

**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: Clarke County School District		Project Number: (DOE Assigned)	
Total Grant Request: \$3,316,787	System Contact Information:		
Number of schools in system: 1 applying:	Name: Dr. Mark Tavernier	Positions: Director of Teaching and Learning	Fax: 706-549-0555
Congressional District: 10	Email: tavernierm@starke.k12.ga.us		

**Sub-grant Status**

- Large District (45,000 or more students)
- X Mid-Sized District (10,000 to 44,999 students)
- Small District (0-9,999 students)

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

**STRIVING READERS**

**Clarke County School District's Grant Proposal**

**I. ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENT AND TEACHER DATA**

**a. CRCT Data: Norm-Referenced Test:** Along with the state's Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) assessments, the Clarke County School District (CCSD) also administers the Scantron Performance Series Norm-Referenced Test each year, an assessment that, when compared to CRCT scores (Table 2), provides a better yardstick to determine how Clarke County students measure up

to students across the nation. With the 50th percentile representing the *average* student performance level, CCSD’s third-grade students combined scored at the 34<sup>th</sup> percentile in reading, fifth-grade students scored at the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile, and eighth-grade students scored at the 39<sup>th</sup> percentile—all significantly below average. Percentile results for the four target elementary schools and target middle school are shown in Table 1:

<b>Table 1: Nationally Norm-Referenced Reading &amp; ELA Performance Results 2011</b>		
<b>Schools</b>	<b>Reading Percentile Scores</b>	<b>Language Arts Percentile Scores</b>
Fowler Drive Elementary School	34	31
J.J. Harris Elementary Charter School	40	33
H.B. Stroud Elementary School	44	35
Winterville Road Elementary School	35	23
Coile Middle School	47	47

Because the norm-referenced test compares Clarke County students to students nationwide, the gaps identified in Table I are alarming.

*State Writing Test:* On Georgia’s 2011 Fifth-Grade Writing Assessment, the percentages of students NOT meeting standards in all four target elementary schools—Fowler Drive Elementary (22%), J.J. Harris Elementary (32%), Stroud Elementary (43%), and Winterville Elementary (31%)—are too high, despite the fact that the schools had significantly improved their writing scores last year as compared to the year before (by 22%, 27%, 22%, and 28%, respectively). Nevertheless, these scores are all still higher than the state’s “Does Not Meet” (DNM) average of 21%. Although fifth-grade writing test results have improved over the past five years, too many Clarke County students are entering middle school with significant writing deficits. On the 2011 Eighth-Grade Writing Assessment, improvements were far less dramatic, but Coile Middle School had the highest DNM score at 34%, as compared to the state average of 18%. At Coile Middle School, 19.9% of students are enrolled in the Remedial Education Program, and 13.2% are enrolled in special education.

*CRCTs in Reading and Language Arts:* Table 2 presents the assessment results for all Clarke County students in grades 3, 5, and 8 who did NOT meet standards on the 2011 CRCTs in Reading and Language Arts:

<b>Table 2: 2011 CRCT Results in Reading and Language Arts – Grades 3, 5, and 8<sup>1</sup></b>							
<b>Schools</b>	<b>% Reading DNM</b>			<b>% Language Arts DNM</b>			
<b>Grades</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	
Alps Road ES & Clarke MS	20.0	25.0	8.1	23.6	18.8	14.9	
Barnett Shoals & Hilsman MS	16.2	8.1	5.3	22.1	4.2	10.3	
Barrow ES & Clarke MS	7.4	9.6	8.1	10.3	1.9	14.9	
Chase Street & Clarke MS	9.4	15.8	8.1	9.4	5.3	14.9	
Cleveland Road & BHL MS	12.7	3.8	5.3	16.4	7.5	16.0	
Fowler Drive & Coile MS	16.3	9.3	10.3	20.4	3.7	11.4	
Gaines ES & Hilsman MS	25.6	10.3	5.3	29.5	13.8	10.3	
Harris Charter ES & Coile MS	15.1	18.2	10.3	8.2	14.3	11.4	
Oglethorpe ES & BHL MS	15.6	15.5	5.3	20.8	13.1	16.0	
Stroud ES & Coile MS	13.0	11.1	10.3	24.1	13.9	11.4	
Timothy Road ES & Clarke MS	3.1	11.5	8.1	12.5	7.7	14.9	
Whit Davis ES & Hilsman MS	12.0	7.8	5.3	14.1	4.9	10.3	
Whitehead Road & BHL MS	6.7	15.2	5.3	9.6	12.1	16.0	
Winterville ES & Coile MS	22.0	26.4	10.3	28.8	14.8	11.4	

