades 4-8"*
Presenter, "*Mathematics Content Improvement Session grades K-8"*
Presenter, "*Mathematics Content Improvement Session grades 6-12"*
Presenter, "*Jack and Jill Organization Summer Mathematics Camp grades 2-12"*
Presenter, "*Cumulative Folders and Permanent Records"*
Presenter, "*Teacher Support Teams Overview"*
Presenter, "Differentiated Instruction"
Presenter, "Library Media Guide Overview"
Presenter, "Common Core State Standards"
Presenter, "Response to Intervention"
Presenter, "Understanding by Design"

Assisted the Idaho Department of Education in developing the Idaho K-2 Mathematics Inventory Assessment Kit.

Mississippi Department of Education Publications:

2004 Mississippi Social Studies Framework and Guide
2004 Mississippi Business and Technology Framework
2006 Mississippi Physical Education Framework
2006 Mississippi Comprehensive Health Framework

Mississippi Gifted Education Program Standards 2004
Approved Courses for the Secondary Schools of Mississippi
Regulations for the Gifted Education Programs in Mississippi 2005
2007 Mississippi Mathematics Framework Revised
2009 Mississippi Foreign Language Framework
2010 Mississippi Science Framework
Textbook Adoption Handbooks Part A, Part AA, and Part B
2011 Mississippi Social Studies Framework
Response to Intervention Best Practices Handbook
Cumulative Folders and Permanent Records Manual of Directions
Mississippi Dyslexia Handbook

Budget Narrative

Budget Narrative

Attachment 1:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1236-MS SRCL Budget Narrative Final 5.5.11.pdf**

Part 5: Budget Narrative

The SRCL funding will support literacy instruction for individuals from Pre-K through grade 12 that is of uniformly high quality and of sufficient quantity to result in a measureable difference in literacy achievement among disadvantaged students. Mississippi's SRCL Budget Narrative provides a clear description of the funds requested, how the funds will be used to complete project tasks, and the relationship between the requested funds and the project goals and objectives. The information below is organized by the budget categories listed in the USDE suggested guidelines. First, the SEA budget is provided for each category. The contractual category includes activities that will be funded from the state's 5%. The contractual category also includes amounts for subgranting 15% to support early childhood activities, 40% to support elementary grades K-5 activities, and 40% to support secondary grades 6-12 activities. After the SEA budget information, the LEA sub-grantee budget information is indicated with supporting details. The ECE Provider sub-grantee information is provided with supporting details after the LEA sub-grantee information.

1) Personnel

Relationship Between Goals of Mississippi SRCL Project

Four full time positions have been established for the MS SRCL project. The position titles are SRCL Bureau Director (BD), SRCL Division Director (DD), and two SRCL Regional Service Officer (RSOs). Each person serving in these positions will devote 100% of their time to the project. These positions are necessary to the success of the project to provide support to the sub-grantees and to provide leadership at the MDE. A description of each position is indicated below.

The SRCL BD duties include, but are not limited to, the following. The BD is responsible for the overall direction, coordination, implementation, execution, control, and completion of the SRCL project to ensure consistency with the MDE and SRCL goals. This includes fiscal and personnel management of the project. The role of the BD is to direct the sub-grantee application processes, oversee the development of the professional learning activities, approve and provide guidance to key consultants, review the sub-grantee reports, analyze all data, adhere to the timelines, and monitor the implementation of the project. The SRCL BD must meet regularly with the director of the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the deputy state superintendent of Instructional Enhancement and Internal Operations. The BD is important to project success because the BD is ultimately responsible for the entire project. The project must have leadership to ensure that project deliverables occur in the designated timeline.

The duties of the SRCL DD include, but are not limited to, the following. The DD provides technical assistance to sub-grantees, conducts regional meetings and webinars, conducts sub-grantee monitoring site visits, and performs functions assigned by the SRCL BD to assist the BD in implementing the SRCL grant project. The DD is important to project success because the BD must have a person who is able to make decisions consistent with the project goals when the BD is unavailable. The DD is important because this position serves as the liaison between the MDE and all sub-grantees.

The duties of the two SRCL RSOs include, but are not limited to, the following. The RSOs must attend all professional development sessions, work with the SRCL sub-grantee literacy coaches, and provide on-site technical assistance with budgets and purchases of instructional and intervention materials. The RSOs will also provide assistance with the

assessment system, data analysis, and instructional practices. The RSOs must also provide demonstration teaching for sub-grantee sites. The RSOs are <u>important</u> to the project's success because they will be directly involved with the sub-grantees to ensure that all project activities are implemented with fidelity. The RSOs are also important because they will be the face of the grant project at the LEA sub-grantee sites. They will be a huge asset in building and facilitating relationships at the sites.

The salary for each position is indicated in the table below. The salary estimates are based on the salary level of each respective position under the State Personnel Board in the state of Mississippi.

