GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program

LEA Grant Application

System Cover Sheet

| Please return to:

Georgia Dept. of Education

Attn:

205 Jessie Hill Jr. Dr

1758 Twin Towers East

Atlanta, GA 30344 | DOE Use Only

Date and Time Received: | DOE Use Only:

Received By: |
|---|---|---|
| Name of Applicant:

Jefferson County Board of Education | | Project Number:

(DOE Assigned) |

| Total Grant Request:

$3,033,719	System Contact Information:	
	Name:

Dr. Donnie Hodges | Position:

Assistant Superintendent |
| Number of schools | Phone: | Fax: |

in system: 6 (plus early learning)	applying: 6 plus early learning: 7	478-625-7626	478-625-7459
Congressional District: 12th	Email: hodgesd@jefferson.k12.ga.us		

Sub-grant Status

____Large District (45,000 or more students)

____Mid-Sized District (10,000 to 44,999 students)

_X_Small District (0-9,999 students)

Check the one category that best describes your official fiscal agency:

X	School District		Community-based Organization or other Not-for-Profit Organization
	Regional/Intermediate Education Agency		Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agency- other

Fiscal Agent/Applicant Required Signatures:

I hereby certify that I am the an authorized signatory of the fiscal agent for which grant application is made and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, application

guidelines and instructions, assurances, and certifications. I also certify that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of the program described in the attached application.

Please sign in blue ink.

Name of **Fiscal Agent's** Contact Person: ___Dr. Donnie Hodges_____

Position/Title of Fiscal Agent's Contact Person: __Assistant Superintendent_____

Address: _1001 Peachtree Street_____

City: ____Louisville GA_____ Zip: _____30434_____

Telephone: (_478__) _625-7626_____ Fax: (_478__) __625-7459_____

E-mail: __hodgesd@jefferson.k12.ga.us_____

____**Signature on paper copies as per Ms. Morrill**_____
Signature of Fiscal Agency Head (required)

__**Molly P. Howard, Ed.D.**_____
Typed Name of Fiscal Agency Head (required)

__**Superintendent**_____
Typed Position Title of Fiscal Agency Head (required)

_____
Date (required)

LEA Narrative:

Jefferson County School System is located in eastern Georgia in the 12th Congressional District. It is comprised of a geographically large, sparsely populated rural area with three small towns -Louisville, Wrens, and Wadley where the three elementary schools are located - spread out over a 35 mile span along U.S. Hwy # 1 which cuts north to south through the county. The middle schools are in Louisville and Wrens with the high school centrally located between Louisville and Wrens. Louisville is near the geographic center of the county while Wrens is in the north and Wadley is in the south. The poverty rate for Jefferson County is 26.5%, and the school system has 84.35% of students who receive free and reduced lunch. Also, all six schools are Title I school wide projects, making all students eligible for Title I services. Many of the students are from homes where literacy growth and expectations are lacking. As a result, the students often enter school with literacy deficiencies that affect the ability to perform at expected levels on state-mandated standards and assessments. A lack of literacy materials and technology support also has a negative impact on the literacy growth of Jefferson County students.

Jefferson County students have scored below the state and the other CSRA RESA districts on the English Language Arts, mathematics, social studies, and science Georgia High School Graduation Tests GHSGTs and End of Course Tests EOCTs.   The graduation rate is just above the state level (81.3%). The Iowa Test of Basic Skills ITBS for fourth and eighth graders also shows significant deficits in reading comprehension and vocabulary. Criterion-Referenced Competency Test CRCT scores for 3rd through 8th graders also indicate below state and CSRA RESA results in Reading/English Language Arts at most grade levels with 164 students (13.7%) not meeting standards for those grade levels. State writing scores also reflect a deficit in writing skills for 3rd, 5th, and 8th graders. Upon examination of the domain data associated with the state tests and the ITBS, the Jefferson County leadership notes that these deficits reflect a lack of literacy skills, especially in vocabulary, reading comprehension, writing, and speaking. Currently, the school system has created a literacy plan that proposes how to institute a systematic

approach for improving literacy needs for Jefferson County students (see Appendix). The Striving Reader

Project can be the vehicle to make this happen. The intent of the project is not meant to be considered

as self-standing, fragmented, or appropriate for piecemeal implementation; rather, it will be

implemented in a thoughtful, planned, systematic manner. As a result, the Jefferson County Board of

Education has identified literacy as a key component of the county strategic plan and has pledged to

place monetary assets when available to support a literacy initiative. They recognize the need for

sustained professional learning in the following areas:

Early literacy (PK-3)	Adolescent Literacy (4-12)
Instructional technology strategies and implementations	Research-based best practices needed for CCGPS literacy demands for all content areas
Formative and summative assessments	Monitoring to ensure fidelity

A major component also includes sustaining a community literacy focus with the early learning

centers in our community. The literacy strategic plan is to include all schools in sustained, quality

professional learning and implementation of research-based best practices in literacy as Jefferson

County implements the CCGPS, the impact of targeted technology instruction on learning, the reading

and writing connection and the responsibility across all content areas, and the importance of monitoring

to sustain and guarantee the impact on instructional growth.

The vision of the Jefferson County School System is to have EVERY CHILD graduate from high

school postsecondary ready based on a mission to partner with the community in creating a learning

culture that challenges, supports, and ensures the success of EVERY CHILD, EVERY DAY. The school

system has gained state and national attention from several successful partnerships including ones with

the Southern Regional Education Board and the International Center for Leadership in Education

through the leadership of the school system and Dr. Molly Howard who was named the 2008 National Association of Secondary School Principal (NASSP) of the Year out of 48,000 candidates. Dr. Howard, who is now Superintendent of the school system, has spoken throughout the country on school reform and the dynamics of changing school culture.

The Jefferson County School System has approximately 2,900 students in grades PK-12 for the 2011-12 school year. The system has consistently lost 50-75 students per year over the last 10 years. The system is comprised of 74% minority students with 84.35% of students qualified for the free-reduced lunch program. Many students come to school with significant literacy delays. Even though many efforts have been made by the school system to address the overwhelming weaknesses in vocabulary, depth of knowledge, and necessary frameworks for active learning that many Jefferson County students have, much work has to be done on institutionalizing and sustaining a comprehensive approach to literacy that can be ultimately applied in all content areas including special education and Career, Technical, and Agricultural Education (CTAE). This will require support for teachers through high-quality professional development, a consistent monitoring piece for leaders, and ongoing understanding of curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment. Jefferson County leadership members from both the school system and the community pledge to make literacy growth a priority and are willing to create a sustainability plan to continue the efforts after the shelf-life of the grant.

Eligibility of Schools and Centers

The following CRCT scores are for the initial spring testing for all students.   (*In some instances, the school applications used the 2nd round AYP CRCT results to determine needs more specifically*.)

Elementary Schools	% F/R (includes PK)	AYP Status	N DNM CRCT Grade 3	% DNM CRCT Grade 3	N DNM CRCT Grade 5	% DNM CRCT Grade 5
Carver Elementary	94.53%	Distinguished	40	7.5%	46	13%
Louisville Academy	84.78%	Distinguished	81	21%	83	15.7%
Wrens Elementary	82.57%	Distinguished	89	12.4%	108	24.2%

Middle Schools	% F/R	AYP Status	N DNM CRCT Grade 8	% DNM CRCT Grade 8
Louisville Middle	89.30%	Made AYP	113	2.7%
Wrens Middle	78.34%	Distinguished	86	10.5%

High School	% F/R	AYP Status	Graduation Rate
Jefferson County High	82.59%	NI-3	81.3%

LEA Process for Selecting Schools: One of the key components of our system strategic plan is for all schools to be more alike than different. A consistent approach and message is critical for vertical and horizontal growth and understanding of progress. Since we are a small school system, it is important not to fracture or splinter programs and initiatives as much as possible. The Board of Education and the system and school leadership teams agree that all schools should be included in this application.

Experience of the Applicant:

The school system has not had state or federal grants in the past five years that fit the description in Section IV: Experience of the Applicant: however, the system has had such grants in the

past ten years. The leadership of the school system is very stable and long-serving, so many of the

current leaders managed these initiatives over the past ten years.

