

<b>Rubric- Implementation Plan</b>		<b>Alabama</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>2</b>
0	The plan does not address any of the key questions	p. 3- Implementation Plan, p. 10- Funding plan, addresses possible funding sources and some model programs, but does not address new or existing laws or bylaws
1	X	
2	The plan answers SOME of the key questions	
3	X	
4	The plan answers ALL key questions about implementation. "Will new or existing state laws, by-laws, or other specific requirements for environmental education be part of the implementation process? Will model programs be identified and replication supported? How will existing federal education funds such as Title II or Title V, Perkins grants, IDEA or STEM funding be integrated into an implementation plan? Is new dedicated funding required?" (NAAEE, 2008, p.8).	

<b>Alaska</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>California</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>pgs. 40-41 address all key questions regarding funding and laws, (model programs are listed in separate objectives). Specific details are listed in Implementation Timeline on pgs 42-57 including a timeline for each objective listed in ELP</p>	<p>No ELP</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>Strategy 5 &amp;6 describe implementation and funding plan, implementation plan does not mention model schools. Funding plan does not address any of the funding opportunities listed in criteria, but does address funding sources within CA.</p>

<b>Colorado</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>Delaware</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Discusses existing law, and identifies model program (appendix C), but does not address any funding specifics</p>	<p>Sections on Implementation and Funding are broken down by three different groups, educators, community partners and government on pages 12, 15, 16-17. Between the sections, all questions regarding new policy development, model programs, and funding are addressed.</p>	<p>Objective 6 addresses model programs and legislation (NCLI, RTTT, A Vision for Sustainability, etc.), but does not mention funding sources.</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>

<b>Florida</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	<b>Idaho</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Section 3 notes Green schools program, and section 6: implementation plan notes steps in the implementation process but does not mention specific funding or laws/by-laws</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>pgs. 55-60 provide very detailed funding plan including expected costs of EE programming and hiring an EL coordinator. Addresses some of the areas where funding can be acquired. Mentions working with legislators to pass laws to support EE. Model programs addressed in separate sections. HELP also provides a detailed implementation plan pgs. 61-68</p>	<p>Implementation section on pg. 9 does not specifically address any questions regarding laws/by-laws, funding sources or identifying/replicating model programs</p>

<b>Illinois</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	<b>Kansas</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>Grants and Long-term funding section addresses some possible funding sources but not in detail. Environmental learning sites and centers section address some model program identification and support. There is no specific implementation section, it appears that implementation plans are listed throughout other sections but with no detail on steps toward implementation rather just partners and goal completion dates. Existing state laws are addressed in the introduction but no plans for new laws/by-laws are part of implementation of plan.</p>	<p>Plan does not address any of the key questions</p>	<p>Implementation section addresses funding sources in-state and matched to federal NCLI funds, but does not address the other funding sources listed. Does not address model programs, and does not address new/existing state laws/by-laws</p>	<p>Does not have implementation section, but does address some funding and model program replication throughout different objectives. No information further political action other than EO that is already in place</p>

<b>Kentucky</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	<b>Maine</b>	<b>Maryland</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>each "goal" of the plan has recommendations for implementation, there is a separate "goal" addressing funding and implementation, and Kentucky has a separate document detailing implementation of their plan in detail.</p> <p><a href="http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/science/Documents/KELP%20Implementation%20Plan_2012.pdf">http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/science/Documents/KELP%20Implementation%20Plan_2012.pdf</a></p>	<p>Does not address any of the key questions</p>	<p>Key Area 5: Addresses short and long term goals in terms of implementation and funding, but does not address the specific key questions such as state laws, model programs, and existing federal funds.</p>	<p>No implementation plan, no ELP</p>

<b>Massachusetts</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
ELP in writing phase	Implementation plan does not explicitly answer any questions about continued funding sources, laws/by-laws, or model program replication	ELP in writing phase	ELP in writing phase

<b>Missouri</b>	<b>Montana</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	<b>Nevada</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>Goal 4: provides a very detailed plan for creating agencies/structures to support EL if funding is received. Also details other possible funding sources, including possible use of fines collected from violating state environmental laws. Model programs are supported in separate section on Green Ribbon Schools. However, the plan does not address laws or by-laws, or any political action, related to advancing the ELP or EE on the state level</p>	<p>Not yet begun writing</p>	<p>Does not address implementation, only some potential funding sources</p>	<p>P. 17-19 discuss the adoption and implementation plan. Requires the hiring of an EL coordinator, and outlines specific funding sources. Section does not address specific laws or by-laws in place or the need to pursue new policy action. Also does not address model program replication</p>

<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>New York</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>pg. 21- Implementation and Funding sections offer very little detailed information. Some vague references to funding sources, but nothing addressing federal funds. Also does not address new or existing state laws/by-laws or replication of model programs</p>	<p>A Call to Action discusses some strategic planning in terms of funding and laws that would support the NJ ELP when finalized but does not address all key questions</p>	<p>While mostly a plan to plan, the implementation section does address all key questions in regards to legislative action and funding sources. Model programs are identified in a separate section in detail, and are also part of the "facilities" section of the ELP</p>	<p>Does not address implementation plan or funding plan. "In addition the committee is continuing to work with NYS elected officials to determine the best pathway for adoption (Legislative effort, Executive Order, or other mechanism)." p.21</p>

<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Does not address any of the specific questions outlined. States that funding sources will be identified as appropriate.</p>	<p>Not yet begun writing</p>	<p>Implementation plan section does not have much detail, but aspects of implementation are spread throughout document. NCLIA act funding is mentioned, Appendix C lists potential funding sources. Does not appear to mention new or existing state laws to support ELP</p>	<p>Document mentions the importance of identifying funding to continue the master plan, but does not explicitly answer any of the key questions according to NAAEE guidelines</p>

<b>Oregon</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
Ch.6: ELP Implementation, timeline broken into annual quarters in 2011 and then years to 2014 for step by step implementation planning	pg. 10- Funding and Implementation- explicitly addresses all key questions	Implementation plan discusses goals to move forward with RIDE (Dept of ED in approval of ELP), also with legislation for RI Children in Nature. Does not discuss any funding sources or model programs	ELP in writing phase

<b>South Dakota</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>Texas</b>	<b>Utah</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
No details provided for any of the key questions on implementation of the plan	Does not address new/existing state laws by-laws as part of implementation process, does not address existing federal education funds (does address state/other grant funding)	Goal IV, Objective 1: does not address any specific key questions	ELP in writing phase

<b>Vermont</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	<b>Washington</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Roadmap focuses on model programs throughout the state. Small section at the end gives suggestions for continued support but no details are provided.</p>	<p>ELP in writing stage</p>	<p>Implementation and funding section of ELP addresses funding questions very thoroughly, however does not address new/existing state laws/legislation. It also does not address identifying model EE programs.</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>

<b>Wisconsin</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
WI ELP provides detailed funding plan, however does not mention legislative action in terms of new or existing state laws/by-laws or model program replication	Writing stage of ELP