Personnel	**Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012**	**Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013**	**Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014**	**Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015**	**Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016**
SRCL BD	Prorated				
• Salary	$53,970	$71,960	$71,960	$71,960	$71,960
• Fringe benefits (29%)	$15,651	$20,868	$20,868	$20,868	$20,868
SRCL DD	Prorated				
• Salary	$33,866	$45,154	$45,154	$45,154	$45,154
• Fringe benefits (29%)	$9,821	$13,095	$13,095	$13,095	$13,095
SRCL RSO	Prorated				
• Salary	$29,330	$39,107	$39,107	$39,107	$39,107
• Fringe benefits (29%)	$8,506	$11,341	$11,341	$11,341	$11,341
SRCL RSO	Prorated				
• Salary	$29,330	$39,107	$39,107	$39,107	$39,107
• Fringe benefits (29%)	$8,506	$11,341	$11,341	$11,341	$11,341
Total (Salary and Fringe)	$188,980	$251,973	$251,973	$251,973	$251,973
Five-Year Total (Salary +Fringe)	**$1,196,872**				

<u>2) Fringe Benefits</u>

The salary is based on state salary scale for the indicated position. The percentage for fringe is 29%. Please see the table in the Personnel section for fringe benefit amounts for each year. The total fringe for all five years is **$269,064.**

3) Travel

Relationship Between Goals of Mississippi SRCL Project

The table on page 10 of the Budget Narrative indicates the travel that will be required of SEA staff working with the MS SRCL project to do the following.

1. Technical assistance to the potential applicants during the RFP process
    - Purpose: To provide technical assistance to potential applicants during the state sub-granting process and to assist potential applicants with meeting sub-grant requirements.
    - Relationship to Project Success: The SRCL project seeks applicants with the capacity to ensure project success. It is vital to provide applicants with a thorough understanding of the sub-grantee requirements so that they realize the expectations and goals of the project.
    - Alignment with Goals: The proposed travel aligns with all goals indicated within the application. In order to be successful, applicants must understand the sub-grant requirements, project goals and expectations, and the sub-grant review process.
    - Potential Participants: SRCL BD, DD, RSOs.
        - Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant's Home to 3 locations within the state (north, south, and central sites)
        - Estimated Number of Trips: Three trips will be made (1 to each site) during year 1 of the project. Two people may ride together.
        - Cost Per Trip: $300 X 3 people = $900 X3 = **$2,700 total**
2. Site visits to interview potential awardees

- Purpose: To ensure commitment and capacity of potential sub-grant awardees.
- Relationship to Project Success: The SRCL project seeks to ensure that potential awardees have full commitment from faculty, staff, and leadership, as well as from identified ECE centers and various stakeholder groups (parents, community, business, etc.). Commitment is vital to the success of the project.
- Alignment with Goals: This proposed travel aligns with all goals of the project. In order to be successful, potential awardees must show commitment to the SRCL project and that they have communicated to all stakeholders.
- Potential Participants: SRCL BD, DD, RSOs
- Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant's Home to 25 sites across the state
- Estimated Number of Trips: 25 during year 1
- Cost Per Trip: $300 X 25 trips = **$7,500 total**

3. Fall and spring sub-grantee site visits
   - Purpose: To monitor sub-grantee progress and provide technical assistance
   - Relationship to Project Success: The SRCL project will continuously monitor sub-grantee progress in meeting SRCL goals. Site visits provide personal contact for face-to-face, individualized observations of and meetings with participating ECE center, ECE provider, and LEA sub-grantees.
   - Alignment with Goals: This proposed travel aligns with all goals of the project. In order to be successful, both project monitoring and technical assistance are imperative.
   - Potential Participants: SRCL BD, DD, RSOs

- Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant's Home to approximately 20 sites across the state
- Estimated Number of Trips: 2 people per 20 sites at 2 times per year = 80 trips per year
- Cost Per Trip: $300 = $24,000 total each year for years 2-5 of the project
- **Four year total: $96,000**

4. RSO Site Visits
   - Purpose: To provide technical assistance and monitor site implementation
   - Relationship to Project Success: Targeted technical assistance trips to sub-grantee sites will be based on sub-grantee assessment and evaluation data. SRCL staff will determine strengths and weaknesses for sub-grantees and will provide support to improve the challenging areas. Sub-grantees must have the support and professional development necessary to meet SRCL goals.
   - Alignment with Goals: The SRCL project seeks to provide support to all sub-grantees in order to meet all SRCL goals. The targeted technical assistance provides an opportunity for SRCL staff to bolster the success of all of the SRCL goals.
   - Potential Participants: RSOs
   - Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant's Home to 20 sites across the state
   - Estimated Number of Trips: 20 visits during year 1; 160 visits each year during years 2-5
   - Cost Per Trip: $300 = $6000 for year 1 and $48,000 for years 2-5
   - **Five Year Total: $198,000**

5. Sub-grantee professional development sessions during the summer

   - Purpose: To attend professional development sessions designed for sub-grantees (i.e., Summer Literacy Academies for Pre-K-grade 12 teachers and Pre-K- grade12 leaders, Literacy Leadership Team Summits, Data Team Summits)
   - Relationship to Project Success: In order for the SRCL project to be successful, the SRCL staff housed at the MDE will need to fully understand the content of the professional development sessions in which the sub-grantees participate. SRCL staff must be engaged with sub-grantees during all professional development activities to ensure implementation with fidelity. Project staff will not attend every session, but will attend at least one session at each site.
   - Alignment with Goals: This proposed travel aligns with all goals of the project. SRCL staff must be experts on the professional development topics in order to ensure sub-grantee implementation.
   - Potential Participants: SRCL BD, DD, RSOs
   - Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant Home to 3 locations within the state
   - Estimated Number of Trips: 3 trips each year per 4 people = 12 trips per year during years 1-3 of the project
   - Cost Per Trip: $1,000 = $12,000 total
   - **Three Year Total: $36,000**