	Project Title	Funding Received	Is there audit?	Audit results
LEA				
LEA (fiscal agent for SHIPS for YOUTH, Inc.	Safe Schools, Healthy Students FY03-FY06	2,872,949	Yes	Clear
Schools				
Carver Elem	21st Century (federal)FY02-FY04	669,846	Yes	Clear
	CSR Grant FY06-FY07	120,587	Yes	Clear
Carver Elem & Wrens Elem	Reading First FY02-FY05	1,423,205	Yes	Clear
Louisville Academy	Tech Literacy Challenge (II-D) FY99-FY02	253,000	Yes	Clear
Louisville Middle	Making Middle Grades Work FY06-FY07	106,879	Yes	Clear
Jefferson County High	High Schools That Work FY03-FY05	192,743	Yes	Clear

Description of Funded Initiatives: Even though the funding for the initiatives above has ended, the

school system has benefitted greatly from lessons learned. Through these initiatives, the Jefferson

County School System leadership has worked to establish a culture of learning where teachers accept

responsibility for student learning within a network of support from peers and administrators through

recursive, job-embedded professional learning. Since most of these initiatives are school-based, the

level of job-embedded professional learning varies school by school; however, the goal is to have a plan

where sustainability and a vertical and horizontal instructional growth pattern emerge. Therefore, the

current Jefferson County leadership team recognizes the need for a systematic sustainability plan. The

school system also has current initiatives, RTI, and READ 180 (universal screener and tiered and Read 180) that are being funded through a combination of IDEA, Title I SIP and/or Title-I A funds. The Striving Reader Project activities as set forth by the grant will not only revisit previous professional learning, such as that provided by Reading First, but also will expand to the new literacy demands and assessments needed to create a more sustainable literacy culture in Jefferson County. Because of lessons previously learned, the leadership team is more aware of what steps to put into place to ensure the sustainability piece of the grant.

Description of Non-funded Initiatives: The school system has a number of initiatives that are on-going and are being sustained because of job-embedded professional learning and are reflected in the system strategic plan. These include Thinking Maps, roll-out of CCGPS, and CLASS KEYS implementation. Since the Striving Reader activities focus on all aspects of literacy, instructional practices to include the importance of assessments, and monitoring, the current initiatives will not be in conflict with any aspects of the grant. Our current roll-out plan of CCGPS centers on the understanding of the standards and instructional planning for the 2012-2013 school year. Based on the roll-out of the current Georgia Performance Standards in 2005-2006, we note that the more training our teachers can have on the roll-out of the CCGPS will only strengthen their knowledge and implementation practices. The Thinking Maps program represents "thinking" organizers to help students plan and organize their thought process; the maps are strategies and should not be in conflict with other research-based strategies. Currently, Jefferson County teachers are evaluated by CLASS KEYS , but that monitoring piece focuses on instructional practices. The Striving Reader's grant will provide the level of professional learning and training that are needed to take teachers and students to the next level.

Description of LEA Capacity:

In their book <u>Switch: How to Change Things When Change is Hard</u>, authors Chip and

Dan Heath (Broadway Books, 2010) highlight Dr. Molly Howard, the Jefferson County

Superintendent of Schools, for the tough challenge she accepted when she became the principal

of the new Jefferson County High School in 1995 where 70% of the students remained in the

county making it one of the poorest in the state with less than 50% of the adult population having

a high school diploma or its equivalent. Through a High Schools That Work (HSTW) grant from

the Southern Regional Education Board and a state designated and funded affiliation with the

International Center for Leadership In Education, Howard, along with strong support from the

school system, led a school reform effort that received state and national attention culminating in

her being named the 2008 NASSP National High School Principal of the Year. Through a

research-based reform model guided by the 12 key practices of HSTW, Howard and her

leadership team established a School of **H.O.P.E**. based on **H**igher Expectations (abolishing the

dual track and putting all students in college-preparatory classes and opening doors for

Advanced Placement (AP) courses; offering **O**pportunities for Success (mastery / modular

approach to mathematics, "no zero" grading policy, and after-school tutoring with teachers and

peers; **P**ersonalizing Learning Environment (teachers-as-advisors stressing relationships, 4 x 4

block scheduling, and face-to-face parent contact); and providing **E**xperiences in Real-World

Problem Solving (youth apprenticeship placements in the community through work-based

learning and articulation with Oconee Fall Line Technical College for dual enrollment).

Over the past fifteen years, the Jefferson County School System has managed several

successful partnerships that resulted in positive project implementation. The school system was

the driving force in establishing our community collaborative SHIPS for YOUTH, Inc. This

collaborative began as the Jefferson County Family Connection and was established in 1994

through the interagency council with the goals of improving economic capacity, school success, and child health. The Jefferson County Family Connection became a partner with Communities in Schools during the 2000-2001 school year and established SHIPS for YOUTH, Inc., a non-profit agency focused on improving quality of life for families in Jefferson County with the school system serving as fiscal agent and driving partner. Collaborative members include all of the county's social agencies, county government, law enforcement, business representatives, the faith community, our local technical college, parents, and students. Through this strong collaborative, a network of blended opportunities and services for families in the county has been established and is working well. Referrals have been streamlined among agencies that are now more competent in discussing problems and issues through monthly board meetings and quarterly full collaborative meetings. Among its accomplishments, the collaborative received a Safe Schools, Healthy Students federal grant for three years totaling over $2.8 million dollars. The school system served as fiscal agent for this project and was able to use staff and resources to support the full implementation of this community-wide project.

Some of the other successful partnerships that had positive project implementation are ones with Oconee Fall Line Technical College (OFTC), the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), and the International Center for Leadership in Education (ICLE). The partnership and articulation with OFTC has resulted in the school system often being touted as the model for dual enrollment for the state of Georgia with one of the highest per size rates of seniors graduating with both a diploma and a technical college seal. In working with SREB through both High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Making Middle Grades Work grants, the school system has made significant progress in both academic areas as well as institutionalizing job-embedded professional learning at the high school level. The HSTW efforts at Jefferson County High

School brought national attention to the staff and its principal, Dr. Molly Howard who was named the 2008 NASSP National High School Principal of the year. As a result of a Georgia Department of Education Daggett school designation and working with the ICLE under Dr. Willlard Daggett's direction, Dr. Howard and her leadership staff presented at the 2008 16th Annual Model School Conference in Orlando in a featured session entitled: "Leading for Secondary School Redesign".

Description of sustainability of initiatives implemented by the LEA

The Jefferson County School System values professional learning that is job-embedded providing opportunities for teachers to build their content and pedagogical knowledge and to examine practices that are based on student learning data. For example, the superintendent of Schools, Dr. Howard, who is a nationally known professional developer, led over sixty system and school administrators and teacher leaders in a year -long professional learning on assessment during the 2010-11 school year. These sessions were held in the evenings, and attendance was voluntary. The response to these monthly sessions was positive and pervasive. Each of the school teams were involved in re-delivering the assessment information and in bringing feedback from the school staffs. Through this initiative, several significant outcomes resulted. The group spearheaded a shift to move away from ability grouping and to redo how students were assessed and grouped for instruction which was instituted in 2011-12. Other outcomes were an examination of grading practices and policies and a move toward standards-based grading which is being piloted at one of the middle schools. This is just one example of the commitment by the school system to be sure that initiatives are carried out with fidelity and integrity and that professional learning is job-embedded to the point that it is sustained.

Resources

Align use of Federal and State funds (GA Striving Reader Subgrant Application, page 21)

FY12	Title I Funds (before carry-over)	Title II Part A Funds	Title VI Part B Funds
LEA	• $264,208 for system-level teacher development specialist and instructional coaches to deliver job-embedded professional learning	•	•
Each Elementary School	• Carver Elementary $166,693 for teachers & parapros $6,277 Classworks • Louisville Academy $167,765 for teacher & parapros $11,758 Classworks • Wrens Elementary $128,079 for teachers & parapros $11,161 Classworks	• $250 for substitutes • $58,000 salary, benefits for teacher • $2,000 stipends • $7,200 for consultant services • $4,300 registration fees	• $10,740 Classworks software
Each Middle and High School	• Louisville Middle $145,235 for teachers & parapros $6,786 Classworks • Wrens Middle $48,102 for teachers & parapros $4,818 Classworks • Jefferson Co. High $195,156 for teachers & parapros	• $250 for substitutes • $1,500 stipends • $11,000 for consultant services • $3,300 registration fees	• $10,740 Classworks software • $1,000 supplies

- LEA Use of Title I Resources: The LEA uses Title I funds for professional learning in the form of instructional coaches to deliver job-embedded professional learning.

- LEA Use of Title II Resources – Based on the Title II needs assessment in the spring of 2011, funds are used to meet the following system goals: every teacher and paraprofessional highly qualified, reduction of class size in kindergarten through grade three to 18 students per class,

quality professional learning in mathematics and literacy, quality professional learning on differentiated instruction, and creation of a quality mentoring program. To meet these goals, Title II funds are used at each elementary school to fund one teacher to reduce class sizes in the early grades. In addition, funds are used to pay for substitutes and registration fees for teachers to attend professional learning activities with a focus on Lexile scores, integrating technology, differentiated instruction, CCGPS redelivery and literacy (writing workshops, standards based best practices, DOK). A consultant works with staff at each elementary and middle school for nine days during the year on DOK levels, differentiated instruction, and formative assessment, with emphasis on mathematics. Stipends are paid to a teacher at each elementary school to attend a local university to receive the Reading Endorsement and for teachers to mentor new teachers at each school.

- Title I and Title II Resources at Each School – Title I funds are used primarily for personnel. Title I also partially funds the Tier 2-3 portion of Classworks for the three elementary and two middle schools. Since Title II funds are used primarily for reduced class size and professional learning, the only resources located at the schools are professional learning materials for book studies.