A CRCT Reading Domain Analysis reveals that the percentage of items correct in the Literacy Comprehension Domain was 68% for third-grade students and 67% for fifth-grade students. Furthermore, the percentage of items correct for Reading Skills and Vocabulary Domain was 78% for third-grade students and 79% for fifth-grade students. The district’s CRCT ELA Domain Analysis reveals that the percentage of items correct for third-grade students was 68% and 69% for fifth graders in the Grammar & Sentence Construction Domain, while in the Research & Writing Process Domain the number of correct items for third graders was 62% and 76% for fifth-grade students. In the Reading Skills & Vocabulary Acquisition Domain, the number of correct items was 75% for fifth-graders. For the Grammar & Sentence Construction and Research & Writing Process Domains, Coile Middle School is the

<sup>1</sup> Shaded rows indicate schools targeted for CCSD’s Striving Readers project.

district's lowest scoring middle school.<sup>2</sup> At a time when the English/Language Arts Common Core Georgia Performance Standards are being implemented in Georgia, our schools need to prepare students for the increased rigor of the new state standards by identifying each student's skill deficits, designing targeted intervention plans (RTI), and monitoring each student's progress as they master the reading skills necessary for reading competency at or above their current grade levels. For disaggregated CRCT results, see Table 7.

*High School Reading and Writing Tests:* CCSD does not currently determine Lexile scores for high school students, but will do so using the Scholastic Reading Inventory with Striving Readers grant funding. English Language Arts and Writing scores are shown below:

<b>Table 3: Graduation Test Domain Analysis – Meets English Language Arts Standards - 2011</b>			
	<b>Reading Comprehension</b>	<b>Literary Analysis</b>	<b>Conventions/Writing</b>
Georgia	76	74	82
CCSD	70	69	76
Cedar Shoals HS	69	68	75

<b>Table 4: Comparison of 2011 Georgia High School Writing Test Pass Results</b>				
<b>Students Tested</b>	<b>Ideas</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Style</b>	<b>Conventions</b>
Cedar Shoals High School	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8
CCSD (3 high schools)	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9
Georgia	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2

**b. High School Graduation Data:<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>2</sup> This data represents scores prior to summer retests.

<sup>3</sup> CCSD's third high school, Classic City High School, is a small (125 students), alternative, self-paced high school.

<b>Table 5: CCSD's Graduation Data over the Past Five Years</b>					
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Cedar Shoals High School	58.1	62.2	61.4	70.4	71.7
Clarke Central High School	63.6	69.3	68.7	71.4	74.1
CCSD Graduation Rates	58.4	63.1	63.3	70.1	70.8
CCSD Targets	65.0	70.0	75.0	80.0	85.0
State of Georgia Graduation Rate	72.3	75.4	78.9	80.8	Not avail.

**c. Early Learning Readiness:** CCSD's Office of Early Learning (Early Head Start, Head Start, Pre-K, and Early Reading First) administers the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-IV) twice a year, in fall and spring, to children ages 3-5. For three-year-olds, the fall 2010 administration revealed that only 45% of students were on target for language development, while the spring 2011 administration demonstrated that 70% of students were on track—a growth factor of 25 percentage points. In the fall of 2010, 42% of children entered Clarke County's Pre-K program with significant language delays. While 58% of Pre-K students demonstrated age-appropriate language development in the fall, 81% of students did so in the spring—a growth rate of 23 percentage points, indicating that 81% of our Pre-K students were ready for kindergarten by the end of the school year.