6. National and/or regional conferences required by the United States Department of Education (USDE)
    - Purpose: To attend national and/or regional conferences as required by USDE or as deemed appropriate
    - Relationship to Project Success: To ensure project success, SRCL staff must also attend professional development activities. National and regional conferences provide the venue to learn about of new research and evidence-based instructional techniques. This kind of professional development allows SRCL staff to provide more up-to-date technical assistance and professional development to SRCL sub-grantees.
    - Alignment with Goals: This proposed travel, in particular, aligns with the professional development goal, but it can benefit all project goals.
    - Potential Participants: SRCL BD, DD, RSOs
    - Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant's Home to various locations across the nation
    - Estimated Number of Trips: 1 trip per year per 4 people = 4 trips
    - Cost Per Trip: $2500 per trip = $7500 total Cost per year is indicated in page _ of the budget narrative
    - **Five Year Total: $47,500**
7. State conferences and/or stakeholder meetings
    - Purpose: To attend meetings (i.e., MS Association of School Superintendents, MS Reading Association, MS Association of School Administrators, MS Early Childhood Summit, MS Head Start Collaborative Conference, and the Higher Education Literacy

Council Conference) across the state to present information related to SRCL progress and success

- Relationship to Project Success: In order to build stakeholder support, facilitate project sustainability, and increase future funding opportunities, it is essential to present information to stakeholder groups across the state.
- Alignment with Goals: This proposed travel also aligns with all goals of the project.
- Potential Participants: SRCL BD, DD, RSOs
- Origin and Destination: Jackson, MS or Participant's Home to various locations within the state
- Estimated Number of Trips: 4 people x 3 trips = 12 trips per year
- Cost Per Trip: $500 = $6000 per year
- **Five Year Total: $30,000**

Basis For Cost Estimates and Computation for Travel

Travel policies are established for use by individuals who are required to travel in-state and out-of-state on official Mississippi Department of Education government business. Travel policies are based on the guidelines established by the Mississippi Department of Finance and Administration. Currently, mileage is reimbursed at $.51 per mile. For MDE personnel, the point of origin will always be from the Mississippi Department of Education or from the staff person's home address and the destination will always be the site of the LEA, ECE center, or training facility. The current standard meal reimbursement rate is $31 per day, with $41 per day in high-cost areas.

The table below provides the estimated costs for SEA travel each year.

Travel for SEA Staff	Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012	Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013	Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014	Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015	Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016
Application TA Regional Sites	$2,700	0	0	0	0
Site School Visit to Interview Potential Awardees	$7,500	0	0	0	0
Sub-grantee Fall Onsite Visits	0	$12,000 40 trips @ $300	$12,000 40 trips @ $300	$12,000 40 trips @ $300	$12,000 40 trips @ $300
Sub-grantee Spring Onsite Visits	0	$12,000 40 trips @ $300	$12,000 40 trips @ $300	$12,000 40 trips @ $300	$12,000 40 trips @ $300
RSO Site Visits	$6000 20 visits @ $300	$48,000 160 visits @ $300	$48,000 160 visits @ $300	$48,000 160 visits @ $300	$48,000 160 visits @ $300
Summer Literacy Academies	$12,000	$12,000	0	0	0
Summer Literacy Leadership and Data Team Summits	0	0	$12,000	0	0
National/Regional Conferences	$7,500	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
State Conferences	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000
Total Per Year	$41,700	$100,000	$100,000	$88,000	$88,000
Five-Year Total	**$417,700**				

4) Equipment

Relationship Between Goals of Mississippi SRCL Project

Equipment to be purchased includes the following.

1. Laptop Computers: Laptop computers or notebooks are essential to the success of the project as SRCL staff provide technical assistance and professional development at sites across the state. The mobility provided by laptop computers or notebooks is key to project staff.
2. LCD Projectors: The projectors will be utilized in professional development sessions and in various meetings where SRCL staff members are presenting information to various stakeholder groups.

3. Desktop Computers: Desktop computers are important for the BD and the DD. The BD and DD will need access to various MDE databases which are only accessed via the MDE server.
4. Printer: The new SRCL office will need one printer for centralized printing needs. Various reports, publications, presentations, etc., will be printed for dissemination to multiple audiences.
5. Office Furniture: The new SRCL staff will need furniture to establish an office in the MDE building.

Basis of Cost Estimates

The basis of cost estimates was secured from the Office of Accounting at the MDE using state guidelines. The table below provides the estimated costs for equipment.

Equipment for SEA Staff	Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012	Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013	Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014	Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015	Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016
Laptop computers for four new employees and trainings ($1,350 each)	$5,400	0	0	0	0
Four LCD projectors for trainings ($2,000 each)	$8,000	0	0	0	0
Desktop computers for two new employees ($1,200 each)	$2,400	0	0	0	0
Printer for SRCL Staff Office	$3,000	0	0	0	0
Desk for 4 stations ($1,000 each)	$4,000	0	0	0	0
Total	**$22,800**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

5) Supplies

Relationship Between Goals of Mississippi SRCL Project

1. Office Supplies: In order to function effectively, adequate office supplies are important.

   Paper, toner, pens, paper clips, folders, chart paper, markers, etc., are important to the

success of the project to provide an organized and efficient office environment. In addition, office supplies are necessary to complete professional development tasks and present information at various conferences and meetings related to the SRCL activities.

2. External Hard Drives: This supply will provide the capacity to back-up important electronic data and files. To maintain office efficiency, staff must back-up electronic materials in the case of computer crashes, environmental hazards, etc.
3. Thumb Drives: In order to provide data and electronic files, staff and sub-grantees will need to have thumb drives for adequate efficiency.
4. Instructional Materials: These materials include supplies that are necessary to deliver adequate professional development and training, as well as professional development for SRCL staff. Staff will need to be able to purchase research-based books that contribute to professional growth.