Clear alignment plan for SRCL and all other plans

In addition to the SRCL grant funding, the Jefferson County School System will continue to invest in literacy efforts, curriculum alignment including CCGPS roll-out, and quality professional learning for teachers and staff members. The system pledges to implement a systematic plan to improve literacy instruction and opportunities by aligning SRCL funding with other programs supported by federal funds including Title I, Title II-A of the ESEA, Bright from the Start, IDEA Act of 2006, and state and local funds. For instance, the school system will continue to fund Classworks, the universal screener and interventions software for RTI Tiers 2-4

through a combination of funding from IDEA, Title I, and Title II-A which will support the literacy efforts. The system will use Title I and Title II-A funds to reduce class size and to provide support for interventions which will also enhance the literacy efforts afforded by SRCL funds. The school system will use its technology team and available e-rate, eSPLOST and local technology funds to support the software, hardware, and non-print media that the SRCL funds will bring.

The school system plan is to maximize the benefit of SRCL and other funding for teachers and students; to communicate clearly that programs will be non-competitive with each other; to integrate program activities to avoid repetition; and to maximize the benefits to students and minimize the costs per teacher and students as good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars. One of the benefits of a small school system is that a small staff makes it easier to communicate and to consolidate initiatives. There are fewer levels of bureaucracy, and it is much easier to ensure against duplication and repetition of people. As a result of this effort, the system and each of our schools have in place a school improvement plan that has decreased previously fragmented efforts. Our current plans focus on improved academic achievement and assessment practices, targeted professional learning, instructional technology planning, and curriculum alignment and development. This more systematic approach to school improvement initiatives has highlighted a need for a more systematic sustainability plan for the literacy goals, a noted aspect of the Striving Reader activities.

List of resources available at each building

Elementary	Middle Schools	High School
Average of 4 non-modern student computers per	Average of 2 non-modern student computers per	Average of 1 non-modern student computer per classroom

classroom	classroom	
Mini lab with 8-9 computers	Mini lab 8-9 computers	4 vocational labs with 25 computers
4 document cameras	2 document cameras	
7 digital cameras	8 digital cameras	25 digital cameras
30% of classrooms have interactive white boards	46% of classrooms have interactive white boards	69% of classrooms have interactive white boards
25 computer lab	Two 25-computer labs	Two 25-computer labs
Generic list of shared resources in every K-12 building:		
Galileo		
Software for intervention and remediation		
Microsoft Office, including Publisher		
Video distribution, united streaming		
Leveled texts – limited in quantity and diversity		
Trade books – fiction and nonfiction – limited in quantity and diversity		
Thinking Maps		
Adequate print materials in the media center, but up-to-date materials are needed.		
Minimal audio-books, DVDs, Videos, TVs, periodicals		
All classrooms have overhead projectors		
All classrooms have high speed Internet access		
All classrooms have at least one networked printer		
At least 2 sets of student response system per school		
All media centers have at least six computers.		
Additional shared resources in every K-8 building:		
Renaissance Place		
Minimal classroom libraries		
Additional shared resources in every 6-12 building:		
SRI licenses (through READ 180)		
Wireless Internet access in part of the buildings		
Mobile carts		
READ 180 software for at least 30 students per school		

A plan to ensure that no supplanting takes place

Even though the school system has been informed that supplanting will be allowed with this grant, the system will make every effort to use funds to support literacy efforts that will supplement and enhance rather than supplant those funds that are already committed because of our efforts to sustain the Striving Reader Project activities.

Detail of how SRCL will add value to the existing resources in the schools

The school system has acknowledged that there is noted critical area for literacy improvement is in the early learning centers, pre-school programs, and in the elementary schools. The primary and elementary students have a dire need for extended work in the foundational reading skills, writing skills, and overall literacy components of learning. Jefferson County students often lack any literacy support from home. As a result of the literacy needs of the students, Jefferson County educators need to be equipped to provide students with viable, sustainable skills and opportunities that will not only show an increase in test scores but also more importantly an increase in all literacy expectations, from early literacy skills to literacy strategies for reading, writing, and communication. The literacy focus for Jefferson County will need to extend into a partnership with Head Start, family day care facilities, the Jefferson County library, and SHIPS for Youth (Family Connection and CIS) to target younger children who are not receiving the literacy needs in the home. Not only will Jefferson County teachers need systematic and monitored professional learning opportunities to improve literacy instruction in the classroom to meet the literacy demands of the CCGPS, but also the Jefferson County teachers will provide professional learning that they have received to the early support systems' personnel on Saturdays, in the evenings, or in the summer.   The goal is to train personnel in daycares or other early learning centers on different literacy strategies to help young children in their comprehension and vocabulary development.   This partnership will create a strong alliance on behalf of the children as they enter the Jefferson County school system. The literacy needs of the younger children will be a critical component in establishing literacy goals for the county because of the rigorous demands of the literary, informational, and foundational reading demands of the (CCGPS).

The second critical literacy need is in improving the content literacy expectations as set forth by the CCGPS and the College and Career Readiness Performance Index. As evident by the performance on the current state assessments, SATs, and other post-secondary measurements, Jefferson County

students are lacking skills necessary in reading, writing, and speaking in the content areas. A critical focus will be to improve literacy skills needed to achieve in English Language Arts, math, social studies, science, and technical subjects, as indicated by the CCGPS. Again, a systematic and monitored professional learning community will be essential in training Jefferson County teachers on evidence-based literacy strategies that are needed to increase the literacy scores of the students. The professional learning will also need to extend on how to choose appropriate materials and technology to support students as they work to increase their literacy skills. Currently, many Jefferson County teachers are lacking the expertise in this critical area.

Perhaps the most critical component for ensuring a strong literacy plan for Jefferson County is in the area of literacy assessment and evaluation.   Currently, Jefferson County is using DIBELS as well as Classworks as the universal screener for students through grade eight. However, a major concern is the lack of true understanding as to how to use these instruments effectively to guide instruction and need. Another concern is the lack of a universal screener for high school students. Also, a lack of understanding regarding Lexiles and what that instrument means in selecting reading materials is of concern. This concern is only going to increase with the issue of text complexity evident in Reading Standard 10 in the CCGPS. Professional learning and training in understanding the different prongs to measure reading materials will be important: quantitative, qualitative, and reader to task. Also, assistance in selecting appropriate reading measures and how to use them will be necessary. Most importantly, the ability to use formative assessments throughout instruction to measure reading growth will be another component of needed professional learning.

Management Plan and Key Personnel:

	Individual Responsible	Supervisor
Project Director	Dr. Donnie Hodges	Dr. Molly Howard

Purchasing	Dr. Donnie Hodges	Dr. Molly Howard
Site-Level Coordinators	See chart below	Principals
Professional Learning Coordinator	Mrs. Cindy Rabun	Dr. Molly Howard
Technology Coordinator	Mrs. Lynn Hopper	Mrs. Cindy Rabun
Assessment Coordinator	Mrs. Cindy Rabun	Dr. Molly Howard

The Jefferson County Public Schools has a qualified and expert infrastructure. Dr. Donnie Hodges, Assistant Superintendent, will serve as Project Director for the SRCL Project and monitor the day-to-day operation of the early learning portion of the project. Dr. Hodges has over twenty years experience at the central office level and has written or collaborated in the writing of and managed a number of grants for the school system including *Reading First, High Schools That Work, Making Middle Grades Work*, Ne*xt Generation School Project, 21*[st] *Century Community Learning Center, and Safe Schools, Healthy Students.*. Dr. Hodges has served as Title I Director for the school system for more than ten years and has extensive experience with federal programs and budgets. Dr. Hodges is currently the Director of Pre-K and has served in that capacity since 1994. She will wear "two hats" in this project: Project Director for the SRCL Project and Coordinator for Early Learning.

School Project Coordinators for the SRCL Project will be named at all six of the schools.

Even though the principals will be expected to be very involved with the grant, school level directors will be named to be responsible for the day-to-day grant operations.

SCRL grant operations	School	Position
Dr. Donnie Hodges	Jefferson County BOE	Coordinator for Early Learning
Ms. Tiffany Pitts	Carver Elementary	Assistant Principal
Mrs. Dana Williams	Louisville Academy	Instructional Coach
Mrs. Ginger Parris	Wrens Elementary	Instructional Coach

Ms. Jacqueline Jukes	Louisville Middle	Instructional Coach
Mrs. Stacy Arnold	Wrens Middle	Assistant Principal
Mrs. Stephanie Hildebrant	Jefferson County High	Assistant Principal

All members of the management team have been closely involved in the literacy task force that worked on the grant at the system level and the school level and in the development of the system literacy plan. Currently, they are all involved in the roll-out of the CCGPS. This roll-out, as well as learning to implement the new CCGPS with fidelity, is an essential part of the school system's literacy focus. The members have researched and studied all aspects of the CCGPS initiative and have participated in collaborative discussions to examine the components of the Striving Reader Project that will best benefit the students of Jefferson County. Each member of the team understands her individual role in serving as the literacy leader in her school. Each member has had experience in planning and conducting professional learning. The members are also involved in the writing and implementing of school improvement plans. Since they have helped to write the individual school plans, they have a full understanding of the existing school data and system needs, forming the basis of the grant.