The results of the 2011 Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS) assessment, shown in Table 6 below, reveal that for Clarke County kindergarten students, the English/Language Arts scores across the district are slightly better than the state average; however, the percentage of students with *low motivation to learn* ("Approaches to Learning") is significantly worse than the state average, especially in two of the target elementary schools, Stroud and Winterville; target schools are shaded:

<b>Table 6: 2011 GKIDS Results for ELA and Motivation to Learn - % NOT Meeting Standards</b>					
<b>Schools</b>	<b>ELA</b>	<b>Motivation to Learn</b>	<b>Schools</b>	<b>ELA</b>	<b>Motivation to Learn</b>
Alps Road ES	15.00	33.20	J.J. Harris (C)ES	11.80	15.30
Barnett Shoals ES	11.00	36.90	Oglethorpe ES	31.20	22.40

Barrow ES	13.30	19.50	Stroud ES	19.40	52.00
Chase Street ES	12.80	15.90	Timothy Rd. ES	21.30	41.60
Cleveland Road ES	11.40	18.10	Whit Davis ES	13.40	18.60
Fowler Drive ES	12.30	10.20	Whitehead ES	18.00	28.40
Gaines ES	20.40	37.50	Winterville ES	8.90	40.80
CCSD	16.40	28.50	State of Georgia	18.6	23.70

Clarke County teachers are challenged not only to teach the standards-based curriculum at each grade level but also to draw out of children their natural curiosity to learn and grow academically. Motivation to learn can be a greater predictor of school success than assessment results.

**d. Disaggregation of Data in Subgroups:** For the 2011-2012 school year, CCSD's federal lunch-program rate is 79.03% (Absolute Priority and Competitive Priority). Table 7 presents CRCT Data for Clarke County subgroups:

<b>Table 7: Disaggregated CRCT Data Grades 3, 5, and 8 – % NOT Meeting Standards</b>						
<b>Grades</b>	<b>% Reading DNM</b>			<b>% Language Arts DNM</b>		
	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>
All Students 2010/2011	37/28	45/34	39/28	56/36	43/32	56/40
Asian Students 2010/2011	0/5	5/5	0/9	6/11	5/11	0/9
Black Students 2010/2011	18/20	21/17	13/9	27/24	17/13	23/16
Hispanic Students 2010/2011	9/8	15/13	6/8	14/14	18/8	16/13
White Students 2010/2011	4/2	8/5	5/1	7/3	5/3	7/2
Economically Disadvantaged 2010/2011	10.00/ 16.33	11.00/ 16.10	9.00/ 8.03	17.00/ 20.39	17.00/ 10.04	21.00/ 14.88
Students with Disabilities 2010/2011	27.00/ 26.50	30.00/ 34.54	32.00/ 32.60	53.00/ 34.49	43.00/ 33.14	55.00/ 41.75
Limited English Proficient 2010/2011	8.00/ 20.55	15.00/ 14.67	10.00/ 24.10	19.00/ 25.11	30.00/ 19.94	31.00/ 35.75

**e. Teacher Retention Data:** CCSD has 1,150 teachers and typically hires about 100 teachers every year. The current turnover rate for Clarke County teachers is 9.47% with 109 teachers resigning by the end of the 2010-2011 school year. Last summer (2011), CCSD had 99 positions posted for certified teachers. Each year, the school district fills about 30% of its open teacher positions from the pool of new University of Georgia College of Education graduates.

**f. Teacher Participation in Professional Learning Communities or Ongoing Professional Learning at the School:** See school proposals.

**II. NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

Clarke County’s Striving Readers needs-assessment process involved brainstorming sessions; compiling and examining student literacy-assessment data and districtwide survey data; determining the needs of the teachers; and exploring the capacity and readiness of schools to implement Striving Readers with fidelity (implementing, monitoring, collecting and reporting data). As a result of the needs assessment, the cluster identified for the Striving Readers grant is the Cedar Shoals High School/Coile Middle School cluster, including the four feeder elementary schools and the district’s Early Learning Center.