Basis of Cost Estimates: The basis of cost estimates for operating an office with 4 staff members was secured from the Office of Accounting at the MDE using state guidelines. The table below provides the estimated costs for supplies.

Supplies for SEA Staff	**Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012**	**Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013**	**Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014**	**Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015**	**Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016**
Office Supplies, External Hard Drives, External Thumb Drives, and Instructional Materials	$21,000	0	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
Five-Year Total	**$36,000**				

6) Contractual

Relationship Between Goals of Mississippi SRCL Project

1. LEA Sub-grant (See pages 28-30 for full detail of each line item.)
    - Purpose and Relationship to Success: The purpose of the LEA sub-grant is to fulfill the requirements of the USDE application guidelines. The sub-granting process is the foundation of the project's success.
    - Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: The LEAs will complete the sub-granting process and be awarded a grant for specified services to participate in the Mississippi SRCL project.
    - Contractor and Cost: Eligible LEAs with 60% free and reduced lunch enrollment rate will be eligible to apply for the competition. Once reviewed, potential awardees will be interviewed and will have site visits before the grant is awarded. The Mississippi State Board of Education will approve the recommended awardees, and upon Board approval, the awardees will be named. Cost for each year is indicated in the table on pages 29-30 of the budget narrative.
    - Justification if contractor named: N/A
    - Amount of time: 5 years
    - **Five Year Total: $100,588,000**
2. ECE Provider Sub-grant (See pages 31-33 for full detail of each line item.)
    - Purpose and Relationship to Success: The purpose of the ECE sub-grant is to fulfill the requirements of the USDE application guidelines. The sub-granting process is the foundation of the project's success.

- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: The ECE provider(s) will complete the sub-granting process and be awarded a contract to serve the ECE centers identified to participate in the Mississippi SRCL project.
- Contractor and Cost: Eligible ECE provider(s) must be non-profit organizations willing to work with participating ECE centers identified by the LEA. Once applications are reviewed, potential awardee(s) will be interviewed before the contract is awarded. The Mississippi State Board of Education will approve the recommended awardee(s), and upon Board approval, the awardee(s) will be named. Cost for each year is indicated on pages 32-33 of the budget narrative.
- Justification if contractor named: N/A
- Amount of time: 5 years
- **Five Year Total: $18,860,250**

3. External Evaluator
   - Purpose and Relationship to Success: An independent evaluator will conduct a yearly evaluation. This will ensure that the evaluation process is fair and objective with valid and reliable information. The evaluation plan will provide data to make comparisons between the different LEA and participating ECE centers by utilizing a matched-school design (ensuring excellent implementation data) to determine which sub-grantees' components (programs, materials, extended school year, etc.) are most effective with Mississippi's high poverty student population. **The evaluation will use methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate** to the objectives of the proposed project. The evaluation focuses on four broad goals of the project: (a) increasing literacy performance of students K-12; (b) increasing language

development and literacy readiness skills of children from Pre-K through age 5; (c) improving literacy instruction that results in teachers acquiring a high level of knowledge and expertise in implementing effective evidence-based literacy instruction; and (d) building capacity in schools and early childhood centers to ensure that the quality of literacy instruction and level of student performance continues to improve beyond the duration of the grant. The evaluation calls for a variety of both quantitative and qualitative methods to address the major research questions. Data sources will include student assessments and outcome measures, participant attendance and feedback of professional development activities, observations of instructional practices to assure fidelity of use, surveys to confirm level of implementation, and interviews and focus groups to obtain perceptions of project effectiveness.

- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Services include writing the independent evaluation with a product of a yearly project evaluation report and a final evaluation at the end of the project.
- Contractor and Cost: Contractor will be identified through the RFP process. Cost for each year is indicated on page 23 of the budget narrative.
    - Justification if contractor named: N/A
    - Amount of time: 5 years
    - **Five Year Total: $642,000**

4. Summer Literacy Academy Development (Pre-K-grade 3)
    - Purpose and Relationship to Success: The focus of this academy is to ensure common and coherent evidence-based content knowledge aligned with the

Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model. All teachers and leaders will use the same "language", thus enabling more accurate communication related to literacy instruction and meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. To allow for modeling evidence-based practices, these academies will be held during summer school or extended school year sessions where students are present.

- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Professional Development Modules and Training of the Trainer Sessions
  - Contractor and Cost: RMC Research Corporation, $98,000
  - Justification if contractor named: RMC Research Corporation has developed professional training, served as technical assistance providers, written various reports, etc., at the national and state level. This organization has a long history of creating quality professional development modules that follow the evidence base. Mississippi is confident in the contractor to deliver an exemplary product.
  - Amount of time: 1 year

5. Summer Literacy Academy Development (Grades 4-12 ELA and Content Area)
   - Purpose and Relationship to Success: The focus of this academy is to ensure common and coherent evidence-based content knowledge aligned with the Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model. All teachers and leaders will use the same "language", thus enabling more accurate communication related to literacy instruction and meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. To allow for modeling evidence-based practices, this academy will be held during summer school or extended school year sessions where students are present.