Sustainability Plan

Through this grant, Jefferson County School System leadership has the intent to further efforts to enrich the culture of learning where teachers accept responsibility for student learning within a network of support from peers and administrators through job-embedded professional learning that becomes more and more internalized and institutionalized. The system will continue to conduct an in-depth study of the CCGPS literacy demands.

As Jefferson County staff becomes more and more familiar with the demands of CCGPS of both

foundational and adolescent literacy, they will be able to lead their own professional learning, thus

building sustainability. The professional learning provided will be systematic and connected to all the

aspects that participants have learned through the Striving Reader activities. Also, leadership from the

county office will be instrumental in the planning and monitoring of that professional learning. The

professional learning sessions will be monthly and with targeted topics based on data and needs as

indicated in the school/system's school improvement plan. The Jefferson County leadership will

participate in the trainings provided through the Striving Reader grant, so they will have first-hand

knowledge of all aspects of the professional learning piece. Any outside consultants needed or desired

will be determined based on recommendations from the Georgia Department of Education and national

research. The purpose of empowering the Jefferson County staff is to allow the staff to embed all

aspects of the learning into the existing school day without depending on afterschool, Saturday or

summer professional learning time, based on the fact that such programs are expensive and Jefferson

County does not have the monetary resources consistently to support such programs. Also, since

Jefferson County staff will become comfortable and knowledgeable with all aspects of the CCGPS

particularly through content areas beyond ELA, Jefferson County will not have a need to add any

additional staff to sustain the project. The goal is to maximize existing resources and personnel to

ensure growth and sustainability. One approach is to have a teacher training team that will redeliver

and train any new teachers or early learning center personnel to Jefferson County. All Jefferson County

schools are Title I Schoolwide Projects. Title I-A and Title II-A funds will be brokered to re-direct the

work to support the initiative beyond the grant. It will be imperative that resources including time,

materials, and energy be used and allocated wisely to meet student and teacher needs. Time must be

allowed and fiercely protected for teacher professional development and data analysis. The school

system plans to assign teacher leaders as instructional mentor teachers to assist and promote content

literacy skills to all content area teachers.

The greatest sustainability challenge will be with the technology aspects of the grant. Jefferson

County's Board of Education, along with early learning centers and school system personnel, are so

dedicated to this effort that existing eSPLOST funds, e-rate, and general funds will be used to maintain

DOE Use Only	DOE Use Only:	DOE Use Only:
Date and Time Received:	Received By:	Project Number

and expand the technology aspects of the grant.

There is a strong commitment from our community to ensure that the literacy initiative will

benefit our students. The commitment extends from the high school student association, Jefferson

County Rotary, and Louisville Kiwanis to have ongoing fundraisers to help sustain this effort. Also, all

school personnel will have the opportunity under a voluntary basis to have money withdrawn monthly

from their pay checks and will be used to fund the FERST foundation subscriptions at the Jefferson

County Library. The goal is to make literacy the number one effort of the entire Jefferson County

community.

Appendices are on hard copies as per Ms. Morrill (via email).

School Name:	Total Grant Request:
Louisville Academy Elementary School	$499,950

System:	School Contact Information:	
Jefferson County		
	Name:	Position:
	Hulet E. Kitterman	principal
Number of Students	Phone Number:	Fax Number:
562	478-625-7794	478-625-3548
	Email Address:	
	kittermanh@jefferson.k12.ga.us	
Number of Teachers		
42.5 certified staff members		

Free/Reduced Lunch %	84.78%	
Principal's Name: Hulet E. Kitterman		**Other Reform Efforts in School:** None
		Principal's Signature: On paper copies as per Ms. Morrill

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant

School and Center Cover Sheet

SRCL School Application:

School: Louisville Academy

Brief narrative giving readers a sense of the school/center

- **School History**

Louisville Academy was chartered in 1796 as one of several college preparatory schools to feed into

the newly established University of Georgia. Until 1970, when schools across the south desegregated,

Louisville Academy was predominantly white. At that time it became an elementary school, serving

both black and white students. Located in Jefferson County, a rural, geographically isolated area, the

school now serves 560 students in pre-k through fifth grades. Approximately 74% of the students are

African American and 24% are white; the rest are Hispanic or multi racial. 84.78% of the student

population qualifies for subsidized meals.

- **Administrative and Teacher Leadership Team**

     The school has an experienced, stable staff, with an average of 15 years experience. The school has

a truly shared leadership vision. The leadership team consists of the principal and assistant principal,

the instructional coach, the media specialist, and all of the grade chairs. Three staff members chair the

vertical teams: a pre-k through second grade team, a third through fifth grade literacy team, and a third

through fifth grade math team. All instructional and curriculum issues are made by the leadership team

and by the vertical team chairs.

     Besides being an experienced staff, the faculty of Louisville Academy is deeply rooted in the

community. With only a couple of exceptions, every school employee resides in Jefferson County and is

active in the community, allowing the public immediate and unrestricted access to the staff. Everyone is

determined that everyone be an effective teacher. Such a community of professionals who are also an

integral part of the larger community creates a heightened sense of accountability.

- **Past Instructional Initiatives**

     In 2003 the school received a $50,000 grant for being named a Title I Distinguished School. This

money was used to contract with Marilyn Burns and set up a Math Institute for all teachers at Louisville

Academy. The school continued to provide professional learning in math for a number of years, using

various sources of money including funds from the *Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education through*

Technology grant (E-math). In addition to providing professional learning, this grant also provided funds

for technology purchases. Even after the E-math funds ended, the school continued to equip classrooms

with interactive smart boards and projectors, using funds from a variety of sources, including teacher fund raising. Staff members then provided training for others. The E-math grant changed the way the school operated—and not just in mathematics. For the first time vertical teams were established and teachers began to assume real ownership of the curriculum. The curriculum they had previously written, using Heidi Hayes Jacobs' and Jay McTighe's and the Learning Focused Schools' materials, began to become viable documents. Teachers became the professional learning leaders of the school.

- **Current Instructional Initiatives**

Louisville Academy has always had a strong focus on writing in all curriculum areas and across all grade levels. (See Assessment History in the appendix.) During the 2007-2008 school year, the school system provided training for every employee in the use of *Thinking Maps*. Louisville Academy insisted that every teacher use *Thinking Maps* and *Write from the Beginning* as the basis of the writing program. The vertical teams re-wrote curriculum using these documents. The percentage of students passing the state writing test increased significantly. In 2011, 81% of students passed the test, compared to the state's 79% pass rate. Still, only 8% of Louisville Academy's students scored in the "exceeds" category.

A number of years ago, the school began using a modified parallel block schedule to reduce class size for reading instruction and rotated groups of children through literacy mini labs that focused on reading and writing in the content area. This current school year the school expanded that concept in order to abandon its 40-year practice of ability grouping. Last school term, in anticipation of this change in teaching practices, the whole staff, led by the vertical team chairs, the instructional coach, and the administration, engaged in year-long professional learning class on standards based practices, using the research-based information from CLASS Keys.

This year this same group of instructional leaders is focusing the staff on the new Common Core Georgia Performance (CCGPS) standards. The vertical teams meet weekly to look at standards both

within their grade level and across grade levels. The ensuing professional conversations have greatly enhanced individual staff members' understanding of the standards. A part of this conversation involved a root cause analysis of the underlying issues in our students' lack of reading ability. Staff members articulated clearly the issues that children were having, and they articulated their own lack of knowledge of how to address some of the issues.

- **Professional Learning Needs**

Although the school has made AYP for twelve consecutive years, the school acknowledges that the reading level of the students is far from adequate. On the 2011 CRCT, 48% of fifth graders had a Lexile of less than 850, and 60% of third graders had a Lexile of less than 650. Scores on the fourth grade ITBS indicate that 42% of the students had a stanine of 3 or lower. A review of the system wide data indicates that this is the same percentage of children who enter ninth grade not able to read critically. This lack of achievement indicates that Louisville Academy's students will not be able to perform at the level demanded by the CCGPS. As this grant will show, the school needs additional professional learning in the following areas:

- o   administering appropriate assessments and using the data to inform instruction;
- o   teaching appropriate foundational and early adolescent reading strategies;
- o   teaching effective writing strategies across the curriculum;
- o   using appropriate technology effectively; and
- o   engaging students in the text.

- **Need for Striving Readers Grant**

Clearly, Louisville Academy has an urgent need to improve student achievement. Just as clearly, Louisville Academy has a capacity to sustain job embedded professional learning. Led by system administrators and curriculum specialists, the school system has recently developed a comprehensive

literacy plan, using the state's plan as a guide. The SRCL grant would provide the funding for

professional learning and materials to enhance the system's literacy plan and to assist the school in

creating and implementing its own literacy plan.