**a. Description of the Materials Used in the Needs Assessment:**

<b>Table 8: Materials Used for Needs Assessment</b>	
<b>CCSD Materials</b>	<b>Contribution to Comprehensive Needs Assessment</b>
CCSD’s annual “School Improvement Survey”	This survey is designed to gather perception data related to each school’s implementation of various components of the <i>Georgia School Keys</i> .
Annual District Data Notebook	This notebook summarizes current and longitudinal school and district performance results of all national, state, and district assessments.
“Comprehensive District-wide Assessment Plan”	<i>Assessment Strand - Georgia School Keys</i> ; Assessment Pyramid; list of K-12 district assessments; “Elementary Reading Levels Correlations”; “District Expectations for Using Data Teams”
“Amended AYP Tracking Charts”	“Grades 3-8 AYP Progress in CRCT Reading/English Language Arts”; “AYP Progress in GHSGT English Language Arts”; “AYP Progress in Graduation Rate”
“Literacy Assessment Results”	“Percentage of Students at or above Benchmark Reading Level” (by quarters); list of students’ reading levels in grades 1, 2, & 3, assessments in spelling, writing, sight words; “Percentage of Students at or above Benchmark Reading Level After Quarter 4”; writing scores
“Preliminary State Assessment Results”	“Historical Data”; “Performance Level Information”; “Subgroup Data”; “Benchmark Data”; “Domain Data”; “GKIDS Data”; “GAA Data”; “ACCESS Results”; “Writing Test Data”; “EOCT”; “Scantron Predictability Study”; “State/RESA/District Comparison”; “Literacy Assessments & CRCT Comparison”; “Cohort Analysis”; “AYP Tracking Charts”; “District School Improvement Survey Data”
CCSD’s District	District goals, initiatives, action steps, timelines

Improvement Plan	
School Improvement Plans	Each school's primary literacy focus and efforts.

**b. Description of the Needs Assessment:** CCSD is a data-rich school district; therefore, identifying a school cluster to participate in a Striving Readers grant was based on historical and recent student-achievement data; AYP trends; SES-usage; the schools' capacity to implement a rigorous Striving Readers grant with fidelity; and the ability to collect evaluation data over the next five years. In November, district administrators collected assessment data related to reading, language arts, graduation rate, and other indicators. The data revealed that the Coile Middle School quadrant of Clarke County (Cedar Shoals High School, Coile Middle School, and the four feeder elementary schools) would be the best placement for a state Striving Readers grant, based on student achievement data, capacity to implement the grant, and individuals located within that quadrant; Deborah Haney, Principal of Winterville Elementary School, for example, is on the Georgia Department of Education's Literacy Team, and Dwight Manzy, Principal of Coile Middle School, implemented the district's only Reading First grant at an elementary school. In addition, CCSD's centrally located Early Learning Center, which serves children from birth to five years of age, is included in the proposed implementation plan because the Center serves all Clarke County schools. Carolyn Wolpert, the district's Early Reading First Coordinator, and Linda Sprague, the Early Learning Center's Professional Learning Coordinator, both serve on Georgia's Literacy Task Force. Based on the needs identified, the Professional Learning Plan (see pp. 19-20) was developed, highlighting examination of assessment data, targeted RTI, reading endorsements, and writing. On November 15, the Striving Readers grant program was explained to principals and district leaders. On November 22, the principals of the 7 target schools met with district leaders, including Superintendent Philip Lanoue, to discuss the

requirements of the Striving Readers grant program related to needs assessment, identification of gaps in each school’s literacy practices, and proposal writing. Following that meeting, each school formed literacy teams that examined school-specific, relevant student-assessment to determine each school’s literacy plan. CCSD conducts a “School Improvement Survey” in the spring of each school year in every school to gather perception data regarding each school’s implementation of various components of the *Georgia School Keys*. Each school’s certified staff, parents, and students participate in this online survey. In the target Cedar/Coile cluster, the following results indicate a need for additional professional learning in these areas:

- (1) The principal and other leaders plan adult learning by utilizing data: Fowler, 46.43%; Harris, 19.30%; Stroud, 13.95%; Winterville, 11.11%; Coile, 27.27%; Cedar, 42.11%.
- (2) Teams meet to review and study current research to make informed instructional decisions: Fowler, 46.43%; Harris, 21.05%; Stroud, 30.23%; Winterville - 11.11%; Coile, 30.91%; Cedar, 40.58%.
- (3) The staff participates in long-term, in-depth professional learning that is aligned with our school: Fowler, 42.86%; Harris, 7.02%; Stroud, 9.30%; Winterville, 8.33%; Coile, 20.00%; Cedar, 33.33%
- (4) Professional learning in our school provides opportunities for teachers and administrators to learn: Fowler, 57.14%; Harris, 17.54%; Stroud, 27.91%; Winterville, 19.44%; Coile, 40.00%; Cedar, 42.11%
- (5) Our principal and other school administrators utilize multiple types of data to drive and monitor instruction: Fowler, 32.14%; Harris, 8.77%; Stroud, 2.33%; Winterville, 5.56%; Coile, 5.45%; Cedar, 35.09%

With a Striving Readers grant, professional learning will focus on teachers’ abilities to analyze student-achievement data and student work related to literacy; enhance CCSD’s response-to-intervention literacy program; use data to inform instruction on a day-to-day, student-by-student basis; and increase teacher expertise in reading and writing strategies across content areas.