- Products to be acquired or Professional services to be provided: Professional Development Modules and Training of the Trainer Sessions
- Contractor and Cost: RMC Research Corporation, $98,000
- Justification if contractor named: RMC Research Corporation has developed professional training, served as technical assistance providers, written various reports, etc., at the national and state level. This organization has a long history of creating quality professional development modules that follow the evidence base. Mississippi is confident in the contractor to deliver an exemplary product.
- Amount of time: 1 year

6. Literacy Leadership Team (Pre-K-grade 12) and Data Team (Pre-K-grade 12) Summit Development
   - Purpose and Relationship to Success: The focus of these summits is to ensure that these teams have the knowledge and capacity to lead the LEA and school effort for instructional improvement in literacy. The leadership team summit will focus on key aspects of leading district and school efforts according to the Mississippi Comprehensive Literacy Instructional Model. The data team summit will focus on using all data to make district and school instructional decisions. Building a culture of data-driven decision-making is imperative to instructional improvements that meet the needs of disadvantaged students.
   - Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Professional Development Modules and Training of the Trainer Sessions
   - Contractor and Cost: RMC Research Corporation, $50,000

- Justification if contractor named: RMC Research Corporation has developed professional training, served as technical assistance providers, written various reports, etc., at the national and state level. This organization has a long history of creating quality professional development modules that follow the evidence base. Mississippi is confident in the contractor to deliver an exemplary product.
- Amount of time: 1 year

7. Mentoring Program Development for ECE center directors and Pre-K-grade 12 school leaders
   - Purpose and Relationship to Success: The focus of the mentoring program is to provide individual support to the leaders of these educational entities. Leadership is foundational to instructional improvement in order to effectively meet the needs of disadvantaged students.
   - Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Professional Development Modules and Training of the Trainer Sessions
   - Contractor and Cost: RMC Research Corporation, $48,000 for development of initial training during Year 3 and $28,000 for follow-up training development for Year 4
   - Justification if contractor named: RMC Research Corporation has developed professional training, served as technical assistance providers, written various reports, etc., at the national and state level. This organization has a long history of creating quality professional development modules that follow the evidence base. Mississippi is confident in the contractor to deliver an exemplary product.
   - Amount of time: 1 year for initial training and 1 year for follow-up training
   - **Total Amount: $76,000**

8. Professional Development Presenters

   - Purpose and Relationship to Success: Professional development is key to the goals of the plan. Building the capacity of teachers and leaders is pivotal to effectively addressing the instructional needs of disadvantaged students. The presenters will be trained and evaluated on content knowledge and presentation skills prior to delivering the professional development to sub-grantees.
   - Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Serve as trainers for the professional development sessions provided by the state for sub-grantees
   - Contractor and Cost: Contractors are not named. Cost is $1,000 per day which includes travel. Cost for each year is indicated in the table on page 23 of the budget narrative
   - Justification if contractor named: N/A
   - Amount of time: 4 Years
   - **Four year total: $156,000**

9. Wireless Generation Presenters

   - Purpose and Relationship to Success: Professional development is key to the goals of the technology-based instructional improvement system. Building the capacity of teachers and leaders is pivotal to effectively addressing the assessment and instructional needs of disadvantaged students.
   - Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Trainers for professional development sessions provided by the state for sub-grantees

- Contractor and Cost: Wireless Generation. Cost for each year is indicated in the table on page 23 of the budget narrative.
- Justification if contractor named: Wireless Generation has a cost effective assessments and instructional improvement system that is based upon rigorous research.
- Amount of time: Two days per site during each summer
- **Five Year Total: $316,500**

10. Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs)

- Purpose and Relationship to Success: The RESAs will facilitate the professional development sessions across the state. There are 6 RESAs in the state that can serve as logistical managers of these sessions. RESA facilitation of the professional development sessions allows the MDE SRCL staff, as well as contracted presenters, to concentrate on presentation tasks.
- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Professional service to be provided is handling all meeting logistics (i.e., facility, registration, meals, CEUs for teachers, School Executive Management Institute (SEMIs) credits for administrators, etc.)
- Contractor and Cost: RESAs; cost for each year is indicated on the table on page 23 of the budget narrative.
- Justification if contractor named: The RESAs are the mechanism in the state that the MDE uses for handling logistics and facilitating meetings for educators.
- Amount of time: 5 years
- **Five Year Total: $1,386,600**

11. Mentoring Program for ECE center directors and Pre-K-grade 12 school leaders

- Purpose and Relationship to Success: The focus of the mentoring program is to provide individual support to the leaders of these educational entities. Leadership is foundational to instructional improvement in order to effectively meet the needs of disadvantaged students.
- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Mentoring at 1 feeder district site once per semester during Years 3 and 4 of the project
- Contractor and Cost: Contractors are not named; Cost is $40,000 per year to cover 20 mentors at $1,000 per day.
- Justification if contractor named: N/A
- Amount of time: 2 days during year 4 and 2 days during year 5 of the project
- **Two Year Total: $80,000**

12. Mississippi SRCL Conference

- Purpose and Relationship to Success: To provide a national perspective related to literacy research and practice, the MDE will host a Mississippi SRCL conference. The conference will provide another avenue for quality, effective professional development that aligns with the goals of the SRLC project. Invited keynote speakers (i.e., Ray Reutzel, Cathy Grace, Louisa Moats, Tim Shanahan, Maureen McLaughlin, etc.) and session presenters will provide more evidence-based professional learning to SRCL sub-grantees.
- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Conference logistics and facilitation

- Contractor and Cost: Contractor is not named. Cost for each year is indicated on page 24 of the budget narrative
- Justification if contractor named: N/A
- Amount of time: 3 years beginning with year 3.
- **Three Year Total: $120,000**

13. Reviewers for Proposal Evaluations

- Purpose and Relationship to Success: The SEA will use the RFP process for the LEA subgrant competition, ECE provider subgrant competition, and the external evaluator competition. A review committee will be trained on the components of each RFP so that proposals may be evaluated.
- Products to be acquired or Professional Services to be provided: Serve as reviewers for the proposal review of LEA applications, ECE provider applications, and external evaluator applications.
- Contractor and Cost: Contractors are not named. Twenty-seven reviewers are anticipated. Cost is $500 per day which includes travel.
- Justification if contractor named: N/A
- Amount of time: 1 Year
- **Total $13,500**

34 CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.46 and Part 80.36 have been followed for the Mississippi SRCL Grant proposal.