Analysis and Identification of Student and Teacher Data

Various data points for the upper grades are consistent and point to a major deficit in reading

achievement. The school lacks solid data for the early grades. Furthermore, there is not enough

diagnostic data for any grade. Even though the school's pass rate for the *Georgia Grade 5 Writing Test* is

higher than the state average, only 8 % of the students fall into the "exceeds" category. While there has

been some progress in closing the achievement gap between subgroups, this continues to be a problem.

The school needs to examine other ways to assess students' progress in reading achievement.   Student

data assessment is below:

a.   **Student data:** *See Assessment History for complete, longitudinal data.*

CRCT 2011 after summer retest. Reading/English Language Arts. FAY students. Grades 3-5					

	All Students	African American Students	White Students	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged Students
Does not meet	18.4%	19.5%	16%	54.5%	20%
Meets	62.4%	67.3%	47%	45.5%	65%
Exceeds	19.2%	13.2%	37%	0%	15%

CRCT 2011. Reading only. After summer retest. All students Grades 3-5.			

	All Students	African American Students	White Students
Does not meet	19%	22%	15%
Meets	62%	67%	46%
Exceeds	19%	11%	39%

Grade 5 Writing Test. Percent of students.			

	All Students	African American	White Students	Students with Disabilities

Does not meet	18%	18%	13%	50% (3 students)
Meets	73%	73%	87%	50%(3 students)
Exceeds	8%	9%	0%	0%

STAR . Fall 2011. Percent of students at each quartile. This data is not disaggregated.

Grade Level	1-24%ile	25%ile-49%ile	50%ile-74%ile	75%ile-99%ile
Grade 1	24.6%	49.2%	21.3%	4.9%
Grade 2	38.5%	22.9%	22.9%	15.6%
Grade 3	50.9%	18.2%	19.1%	11.8%
Grade 4	50.0%	21.%	21.8%	6.4%
Grade 5	40.1%	24.7%	16.0%	11.1%

Classworks Universal Screener for Reading. Percent of students NOT ready for grade level.

Grade Level	All Students	African American	White
Kindergarten	37%	27%	10%
Grade 1	69%	50%	19%
Grade 2	54%	45%	9%
Grade 3	32%	30%	2%
Grade 4	49%	45%	4%
Grade 5	45%	37%	8%

.ITBS Fall, 2011. Reading and ELA percentile and stanine averages

	Reading %tile	Reading Stanine	% 1st-3rd stanine	%4th-6th stanine	% 7th-9th stanine
Grade 4	31 %ile	4	42%	52%	6%
Grade 2	40 %ile	NA	NA	NA	NA

b. High school graduation data:

Although the high school graduation rate exceeded the state average this past year, a significant

portion of the high school's resources are dedicated to remediation of students who are not yet ready

for secondary work.

c. Early learning readiness

Assessment	Comments
GKIDS	77% met language arts standards
	54% met "approaches to learning" standards
DIAL III	16% of entering kindergarteners scored at risk in one or more areas

d. Disaggregation of data into subgroups. *See charts above.*

e. Teacher Retention Data

Teacher Experience and Retention Data		
	2010	**2011**
Annual Teacher retention rate	95%	82% (several retirees)
Experience Continuity Ratio	.98	.98
Principal Experience Continuity Ratio	1.0	1.0
Number of Master Teachers	1	1
Highly Qualified	100%	100%
Percentage with Level 4 Certification	31.75	35.3%
Percentage with Level 5 Certification	46.3%	44.1%
Percentage with Level 6 Certification	17.1%	17.6%
Percentage with Level 7 Certification	2.4%	2.9%
Average teaching experience in years	15.7 years	16.5 years
Teachers with fewer than 3 years experience	7.3%	2.9%
Teachers between 3 and 20 years experience	68.3%	67.6%
Teachers with more than 20 years experience	24.4%	29.4%
Number of ESOL certified teachers	3	3

f. Teacher professional learning

With the exception of 1 half-time employee, everyone participated in job embedded

professional learning during the 2010-2011 school year. The most powerful professional learning during

2010-2011 were the sessions revolving around CLASS Keys, especially the conversations about

assessment and standards based instruction. The resulting conversations in both small groups and large

groups demonstrated a significant lack of understanding about using assessment information to inform

instruction.

Professional Learning	**# of participants**	**% of staff participating**
CLASS Keys	38	90%
ACTIVboard training, beginning	4	9.5%
ACTIVboard training, advanced	4	9.5%
Working on the Work: grades 3-5	11	26%
Classworks/RTI	10	23.8%
RTI for paraprofessionals	9 of 13 parapros	69% of paraprofessionals
Pre-K Best Practices for Teachers	3 of 3 pre-k teachers	100% of pre-k teachers
Pre-K Best Practices for parapros	4 of 4 paraprofessionals	100% of pre-k parapros

The focus for the current school year involves the unpacking of the Common Core Georgia

Performance Standards (CCGPS) English Language Arts and Math standards. Teachers meet weekly in

their vertical teams to discuss common standards, to determine the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) of the

standard, to write essential questions; and to form sample assessment items that match the DOK level

of the standard. They post their work on a shared drive that is accessible to all system level staff in all

schools. In addition, teachers also meet weekly by grade level to plan curriculum and assessments for

the coming week and to reflect on the previous week's work. These meetings are true job embedded

professional learning.

Needs Assessment

a. Description of the materials used in the needs assessment process

   The materials used in the needs assessment process include the disaggregated test data as illustrated

in the data analysis section of this grant, the needs assessment survey adapted from Reading First, and

discussions from the staff via the process described below.

b. Description of the needs assessment process.

   The School Improvement Planning (SIP) team consists of the two administrators, the instructional

coach, the media specialist, and the department/grade chairs from each grade level. This team works on

data analysis and then discusses the results with the vertical team chairs who take the information back

to their respective teams.

   The language arts vertical teams and the math vertical teams consist of teachers in grades PK-2

and in grades 3-5. Special education teachers are also a part of these teams. The team chairs lead their

respective teams through more complex analysis of their individual test data. The conclusions brought

from these meetings are presented to the Literacy Team which makes further suggestions.

The final step in the needs assessment process is to present the data and findings to the entire faculty. This group then begins the process of identifying specific strengths and weaknesses. The ideas generated from this process become the basis for the School Improvement Plan, as well as for this grant proposal.

c.   A listing of individuals who participated in the needs assessment

Participants in the needs assessment		

School Improvement Team	Vertical Team	Literacy Team
Principal	Literacy chair grades 3-5: soc st/ writing teacher	Principal
Assistant principal	Math chair, grades 3-5	Assistant principal
Instructional coach	Literacy/Math chair grades PK-2	Instructional coach
Media specialist	All teachers per their discipline	Media specialist
Grade chairs PK-5	Instructional coach	Vertical team literacy chair
		Vertical team math chair
		Vertical team PK-2 chair
		4 additional teachers
		1 parent

Areas of concern

a. Clearly identifies areas of concern as they relate to the research-based practices found in the "What" document.

The areas of concern are referenced to one of the nine components of the "What" document in Georgia's Literacy Plan.

- Early learning lacks appropriate data to make informed decisions. Clearly additional interventions need to occur in the birth to five age group. (Components 1 and 2)

- All data points for the upper elementary grades indicate that, based on the new Lexile requirements of the Common Core, almost 50% of students are not ready for grade level instruction. Best practices for instruction need to be addressed through professional learning on the part of all staff, including leadership. (Components 4 and 6) Vertical and horizontal alignment needs to be clearly articulated to prevent this drop in test scores. (Component 8)

- The achievement gap among various subgroups remains wide. A four-tiered instructional model for all students needs to be enhanced. (Component 5)

- Assessment data is not diagnostic in nature, and thus not useful in making meaningful decisions. Formative and summative assessments need to guide instruction more effectively. (Component 3)

- Students lack persistence and motivation to engage in text—especially when dealing with longer and more complex text. (Component 9)

b. **Identifies specific age, grade levels, or content areas in which the concern originates.**

- Reading scores drop dramatically after the early childhood grades and do not recover.

- Early childhood readiness is not adequately assessed.

- The achievement gap widens as students progress through elementary school.

- Even though writing scores remain near or above the state average, considerable resources are used in grade 5 to maintain these scores.

c. **Identifies the areas of concern and details the steps the school has or has not taken to address the problem.**

Steps taken to address the problems:

- The school increased the reading instruction for grades 4 and 5 to an 85 minute block.

- The writing curriculum for grades 4 and 5 is infused into the social studies curriculum and includes historical fiction, research, and expository writing.

- The labs in grades 1 through 3 allow for small, needs-based groups and for a large, heterogeneous group. The labs focus on reading and writing in the content areas.

- The school system purchased software to monitor students' progress and to assist in the RTI process.

- The vertical teams help to address the problem of curriculum gaps by looking at curricula over several grade levels, noting how concepts at one grade level feed into concepts at upper grade levels.