**c. Listing of Individuals Who Participated in the Needs Assessment:**

- Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services & School Performance
- Dr. Mark Tavernier, Director of Teaching and Learning and SR Project Director
- Xernona Thomas, Principal, J.J. Harris Elementary Charter School
- Deborah Haney, Principal, Winterville Elementary School

- Tim Jarboe, Director of Assessment
- Dr. Toni Reed, Director of Grants & Research
- Lynn Snelling, Executive Director, Technology Services
- Dr. Tony Price, Principal, Cedar Shoals High School
- Dwight Manzy, Principal, Coile Middle School
- Anissa Johnson, Principal, Fowler Drive Elem. School
- Dr. Ingrid Gilbert, Principal, Stroud Elementary School
- Alita Anderson, Elem. Literacy Coach
- Carlyn Maddox, Secondary Literacy Coach
- School-based Literacy Teams of 5-7 people each

### III. AREAS OF CONCERN

#### **a & b. Areas of Concern as They Relate to the Researched-based Practices Found in**

**the “What” Document:** DOE’s “What” document stresses writing as an important foundation for literacy development beginning with children birth to three years of age (p. 2) and extending through twelfth grade (p. 15). Skills learned during the first five years—including alphabet knowledge, awareness and concepts of print, writing as a means of communication, use of writing tools, and early attempts at writing—provide the foundation for later, more sophisticated reading and writing mastery. Many Clarke County students enter kindergarten without prerequisite oral-language skills and emergent reading and writing skills. For teachers, reading and writing instruction is challenging at every level. As teachers in all content areas learn effective ways of incorporating reading and writing instruction into their daily lessons, student’s literacy skills are expected to improve. Across the school district, the most conspicuous areas of concerns are: (1) transitions from Pre-K to kindergarten, K to 1<sup>st</sup> grade, 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup>; (2) literacy-focused vertical and horizontal alignment; (3) instructional materials for grades K-2; (4) Lexile scores for high school students; (5) strategies for addressing student motivation; and (6) professional-learning on research-based instructional strategies for teaching reading and writing, including across the curriculum.

**c. Areas of Concern and Steps Schools Have or Have Not Taken to Address Them:**

<b>Table 9: Areas of Concern and Solutions</b>	
<b>Areas of Concern</b>	<b>What CCSD Has Done or Has NOT Done to Address the Problem</b>
1	CCSD has few SBRR services in place to address transitions between these early grades.
2	Vertical alignment has been achieved in K-5 and 6-8, but CCSD has not vertically aligned literacy efforts in transitions from grades 8-9 or in grades 9-12.
3	K-2 does not have a core reading series for this age group.
4	CCSD does not currently determine Lexile scores for high school students.
5	Because students typically are competent users of technology, handheld computing devices, such as iPads or e-readers, increase student motivation to learn; through professional learning opportunities, teachers need to learn additional ways of increasing student motivation to learn.
6	CCSD provides ongoing professional learning and middle and high schools in reading and writing strategies identified in School Improvement Plans, but there has not been a systematic effort K-12 for literacy goals. Teachers need intensive professional learning focused on literacy, especially literacy instruction across the curriculum.

**IV. ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS**

**a. Root or Underlying Causes of the Areas of Concern Found in the Needs Assessment:**

Each July, CCSD provides schools with an “Annual District Data Notebook” that summarizes school and district performance on all state and district assessments. During pre-planning of each school year, CCSD provides schools with re-rostered data to match each school’s current enrollment. During the 2010-2011 school year, the Instructional Services Division conducted over 2,500 classroom walkthroughs to assess the implementation of standards-based classrooms. Each school’s School Improvement Leadership Teams use these data to conduct root cause analyses in order to target specific students, grades levels, and content areas in need of focused effort. During the Striving Readers planning and grant-writing stage, school-based Literacy Teams examined school-specific literacy data in their attempt to discover: (1) areas of concern; (2) specific root causes of the identified areas of concern; (3) gaps in each school’s comprehensive literacy plan when compared to DOE’s “What” document; (4) what each

school's identified needs are as the literacy teams designed a comprehensive literacy plan for the school; and (5) the action steps needed to implement the literacy plan. For specific root-cause analyses results, see each school's grant proposal.