Basis of Cost Estimates

The basis of cost estimates was secured from the Office of Accounting at the MDE using state guidelines. The MDE procurement guidelines must be followed for contracting with vendors and individuals. The table below shows the breakdown for the contractual category.

Contractual	Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012	Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013	Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014	Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015	Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016
LEA Sub-grant (Begins March 2012)	$23,896,000	$23,892,000	$19,200,000	$17,280,000	$16,320,000
ECE Provider Sub-grant (Begins May 2012)	$4,480,500	$4,479,750	$3,600,000	$3,240,000	$3,060,000
External Evaluator	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000	$125,000	$175,000
Development of summer literacy academy (Pre-K-grade 3)	$98,000	0	0	0	0
Development of summer literacy academy LEAs grades 4-12 (ELA and Content Area)	0	$98,000	0	0	0
Development of leadership team and data team summits	0	0	$50,000	0	0
Mentoring program development for mentors of school leaders and ECE directors	0	0	$48,000 (initial training)	$28,000 (follow-up training)	0
Professional Development Presenter Costs (all summer academies)	$36,000 (6 sites x 3 days x 2 presenters = 36 days at $1,000	$36,000 (6 sites x 3 days x 2 presenters = 36 days at $1,000	$48,000 (6 sites x 4 days x 2 presenters = 48 days at $1,000	$36,000 (6 sites x 3 days x 2 presenters = 36 days at $1,000	0
Wireless Generation	$136,500	$100,000	$30,000	$25,000	$25,000
RESA facilitation	$430,800	$430,800	$225,000	$150,000	$150,000

Mentors for ECE Directors and Principals (20 Mentors)	0	0	0	$40,000	$40,000
MS SRCL Conference	0	0	$35,000	$35,000	$50,000
Reviewers for evaluating Proposals	$13,500	0	0	0	0
Total	$29,205,300	$29,150,550	$23,350,000	$20,959,000	$19,820,000
Five-Year Total	**$122,370,850**				

7) Construction

Not Applicable—No costs

8) Other

Relationship Between Goals of Mississippi SRCL Project

1. Printing, Orientation Notebooks, Summer Literacy Academy Notebooks, Literacy Leadership and Data Team Notebooks, Mentoring Notebooks
    - Cost: The notebooks will average about $75 per notebook depending on the length of the training.
    - Purpose and Relation to Success: The training notebooks coincide with the professional development sessions required by the SRCL project. All participants must have access to materials during and following the training sessions.
    - **Five Year Total for Printing: $529,800**
2. Meetings Conducted at MDE
    - Cost: These meetings will average $ 1,000 per meeting. Cost for each year is indicated in the table on page 26 of the budget narrative.
    - Purpose and Relation to Success: Meetings with proposal reviewers, the State Literacy Team, SRCL Committee of Practitioners, and other stakeholder groups, as

well as sub-grantees will be conducted at the MDE building. These meetings will require various provisions, such as food, beverage, etc. These stakeholder groups are involved in continuous project improvement and evaluation which are imperative for project success.

- **Five Year Total: $12,000**

3. Communication Materials
   - Cost: Cost includes yearly reports, public broadcasting techniques, and other tools to disseminate SRCL messages and publications. Cost for each year is indicated in the table on page 26 of the budget narrative.
   - Purpose and Relation to Success: Communication materials for different stakeholder groups are important to ensure that the progress of the Mississippi SRCL project is being properly communicated throughout the state, region, and nation.
   - **Three Year Total: $75,000**
4. Trainer of the Trainers (ToT) Meeting at MDE
   - Cost: Cost includes food, travel, and other expenses related to hosting the ToT meeting. Cost for each year is indicated on page 26 of the budget narrative.
   - Purpose and Relation to Success: The trainer of the trainer model is the most reasonable way to handle the facilitation of the professional development modules.
   - **Four Year Total: $81,000**
5. Postage
   - Cost: Cost for each year is indicated on page 26 of the budget narrative.

- Purpose and Relation to Success: It is vitally important to communicate with various stakeholder groups, sub-grantees, the USDE, and other agencies/entities regarding the SRCL projects.
- **Five Year Total: $6,000**

Basis of Cost Estimates

The basis of cost estimates was secured from the Office of Accounting at the MDE using state guidelines.

The table below provides the breakdown for items indicated in the Other Category.

Other	Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012	Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013	Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014	Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015	Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016
Printing—Orientation Notebooks (160 notebooks @ $15)	$2,400	0	0	0	0
Printing—Summer literacy academy notebooks (Pre-K-3)	$151,200	0	0	0	$25,000
Printing—Summer literacy academy notebooks (grades 4-12 ELA and Content Area)	0	$151,200	0	0	$25,000
Printing—Notebooks for literacy leadership and data team summits	0	0	$75,000	0	$25,000
Printing—Notebooks for mentoring program	0	0	0	$75,000	0
Meetings conducted at the MDE ($1000 per meeting)	4 meetings $4000	2 meetings $2000	2 meetings $2000	2 meetings $2000	2 meetings $2000
Communication Materials (Brand Marketing)	$10,000	0	$15,000	$25,000	$25,000
Training of Trainers for Presenters at the MDE ($900 per person)	$18,000 (20 trainers)	$18,000 (20 trainers)	$18,000 (20 trainers)	$27,000 (30 trainers)	0
Postage	$2,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Total	$187,600	$172,200	$111,000	$130,000	$103,000
Five Year Total: $703,800					

9) Indirect Costs

The indirect cost rate for the current period is 15.7%. Please see attached indirect cost rate agreement. The MDE does not plan to collect indirect on the entire 5% for every year of the project. The amount of indirect cost will depend on activities, but will not exceed the 15.7% for any year of the project. See table below for indirect cost estimates for each year.