Steps needed to be taken to address the problem:

- Tiered instruction needs to be more fluid.

- The school needs to examine its foundational reading program to determine why the gains made in early childhood are not maintained.

- The staff has expressed a keen interest in extended professional learning in both foundational reading and early adolescent reading.

- Writing in the content area needs to be emphasized in all grade levels.

- Students need to explore other reading and production media.

Root cause analysis

a. The root or underlying cause of the areas of concern found in the needs assessment.

Using *"The 5 Why's"* root cause analysis method, the literacy team determined that students' low reading level was due to the students' lack of ability to do the following:

- use phonics to decode text;

- ready fluently, attend to text, engage with the text, and persevere;

- process ideas and make logical relationships; and

- comprehend and produce text at a complexity level commensurate with their grade level.

Students have difficulty with the above issues because of limited language. Students' language and vocabulary are impacted by their lack of experiences. Students' lack of experience is a result of the culture of poverty and of living in a geographically isolated area.

The purpose of this grant is to address the issues bulleted above through appropriate evidenced-based instructional interventions, focusing on foundational and early adolescent reading and focusing on reading and writing in the content area.

b. The specific grade levels that are affected.

The foundational reading piece impacts every grade level from pre-k through high school. Students who enter middle and high school in need of remediation consume resources that would otherwise be utilized to raise the achievement level of all students.

c.   A specific rationale for the determination of the cause

The pervasive *culture* of poverty that exists in Jefferson County has dramatically impacted the language acquisition of children. According to the National Early Literacy Panel (2008), quoted in the "Why" document, early literacy consists of "two…sets of …abilities: (a)code-related skills and (b) oral language skills. Code-related skills are those that allow children to crack the code for translating the written word into speech. Oral language skills include skills that relate to deep understanding of spoken and written communication." The document states that code-related skills can typically be mastered with a couple of years of instruction. Not so with oral language skills which take years to develop and include "comprehending and producing complex sentences, drawing inferences, the ability to listen, and… acquiring new vocabulary" (Lynch, Van den Broek, Kremer, Kendeou, White, & Lorch, 2008). The "Why" document further states that "children with insufficient oral language may struggle in later elementary grades and beyond as they encounter 'heavy texts' or long books with well-developed themes, complex plots and sentence structure, and complex vocabulary" (Stahl, 2007).   Intensive interventions are required when children who come from homes where language is "functional" as opposed to "expressive," where oral language is not appropriately developed.

d. What has been done in the past to address the problem.

The following steps are in place to address this problem:

   a. Teachers are beginning to look at individual students' strengths and weaknesses, as opposed to whole class strengths and weaknesses.

   b. Each grade level has a plan for remediation for students who are not achieving.

   c. The schedule has been changed, and personnel have been shifted to allow for small group instruction.

   d. Vertical teams focus on the standards and on data.

e. New information the needs assessment uncovered.

The needs assessment process uncovered a lack of deep knowledge about tiered instruction and about how to use data to inform instruction.

**School Literacy Team**

a. a listing of the members of the site based literacy team.

The school based literacy team consists of the following:

- principal and assistant principal,

- the instructional coach,

- the media specialist, and

- the vertical team chairs for both literacy and mathematics.

- one parent

- additional teachers

b. the function of the site based literacy team in terms of the needs assessment.

The function of the site based literacy team is three-fold: (1) to review data, (2) to review and monitor research-based best practices, and (3) to communicate ideas to the administration, to the vertical teams, and to the faculty.

c. minutes of the meetings of the site-based literacy team.

The literacy team met on October 18 and on November 10. The complete agenda, minutes and signatures are in the appendix. A summary of the meetings is below:

October 18 Literacy Team notes	November 10 Literacy Team notes
• Looking at the data • Needs assessment plan • Plan to unpack CCGPS/DOK • Differentiation with standards • Assessments need to drive instruction • Students struggle with writing because of lack of prior knowledge and lack of writing experiences. • Virtual field trips. • Low literacy skills evident in all data points,	• Analyze findings from needs assessment • Need to look at text complexity • Target Lexile of 650 for grade 3 and 850 for grade 5. • Need support in reading and writing across the disciplines • Students lack word attack skills. • Need interventions for struggling readers. • Need to progress monitor

d. how the site based literacy team communicates and includes all members of the staff in the decision making process.

The literacy team communicates directly with the school improvement team and with the faculty at large. The vertical team chairs are crucial in making this process work. These chair people are known for their instructional expertise, commanding the respect of the entire staff. The formal and informal conversations the team has with the staff become a part of the needs assessment process. This team presents the data to the faculty and thus begins the process of root cause analysis and needs assessment.

Project Goals and Objectives

a. A clear list of project goals directly related to the identified needs.

- To create and implement a sustainable literacy plan that would insure that every child communicates effectively; accesses and uses multiple forms of media; and reads and writes fluently using a variety of media and across all disciplines.

- To have every child reading at a Lexile level of 850 or higher when he leaves elementary school.

b. A clear list of project objectives that relate to implementing the goals identified:

- To provide professional learning for all instructional staff to include Common Core literacy, evidence-based strategies, and formative assessments based on the standards to guide viable interventions

- To provide professional learning for instructional staff in the teaching of foundational reading and in teaching early adolescent reading, using the research based strategies as outlined by the "What" document and using the 10 instructional improvements from *Reading Next.*

- To provide professional learning for all staff in the teaching of writing across all disciplines.

- To provide professional learning on using data to inform tiered instruction and to establish needs-based reading and writing groups.

- To provide students with access to rich and varied print and other media to engage them in the text.

c. The research-based practices in the "What and Why" documents as a guide for establishing goals and objectives.

The "What and Why" documents refer to clear and specific standards for every developmental level from birth through twelfth grade. This document meshes with both the state literacy plan and with the Jefferson County literacy plan. It refers not only to standards for best instructional practices, but also to professional learning opportunities for teachers, to the use of technology and other media, to a tiered instructional model, to vertical alignment, and to sustainability.

The goals and objectives stated in this grant proposal reflect those components of the "What and Why" documents and are crucial for students to have workforce readiness skills, one of the strategic goals of the Georgia Department of Education.

d. Considers practices already in place when determining goals and objectives.

Practices in place at Louisville Academy include the following:

- a fully functional vertical team that has been in place for several years;

- a stable staff with strong ties to the community;

- an intense desire to participate in meaningful professional learning and dialogue; and

- an instructional schedule that supports small and large group instruction and that allows extended time for literacy instruction.

e. Goals to be funded with other sources.

Goals to be funded	Other sources of revenue
Instructional coach	Title I
Reduced class size	Title I and Title IIA
Print and other media	QBE
Technology purchases	General fund and SPLOST
Basic infrastructure	E-rate and general fund
Professional learning	Title II, Part A
Software for tiered instruction	Title I, Title VI Part B

Scientific, Evidence-Based Literacy Plan

According to the Georgia Literacy Task Force, the definition of 21st Century Literacy is the *ability to speak, listen, read, and write, as well as to view print and non-print text in order to communicate effectively, to think and respond critically, and to access and use multiple forms of media and information*. Implementing the definition of literacy is indeed the purpose of this literacy plan.

a. Proposes a plan to implement the goals and objectives identified

b. Establishes who will implement

c. Clearly defines what will take place in the project based on the "What" document

See the chart below for items a, b, c.

Goal: To create and implement a sustainable literacy program that would insure that every child communicates effectively; accesses and uses multiple forms of media; and reads and writes fluently using a variety of media and across all disciplines.

a. Objectives	b. Who will implement	c. What will take place
• To provide professional learning for all instructional staff to include Common Core literacy evidence-based strategies and formative assessments based on the standards to guide viable interventions	• Instructional Coach • Vertical Team Chairs • Consultant	• Professional learning for 2 days in the summer of 2011 for all instructional staff • Vertical teams and grade levels meet to unpack standards and to write formative assessments
• To provide professional learning for instructional staff in the teaching of foundational reading, using the research based strategies as outlined by the "What" document. • To provide professional learning for instructional staff in the teaching of early adolescent literacy, using the ten instructional improvements from *Reading Next* as outlined by the "What" document.	• Consultants • Instructional coach	• 50 hours of professional learning for all staff members in either foundational reading and/or early adolescent reading focusing on the specific research-based reading elements. To be completed during summer 2012 and school year 2012-2013.
• To provide professional learning for all staff in the teaching of writing across all disciplines.	• Vertical team chair for social studies and writing • Vertical team chair for math • All ELA and content area teachers • Consultant	• Use research-based instructional strategies to teach children to produce text—both print and otherwise—across all disciplines. These writing and production strategies should be incorporated into the science and social studies curricula.
• To provide professional learning in the use of specific assessment instruments and in using data to inform tiered instruction and to established needs-based reading and writing groups.	• Consultants • Administration with support from local BOE	• Webinar or other training • Data retreats • Focus school improvement on specific subgroups and specific individuals • Design schedule to allow for specific interventions
• To provide students with access to a rich environment of print and other media	• Media specialist • Vertical team chairs • Administration	• Provide multi-leveled print and other media for classroom use • Provide additional multi-leveled non fiction text • Provide equitable access to software and a wide variety of

		both technology and print
To provide professional learning to support teacher use of software and technology	• Consultant • Administration	• Initial training from a consultant. On going, job embedded professional learning conducted by staff members and by consultants.