**b. Specific Grade Levels Affected:** Literacy practices at all grade levels must be improved.

Over the past five or six years, only two elementary schools have implemented literacy grants (Reading Excellence Act and Reading First). CCSD's Early Learning Center, however, has implemented two Early Reading First grants (the largest ERF grants in the nation), which include Pre-K programs at all 14 elementary schools. Transitions between grades and vertical articulation of teaching practices need to take place throughout the school district. Grades K-2 do not currently have a core reading series, and Lexile scores for high school students are currently not available with current assessments. DIBELS and Scholastic Reading Inventory will be integrated into the current assessment schedule and practices.

**c. Specific Rationale for the Determination of the Cause:** There has been a lack of intensive, coordinated *districtwide* professional learning—birth through 12<sup>th</sup> grade—on *how* to teach reading and writing across the curriculum effectively to all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.

**d. What Has Been Done in the Past to Address the Problem:** Professional learning focused on literacy has been offered primarily to early learning and elementary teachers. The district has purchased software programs, e.g., *FastForward* and *READ 180*, to supplement Tier I instruction for students in grades 6-12. CCSD recently purchased *Voyager* for grades 1-8.

**e. New Information the Needs Assessment Uncovered:** The need for Lexile scores for high school students; the need for additional materials and assessments for RTI Tiers 2, 3, and 4.

## V. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

**a. List of Project Goals Directly Related to the Identified Needs:**

<b>Table 10: Needs and Goals</b>	
Identified Needs	Goals
Reading and writing instruction in all content areas based on specific strategies needed for each discipline; professional learning on content (e.g., grammar) and pedagogy (instructional strategies on RTI Tiers).	<b>Goal 1:</b> To increase best practices with teachers of every content area in direct, explicit reading instruction, and writing proficiency.
Professional learning related to formative and summative assessments birth through 12 <sup>th</sup> grade is needed for effective RTI monitoring.	<b>Goal 2:</b> To implement frequent screening, diagnostic, progress, and summative assessments so reading and writing proficiency is monitored for all students in Tiers 1-4.
Although ELA standards are vertically and horizontally aligned, teachers' knowledge of standards, skill levels, and practices required for other grades is lacking.	<b>Goal 3:</b> To clearly articulate vertically and horizontally common core standards and standards-based practices so that cohesion is experienced between grades and schools.

**b. Project Objectives That Relate to Implementing the Goals Identified:**

<b>Table 11: Project Objectives</b>	
Goals	Objectives
1	<b>1.1:</b> All students in Tiers 1-4 will receive direct and explicit reading strategies, including application of strategies for diverse texts, guided practice of strategies appropriate to the difficulty of texts, extended reading time with an instructional focus. <b>1.2:</b> All students in Tiers 1-4 will receive explicit vocabulary instruction, including learning new words by multiple exposures in a variety of contexts, and strategies to become independent vocabulary learners (knowledge of word components, use of reference materials). <b>1.3:</b> All students in Tiers 1-4 will receive writing strategies in every content area, including writing in all content areas on a daily basis and engaging in the writing process for specific audiences or purposes. <b>1.4:</b> Quarterly research-based writing will be required in all content areas.
2	<b>2.1:</b> All students will be assessed quarterly on reading comprehension and writing proficiency and will receive strategic instruction through Tier 1 and Tier 2-4 interventions. <b>2.2:</b> Teachers will identify Tier 2-4 students and their literacy assets and deficits by domains, and 90% of students will be correctly placed on Tiers 1-4, as appropriate. <b>2.3:</b> Teachers will provide interventions appropriate for students on Tiers 2-4, as indicated by ongoing formative assessments and will track student results.
3	<b>3.1:</b> Teachers will actively participate in professional-learning communities for multiple grade levels; schools will meet quarterly to examine benchmarks and similar student data as well as RTI data on a student-by-student basis. <b>3.2:</b> Professional learning includes comprehensive training and re-delivery of common core training with job embedded follow-up for all teachers by administrators and instructional coaches. <b>3.3:</b> During Year 1, Curriculum Teams (early learning, elementary and secondary) will meet to create vertical and horizontal

	articulation documents that teachers will use to plan instruction. <b>3.4:</b> All students will receive literacy common core standards and standards-based practices in all content areas.
--	---