	Year 1 SEA Oct 2011 July 2012	Year 2 SEA Aug 2012 July 2013	Year 3 SEA Aug 2013 July 2014	Year 4 SEA Aug 2014 July 2015	Year 5 SEA Aug 2015 July 2016
Indirect Cost	$202,620	$190,277	$182,027	$166,027	$132,027
Five Year Total: $872,978					

Total Budget Costs

	Year 1 Oct 2011 July 2012	Year 2 Aug 2012 July 2013	Year 3 Aug 2013 July 2014	Year 4 Aug 2014 July 2015	Year 5 Aug 2015 July 2016
LEA (80%)**	$23,896,000	$23,892,000	$19,200,000	$17,280,000	$16,320,000
ECE (15%)	$4,480,500	$4,479,750	$3,600,000	$3,240,000	$3,060,000
SEA (5%)	$1,493,500	$1,493,250	$1,200,000	$1,080,000	$1,020,000
Total Costs	$29,870,000	$29,865,000	$24,000,000	$21,600,000	$20,400,000
Five Year Total: $125,735,000					

****Note: In the LEA sub-granting process, LEAs must provide evidence of equal distribution between K-5 at 40% and 6-12 at 40% with equal amounts going to middle and high school.**

Supporting Details for Budget Narrative LEA Sub-grantee

Using a Request for Proposals (RFP) process, school districts with at least 60% of enrolled students qualifying for free or reduced lunch may apply for competitive grants funds for the implementation of the SRCL project in K-12 schools to address effective practices in instruction to impact disadvantaged students. During year one, approximately 20 competitive grants will be awarded. The size of the grant will depend on the size of the schools that the LEA is planning to include. The SEA anticipates approximately 60 schools (any configuration of grades K-12) will be served under the MS SRCL project. All sub-grantees will be required to implement according to activities in their proposal. Each LEA submitting a proposal must include at least one elementary school, one middle school, and one secondary school within the K-12 configuration as a feeder pattern. Expenditures will include providing professional learning and resources for LEA teachers, leaders, leadership teams, data teams; employing a literacy coach at each participating school; using a cohesive, technology-based assessment system for making instructional decisions; and utilizing print and digital instructional materials that are evidence-based to meet the instructional needs of disadvantaged students.

The LEA budget categories align with the SRCL goals and activities in the Project Narrative Section A (i) (d). The overall goal is to implement a comprehensive and coherent literacy program Pre-K through grade 12 that includes effective literacy instruction. The goals for each component of the plan are as follows:

- Increase educators' knowledge and skills in implementing research supported literacy instruction
- Improve in the selection and use of literacy instructional materials to address students' needs

- Improve literacy achievement through assessment and data utilization.
- Improve the quality of instructional interventions
- Provide language and text-rich environments
- Continuous improvement by monitoring program implementation and outcomes

The sample LEA budget below is based upon awarding approximately 20 LEA school districts. It is anticipated that the SRCL project will support approximately 60 school sites serving approximately 400 students in each school. These sites will be configured in different ways based upon the individual LEA. The LEA sub-grantee funding request for each year is 80% of the total budget amount with LEAs providing evidence in the sub-granting process that 40% of their budget will support grades K-5 and 40% of their budget will support grades 6-12 with equal amounts between their middle and high schools.

Sample Annual Budget Summary for a <u>School</u> of Serving approximately 400 Students	**Year 1 LEA Mar 2012 July 2012**	**Year 2 LEA Aug 2012 July 2013**	**Year 3 LEA Aug 2013 July 2014**	**Year 4 LEA Aug 2014 July 2015**	**Year 5 of LEA Aug 2015 July 2016**
Personnel - Literacy coach • Salary • fringe benefits (29%)	Prorated $12,500 $3,625	 $50,000 $14,500	 $52,500 $15,225	 $55,125 $15,986	 $57,881 $16,786
Professional Development • Stipend $200 per day for 5 days of summer training ($1000 x 17 people) • Travel expenses to attend meetings & training ($500 x 19 people) • Literacy Coach Tuition	 $17,000 $9,500 $0	 $17,000 $9,500 $3,500	 $17,000 $9,500 $3,500	 $17,000 $9,500 $3,500	 $17,000 $9,500 $0