Goal 2. To have every child reading at a Lexile level of 850 or higher when leaving elementary school.

a. Objectives/Goal	b. Who will implement	c. What will take place
Every child will read at a lexile of 850 or higher when leaving elementary school.	• Vertical Teams • School Improvement Team • Administration	All of the above activities address this goal. In addition, extended learning time is crucial for students who struggle. • Summer school • After school • Training using brain based learning software

d. Details the current instructional schedule.

• **Kindergarten**

Kindergarten classes are self-contained, with each teacher having a full time paraprofessional. The students in tiers 2, 3, and 4 receive individual instruction from their teacher throughout the day—during small group time, during center time, during outside time, etc. They also go to a Classworks lab 2 days a week for intervention activities.

• **Grades 1-3**

Using a parallel block schedule in conjunction with literacy and math labs, teachers in grades1 through 3 run small, needs-based groups in the morning for reading/language arts and in the afternoon for math. The literacy labs focus on reading and writing in the content area. The math lab uses learning centers and a hands-on approach. Students who are in tiers 2, 3 or 4 use the Classworks lab 4 days a week. Reading, writing and language arts instruction occurs every morning for 165 minutes. Each student has the following daily schedule:

o Small group reading instruction for 1 segment with regular classroom teacher.

- o Whole group ELA for 1 segment, with regular classroom teacher.

- o Whole group science/social studies literacy for 1 segment in the literacy lab.

- o Paraprofessionals, special education teachers, and classroom teachers, provide intervention for reading for students in tiers 2, 3, and 4.

- o Small group math instruction for 1 segment with regular classroom teacher or special education teacher.

- o Whole group math instruction for 1 segment with regular classroom teacher.

- o Small group math instruction with lab teacher, special education teacher, paraprofessional for students in Tiers 2, 3, and 4.

- **Grades 4 and 5**

  Students in grades 4 and 5 have the same schedule:

  - o Students attend 4 classes, each 80 minutes long: reading, social studies/writing, science, and math.

  - o Each reading class is broken into 2 groups based on student's needs; each group is taught by a highly qualified reading teacher, thus allowing for more individual attention.

  - o The social studies teachers in grade 4 and 5 are responsible for teaching expository writing. The social studies and the writing curricula are combined into one document.

  - o The science teacher for grade 4 and the science teacher for grade 5 take students to the Classworks lab at least 2 days a week for specific interventions.

The schedules described above allow for an extended time for reading/writing instruction, and they also allow for small group instruction for reading. Other certified staff members who do not have direct classroom responsibilities also assist with small group instruction and with individual tutorials for students in Tiers 2, 3, and 4.

e. Details a plan for tiered instruction

- Tier 1. Standards based instruction, including differentiated instruction, using a wide variety of texts and media in the regular classroom. All students participate in Tier 1.

- Tier 2. Needs based, flexible groups. Tier 2 involves small group instruction, and one-on-one re-teaching to address specific needs. "Extra" staff members—and volunteers assist with these groups. Progress monitoring occurs every 2 weeks.

- Tier 3. It is imperative that teachers use data to inform instruction and to implement evidence based interventions for Tier 3 students. Tier 3 instruction is SST driven, is tailored to the specific student, and uses different materials specifically designed to address the student's needs. Constant progress monitoring is crucial to determine the effectiveness of interventions. Research indicates that additional time is needed for students in Tier 3 to improve reading achievement.

- Tier 4. Instruction for students in Tier 4 is driven by each child's Individual Educational Plan (IEP). Teachers trained to deal with students' specific disabilities, along with the regular classroom teacher, are charged with the responsibility for implementing the interventions for students in Tier 4.

f. Details the material currently used for Tier 1 instruction:

Content Area	Text	Comment
Language Arts	*Storytown,* Houghton Mifflin	Basal reading program with some of the accompanying materials
	Leveled texts and classroom novel sets	Limited in quantity and diversity
	Trade books	
Social Studies	*Social Studies, Our Democracy*, HM	
Science	*Georgia Science,* Harcourt	
Math	*Investigations in Number, Data, and Space*, Pearson Scott Foresman	Hands on, concept development
	Mathematics, Scott Foresman AW	Traditional text
Interdisciplinary	Variety of software on the server	

g. Lists the time, personnel, and strategies Tiers 2, 3,and 4.

Tier	Time	Personnel	Strategies
Tier 2	As needed per	Regular classroom	Small group or one-on-one remediation with volunteer or a

	formative assessments	teacher	resource teacher. Use of leveled texts. RTI lab with software that tailors practice for students' needs.
Tier 3	Daily	Regular classroom teacher	Small group instruction daily. Low tech modifications to text. Use of leveled texts. RTI lab 2-4 times a week. Small group assistance from special education teacher or other certified personnel.
Tier 4	Daily	Special education teacher. Regular classroom teacher	Reading with adapted text. Text to speech electronic assistance if needed. Individual or small group assistance from special education teacher. RTI lab 2-4 days a week.

h. Includes a statement regarding conflict with other initiatives

There is no conflict with any other initiatives.

Strategies and Materials (Existed and Proposed)

a. General list of current classroom resources for each classroom in the school.

Each classroom has the following resources:

Pre-K and K	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3 -5
2 student computers (not modern)	3 student computers (not modern)	4 student computers (not modern)	5 student computers (modern)
Mini lab 9 computers (not modern)	LCD projector	Interactive white board (modern)	Interactive white board (not modern)
	Document camera	Document camera	Document camera
	Mini lab 8 computers, not modern	2 mini labs 8 computers each (not modern)	Student response devices (not modern)
			2 mini labs with 8 each (not modern) for grade 3 25 computers
			25 computer lab

b. generic list of shared resources

- Galileo

- Software for intervention and remediation

- Renaissance Place

- Microsoft package

- Video distribution

- United streaming

- Leveled texts—limited in quantity and diversity

- Trade books—fiction and nonfiction—limited in quantity and diversity

- Internet access in every classroom

c. A general list of library resources or a description of the library as equipped.

The media center is truly the hub of the school. While it has a good supply of fiction books, the non-fiction section needs attention. Most books are labeled with a grade equivalency to help students self-select appropriate material. In addition, certain shelves are designated for particular types of reading materials; e.g., "*I Can Read*" books, easy chapter books, long picture books, easy reading, Newbery books, etc.

The media specialist and her aide work directly with the students to help them access and evaluate information, using traditional text and other media. The five look up stations in the media center double as research stations when Internet access is needed.

d. A list of resources needed to implement the literacy plan including student engagement.

Software	Hardware	Print
Brain based learning	Modern computers	Audio and e-books
Augmented reality	Interactive whiteboards	Graphic novels for media center
Text to speech	e-notebooks	Non fiction books for media center
On line grading capability	Headphones & mics	Children's magazine subscriptions
	Document cameras	Professional journals
	Digital/video/web cameras	Classroom libraries
	Charging station	Leveled texts for classrooms
	Hand held student response devices	

e. A generic list of activities that support classroom practices

- Use of a framework for instruction

- Use of graphic organizers

- Frequent progress monitoring

- Frequent formative assessments and common summative assessments

- Emphasis on higher order thinking skills

- Good standards based instruction

f. A generic list of strategies needed to support literacy intervention programs

- Writing daily in all disciplines, using a specific instructional framework

- Exposing students to a print and media rich environment

- Producing research projects

- Authentic reading and writing activities

g. A generic list of additional strategies needed to support student success

- Professional learning for foundational reading and for early adolescent reading

- Professional learning writing across the curriculum

- Extended learning time

- Appropriate assessment instruments and procedures

Project Procedures and Support

Below are examples of a sample instructional schedule for each grade level that show the following:

a. Tiered instructional schedule by grade level.

b. Students in elementary school receive at least 90 minutes of tiered instruction through the content areas.

c. A schedule that is designed for RTI.

Kindergarten sample schedule. Students stay with their regular teacher and parapro all day.

8:15-8:45	8:45-9:30	9:30-10:15	10:15-10:45	10:45-11:45	11:45-12:00	12:00-12:45	12:45-1:30	1:30-2:15	2:15-2:45
Large group: Calendar, daily news, story time, etc.	Literacy centers	Small groups literacy Pull Tier 2, 3,4 students	Story time—non fiction books	Lunch Art/ PE music/ 3 days a week RTI lab 2 days a week	Story time	Large group math	Math centers	Small group math Pull Tier 2, 3, 4 students	Science/ soc st

Small group for literacy: cut up stories, make words, journal writing, etc.

Grades 1, 2, 3 sample schedule. Students stay with their classroom teacher except lab time.