**c. Research-Based Practices in the “What” and “Why” Document as a Guide for Establishing Goals and Objectives:**

<b>Table 12: Research-Based Practices that Support Goals &amp; Objectives</b>	
<b>Goals &amp; Obj.</b>	<b>Research-Based Practices</b>
Goal 1 Obj. 1.1-1.4	Grade-level or content groups of teachers will focus on student work and data to plan instruction and interventions on a student-by-student basis; provide modeling, classroom observations, and coaching to improve instruction; require all students to write extensively—extended prose in elementary and essays in high school; use functional approaches to teaching the rules of grammar; provide students with opportunities for collaborative writing; study media approaches to writing; use multiple formative assessments that provide students with detailed feedback (“Why,” p. 46); have students write about the texts they read, and explicitly teach students the writing skills and processes that go into creating text (“Why,” p. 48). Use Mills’ list of non-conventional reading skills (i.e., multimodal cueing systems; emergent, screen-based genres; non-linear reading comprehension and navigation skills; computer skills, such as switching between reading and writing; and critical literacy skills (“Why,” p. 52). teachers must become proficient in the use of instructional technology; identify consultants to work with CCSD secondary schools on reading and writing for struggling adolescents and reading and writing across the curriculum; let students pick some of their reading material; provide opportunities for teachers, especially at the secondary level, to earn Reading Endorsements.
Goal 2 Obj. 2.1 & 2.3	Non-ELA teachers will participate in intensive PL to learn how to strategically incorporate literacy instruction in all content classes; teachers will design project-based learning assignments that require collaborative research and writing; teach students at all reading levels and all content areas to visualize, question, make connections, predict, infer, determine importance, and synthesize/create; help students to relate content material to their own lives; help students become proficient in three types of texts—argument, informative/explanatory, narrative (“Why,” pp. 44-45);
Goal 3 Obj. 3.1 - 3.4	Teachers will use “Lexile Ranges Aligned to CCR Expectations” (“Why,” p. 50); update Growth charts following formative assessments; design and deliver lessons and assignments based on Growth Chart groupings.

**d. Practices Already in Place When Determining Goals and Objectives:**

<b>Table 13: Practices Already in Place That Support Goals &amp; Objectives</b>	
<b>Goals and Obj.</b>	<b>CCSD’s Practices</b>
Goal 1; Obj. 1.1-1.4	Formative & summative assessments, classroom walkthroughs; data summits; data notebooks; coordinated professional-learning sessions; annual School Improvement Surveys of teachers, students, and parents; school-improvement process
Goal 2; Obj.	Four-Tier RTI process; targeted professional-learning; “Assessment Calendar”

2.1 - 2.3	(see Appendix A)
Goal 3; Obj. 3.1 & 3.4	Limited use of Lexiles; limited use of Reading Growth Charts; Curriculum Renewal Committees

**e. Goals to Be Funded with Other Sources:** All of the Striving Readers Goals will be supported with local, state, federal funds and competitive grant funds when available.