Assessment • Assessment materials ($20 per student x 400 students)	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000
Instructional Materials • Approved Core program and ancillary materials (400 students)	$190,000 ($475 per student)	$150,000 ($375 per student)	$130,000 ($325 per student)	$104,800 $262 per student)	$94,000 ($235 per student)
• Approved supplementary materials (400 students)	$80,000 ($200 per student)	$80,000 ($200 per student)	$30,000 ($75 per student)	$30,000 ($75 per student)	$30,000 ($75 per student)
• Approved intervention materials (100 students)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)	$25,000 ($250 per student)
• Language and text-rich materials (400 students)	$32,000 ($80 per student)	$32,000 ($80 per student)	$20,600 ($51.50 per student)	$16,000 ($40 per student)	$12,000 ($30 per student)
Technology: Wireless Generation (Pre-K through Grade 12) Assessment System • Training (Follow-up)	$3,641.65	$3,700	$3,675	$3089	$1833
• Hardware ($1,000 x 17 teachers)	$17,000	$5,000	$5,000	$0	$0
Total Estimated cost per school **Average per student cost**	**$398,266.65** **($995.66)**	**$398,200** **($995.50)**	**$320,000** **($800)**	**$288,000** **($720)**	**$272,000** **($680)**
Total cost for 60 schools	**$23,896,000**	**$23,892,000**	**$19,200,000**	**$17,280,000**	**$16,320,000**
Five Year Total: $100,588,000					

Supporting Details for Budget Narrative Early Childhood Education (ECE) Provider

After the LEAs are awarded, a sub-grant competition will be held for Early Childhood Education Providers using the Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The ECE Provider(s) will be required to partner with the participating ECE centers identified by the LEA subgrantees to design and implement SRCL project activities in Pre-K programs that feed into the LEA sub-grantee's elementary school(s). The SEA anticipates approximately 60 ECE centers being served under the MS SRCL project. The ECE provider(s) will be required to implement according to their proposal. Expenditures will include providing professional learning and resources for ECE directors and teachers; employing a part-time literacy coach at each participating ECE center; and utilizing a coherent assessment system for administering assessments and analyzing data.

The ECE provider(s) budget categories align with the SRCL goals and activities in the Project Narrative Section A (i) (d). The overall goal is to implement a comprehensive and coherent literacy program Pre-K through grade 12 that includes effective literacy instruction. The goals for each component of the plan are as follows:

- Increase educators' knowledge and skills in implementing research supported literacy instruction
- Improve in the selection and use of literacy instructional materials to address students' needs
- Improve literacy achievement through assessment and data utilization.
- Improve the quality of instructional interventions
- Provide language and text-rich environments
- Continuous improvement by monitoring program implementation and outcomes

The sample ECE provider(s) sub-grantee budget below is based upon serving approximately 3,000 three- and four-year old children who attend participating ECE centers that feed into the LEA sub-grantee elementary schools. The ECE provider(s) sub-grantee funding requested for each year is 15% of the total budget amount.

Sample Annual Budget Summary for Early Childhood Education (ECE) Provider(s) Serving 3,000 Children	**Year 1 ECE Mar 2012 July 2012**	**Year 2 ECE Aug 2012 July 2013**	**Year 3 ECE Aug 2013 July 2014**	**Year 4 ECE Aug 2014 July 2015**	**Year 5 ECE Aug 2015 July 2016**
Personnel – **16** Literacy coaches • Salary • Fringe benefits (29%)	Prorated $200,000 ($12,500 per coach) $58,000 ($3625 per coach)	$800,000 ($50,000 per coach) $232,000 ($14,500 per coach)	$840,000 ($52,500 per coach) $243,600 ($15,225 per coach)	$882,000 ($55,125 per coach) $255,776 ($15,986 per coach)	$926,096 ($57,881 per coach) $268,576 ($16,786 per coach)
Professional Development • Stipend $200 per day for 5 days of summer training ($1000 x 375 ECE directors, staff, and coaches) • Travel expenses to attend meetings & training ($500 x 375 ECE directors, staff, coaches) • Literacy Coach Tuition	$375,000 $187,500 $0	$375,000 $187,500 $56,000	$375,000 $187,500 $56,000	$375,000 $187,500 $56,000	$375,000 $187,500 $0
Assessment • Assessment materials ($39 per student x 3,000 students)	$117,000	$117,000	$117,000	$117,000	$117,000
Instructional Materials • Approved Core program and ancillary materials (3,000 students) • Approved supplementary materials (3,000 students)	$1,200,000 ($400 per student) $900,000 ($300 per student)	$900,000 ($300 per student) $720,000 ($240 per student)	$480,000 ($160 per student) $300,000 ($100 per student)	$300,000 $100 per student) $192,000 ($64 per student)	$225,000 ($75 per student) $213,000 ($71 per student)

• Approved intervention materials (3,000 students)	$582,000 ($194 per student)	$600,000 ($200 per student)	$600,000 ($200 per student)	$570,000 ($190 per student)	$519,000 ($173 per student)
• Language and text-rich materials (3,000 students)	$480,000 ($160 per student)	$480,000 ($160 per student)	$390,000 ($130 per student)	$300,000 ($100 per student)	$225,000 ($100 per student)
Technology: Wireless Generation (Grades K-6) and 7-12 Assessment System • Training (375 people)	$6,000	$7,250	$5,900	$4,724	$3,828
• Hardware ($1,000 x 375 teachers)	$375,000	$5,000	$5,000	0	0
Estimated Total (cost per student)	**$4,480,500 ($1,494)**	**$4,479,750 ($1,493)**	**$3,600,000 ($1,200)**	**$3,240,000 ($1,179)**	**$3,060,000 ($1,020)**
Five Year Total: $18,860,250					

It is estimated that approximately 20 school districts will be funded, providing services to approximately 60 schools and 24,000 K-12 students. Mississippi estimates that approximately 60 participating Early Childhood Education centers will participate with approximately 3,000 Pre-K (3 and 4 year old) children. In all, Mississippi's project will impact approximately 1,515 educators and 27,000 Pre-K through grade 12 students who will be served in the highest poverty areas of Mississippi.