	8:15-9:05	9:05-9:55	10:15-11:05	11:10-12:15	12:15-1:05	1:05-1:55	1:55-2:45
Teacher A 2 distinct groups: A. B	RTI reading group A	Regular reading Group B	Whole class language arts	Lunch/ Recess/art/ music/PE	RTI math Group A	Regular math Group B	Whole class math
Lab teacher	Group B science/social studies literacy lab	Group A science/social studies literacy lab	Works with individs/ small groups for Tiers 2, 3, 4 Teamed with reg. teacher	Pull students as needed for RTI	Group B Math extension	Group A Math RTI	Small group/ individual math instruction

Before school: Students in Tiers 2, 3, 4 who arrive early work with teacher on hall duty.

Grades 4 and 5 sample schedule. Students go to each of 4 classes: reading, soc st/writing, science, and math. The shaded blocks show how an individual child would move through the day.

	8:10-9:35	9:35-10:55	10:55-12:25	12:25-12:55 Lunch	12:55-2:10	2:10-2:50 Art/music/ PE
Reading Teacher	Reading Group regular (small group)	Reading Group regular (small group)	Reading Group regular (small group)		Reading Group regular (small group)	RTI: Tiers 2, 3, 4 Students are regrouped 2 days a week for specific, needs based instruction w/ regular teachers and with art, music, and PE teachers.
Soc St / Writing Teacher	Whole Class	Whole Class	Whole Class		Whole Class	
Science Teacher RTI lab 2 days a week.	Whole Class	Whole Class	Whole Class		Whole Class	
Math teacher	Whole Class	Whole Class	Whole Class		Whole Class	
Augmented Reading Teacher	RTI reading group (Tier 2)	RTI reading group (Tier 2)	RTI reading group (Tier 3)		reading group	
Sp. Ed Teacher	RTI group 3 and 4	RTI group 3 and 4	RTI group 4			

Before school: Students in Tiers 2, 3, 4 who arrive early go to RTI lab.

Professional Learning Content and Strategies Identified on the Basis of Documented Needs

a. a table indicating the professional learning activities that staff have attended in the past year.

(documented in table below)

b. the number of hours of professional learning that staff have attended. *(documented in table below)*

c. The percent of staff attending professional learning. *(documented in table below)*

a. Professional learning activity provided in the past year	Number of participants	b. Hours	c. Percentage of staff participating
Best Practices and CLASS Keys	38	20	90% (everyone except Pre-K and 1 half-time employee)
ACTIVboard training, beginning	4	6	9.5%
ACTIVboard training, advanced	4	6	9.5%
Working on the Work: grades 3-5, writing, science, social studies, math	11	6 hours per subject	26%
Classworks/RTI	10	6	23.8%
RTI for paraprofessionals	9 of 13 instructional paraprofessionals	3	69% of paraprofessionals
Pre-K Best Practices for Teachers	3 of 3 pre-k teachers	5	100% of Pre-K teachers
Pre-K Best Practices for Teaching Assistants	4 of 4 paraprofessionals	5	100% of Pre-K parapros

d. A detailed list of on-going professional learning.

- Whole faculty professional learning about reading strategies, DOK, assessment.

- Vertical teams meet weekly or bi-weekly to look at the CCGPS across grade levels, to unpack standards, to determine the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) of standards, to write essential questions, and to form sample assessments that match the DOK of the standard.

- Grade level teams meet weekly and engage in job-embedded professional learning directly related to the classroom.

- Book study about dealing with disruptive behavior.

e. The preferred method of delivery of professional learning.

The preferred method of delivery in order of preference: summer with stipends, release time during the school day, at the end of the school day.

- **The programmatic professional learning needs identified in the needs assessment**

Programmatic professional learning is needed in the following areas:

- Teaching struggling readers, using the component parts of sound foundational reading strategies.

- Teaching early adolescents using the tenets in *Reading Next* as outlined in the "What" document.

- Learning to use good assessment practices and instruments and to analyze data to inform 4-tiered instruction.

- Using engaging and interactive technology and other media for reading, writing, and production.

- Teaching writing in all discipline areas so that the reading/writing/learning connection is clear and fluid.

Assessment/Data Analysis Plan

a. A detailed listing of the school's current assessment protocol			
Assessment	**Purpose**	**Skills**	**Frequency**
DIAL III	To identify SDD students entering kindergarten	Readiness, cognition, numeracy	Once a year
GKIDS	To identify readiness for first grade	GPS standards for kindergarten	Summative at end of year
Classworks Universal Screener	To identify readiness for grade level work	National standards	3 times a year
STAR	To identify reading level to help students self select books	Comprehension and vocabulary	3 times a year
CRCT	To test mastery of GPS	GPS: comprehension and vocabulary	Once a year, grades 3-5
ITBS	Norm referenced test to compare students	Reading comprehension and vocabulary	Once a year in grades 2 and 4

	nationally		
Georgia Writing Test	To measure students' achievement in writing	Writing standards	Once a year in grades 3 and 5
Common summative assessments	To evaluate mastery of a unit of study	Skills taught within a unit of study	At the end of a unit of study.
Formative assessments	To monitor progress towards achievement of stated standards/objectives	Specific skill sets within a unit of study	Given frequently within a classroom

Common summative assessments are not given consistently at Louisville Academy in all grades.

They are more frequent in the upper elementary grade levels. Writing common summative assessments

is a focus of the school improvement plan. Teachers use formative assessments to revise their

instruction and to help plan for students in Tiers 2, 3, and 4. During the 2010-2011 school year, the staff

engaged in professional dialogue regarding the use of formative assessments.

b. An explanation of the current data analysis protocol

The school has not used a data analysis protocol. However, the protocol below is the one that

the school will use in the future.

<p style="text-align:center">Data Analysis Protocol for Louisville Academy (See appendix for detailed version)</p>

Guiding Questions	- In what areas were our students NOT successful? Why? - What DOK level is required for students to master the objective/skill/standard? - What best practice strategies were used to teach these objectives/skills/standards? - What did we do to promote success? - What specific interventions were used to address these areas?
Exploring Root Causes	Use the "5 Why's" or other root cause analysis procedure to identify root cause. - What strategies did not produce the expected results? - List some possible reasons/hypotheses to explain lack of student success.
Taking Action	- What resources are needed to support student needs? - How can we set and monitor measurable learning objectives? - How will students in Tiers 2, 3, and 4 be supported? - What differentiated instruction might be implemented?

	• Are there some gaps that could be filled using whole class instruction? • What will we do for students that do not master objectives/skills/standards? • How can we schedule time to meet with individuals or small groups? • How should we target professional development?
Student Learning Goals?	
Improvement Strategies?	
Action Steps?	
Professional development?	
Evidence of Success?	
Evaluation Process?	

c. Comparison of the current protocol with the SRCL assessment plan

Age/Grade Level	SRCL Assessment	Currently used by Louisville Academy?	Plans for future use at Louisville Academy?	Other assessments administered by Louisville Academy
Four Year Old	PALS	No	As allowed by Bright from the Start	DIAL III
	PPVT	No	As allowed by Bright from the Start	
	ELLCO	No	As allowed by Bright from the Start	
	CLASS		Yes	
Kindergarten thru Grade 2	DIBELS	No	Yes	Classworks
	CRCT	No	If required by state	GKIDS for kindergarten only
	IPI	No	Yes	STAR
Grades 3-5	DIBELS	No	For selected students	Classworks
	CRCT	Yes	Yes	STAR
	IPI	No	Yes	
Grades K-12	ACCESS for ELLs	Yes	Yes	

- **A brief narrative detailing how the new assessments will be implemented**

- Assessments for the Pre-K program to be given as allowed by *Bright from the Start.*

- DIBELS will be administered as the universal screener and for progress monitoring in the early

    childhood grades.

- Even though the SRCL plan recommends Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) for grades 6 and up, the school would like to administer the SRI rather than the STAR for students in all grades, but especially for grades 4 and 5.

- The Informal Phonics Inventory (IPI), typically administered 2 to 3 times a year, evaluates students' knowledge of phonics, a determined weakness of the instructional program.

A narrative listing current assessment that might be discontinued as a result of the implementation of SRCL.

- STAR will be discontinued if SRI is adopted. Because SRI gives a Lexile, it will not be necessary to also get a grade equivalency on each student.

- Classworks universal screener will be discontinued in favor of DIBELS universal screener, especially for the early childhood grades.

- **A listing of training that teachers will need to implement any new assessments**

- SRI. Teachers need training to administer this assessment

- DIBELS. Teachers need training to administer this assessment, using both the electronic version and the paper-pencil version.

- IPI. Training will be necessary to administer the IPI.

- **A brief narrative on how data is presented to parents and stakeholders.**

Data is presented to parents in the following manner:

- Individual standardized test data is sent home.

- Formative assessments are sent home weekly.

- Parents have access to on-line grading system used by teachers.

- The principal has a yearly meeting with parents to present data from standardized tests.

Appendices are on hard copies as per Ms. Morrill (via email).