## VI. SCIENTIFIC, EVIDENCE-BASED LITERACY PLAN

**a. Plan to Implement the Goals and Objectives Identified:** Over the past several years, Clarke County leaders and teachers have implemented some elements of a comprehensive, districtwide literacy plan, but until the Striving Readers grant opportunity became available, CCSD had never designed or implemented an evidence-based birth-through-12<sup>th</sup>-grade literacy plan. During Year 1, CCSD will provide targeted, differentiated professional learning for administrators and teachers in the six Striving Readers schools and Early Learning Center; implement reading and writing across the curriculum; develop Reading Growth Charts that will immediately enable teachers to identify and respond to students at all performance levels; purchase new instructional materials and diverse texts; base lesson plans on the Common Core GPS; and implement handheld computing devices in target grades to increase student engagement. During Year 2, CCSD will provide professional learning and will develop a scope and sequence for CCGPS ELA Standards. In years 3-5, CCSD will collect and report data and will continue to administer the Striving Readers Literacy Plan in target schools and expand SR practices to additional schools. Dr. Mark Tavernier, Director of Teaching and Learning, will serve as Project Director for the Striving Readers grant. Dr. Tavernier administers CCSD’s curriculum and instruction programs in all content areas, the district’s professional-learning program, textbooks, and state and federal grant projects in the content areas. In addition, he supervises content coaches and instructional technology specialists. As Project Director, he will facilitate the work of a districtwide Literacy Team initially composed of leaders and teachers from the six targeted schools and Early

Learning Center. The Literacy Team will ensure that the activities presented in this grant proposal are implemented with fidelity.

All grant activities will support the nine research-based key components that provide the foundation of comprehensive literacy plans (“What,” p. 1): (1) standards; (2) components unique to birth-to-five; (3) ongoing formative and summative assessments; (4) response to intervention; (5) best practices in instruction; (6) high-quality teachers; (7) engaged leadership; (8) clearly articulated plan for transitions and alignment; (9) intentional strategies for maintaining engagement. All grant activities will be aligned with these nine key components, as follows:

<b>Table 14: Grant Activities and Their Alignment with Nine Key Components</b>	
<b>9 Components</b>	<b>Activities</b>
1	Standards for birth to three; Pre-K; K-5; 6-8; and 9-12, including the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards in ELA.
2	Provide professional-learning activities based on birth-5 standards. <sup>4</sup>
3	Update the birth-5 assessment schedule to fill gaps in data collection; use Work Sampling System to share data with kindergarten teachers; provide transition support for infants moving from infant to toddler, toddler to preschool and preschool to Pre-K programs; Pre-K to K; K to 1; 1 to 2; 2 to 3; 5 to 6; 8 to 9 (“What,” pp. 11-12). In January 2012, Cedar Shoals High School will implement a new Rising 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Transition Program for Coile Middle School students (as well as Cedar’s other feeder middle school).
4	See Clarke County’s Response to Intervention – Literacy, (see Appendix B); “What,” pp. 15-16).
5	Provide professional learning on high-impact, research-based best practices for birth-5, elementary, middle school, and high school teachers; provide best practices for reading and writing instruction across the curriculum (“What,” pp. 12-15).
6	Beginning in August 2012, classroom walkthroughs (see Appendix C) will focus on literacy for two years. During the 2011-2012 school year, CCSD is implementing a new CCSD Teacher Evaluation System that replaces the GTEP. The new multi-tiered, rigorous system identifies specific instructional and classroom skills and content knowledge that teachers need to master in order to become highly effective teachers. The new system also provides teachers with a pathway to school leadership.
7	As instructional leaders, principals will monitor the literacy RTI program in their schools, participate in professional-learning sessions focused on literacy (e.g., coaches’ training, redelivery of training for teachers). Implementation and impact analysis of the Striving Readers grant will be built into monthly professional-learning communities for principals

<sup>4</sup> In addition to providing direct services at the district’s Early Learning Center, CCSD partners with two community early learning centers to provide birth-to-five educational and developmental services to students based on Early Head Start, Head Start, Pre-K, and Early Reading First standards and requirements.

	and district leaders (“What,” pp. 16-17).
8	In CCSD, an area of concern involves <i>transitions</i> , particularly between birth-to-three to Pre-K, Pre-K to kindergarten, kindergarten to first grade, fifth grade to sixth grade, and eighth to ninth grade (“What,” p. 11). A central feature of the proposed Striving Readers implementation plan, teachers will focus on developmental stages of childhood, vertical alignment of standards, ongoing assessments, and RTI (“What,” p. 18).
9	Teachers will adopt A-F action steps (“What,” p. 19). As a strategy for maintaining student engagement, grant funding is requested for handheld computing devices for 5 <sup>th</sup> - and 8 <sup>th</sup> -grade students and their teachers, as well as school media centers.

**b. Who Will Implement:** Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services and School Performance, will oversee the Striving Readers grant. Dr. Mark Tavernier will serve as Project Director. Each of the schools in the Cedar/Coile cluster—plus the Early Learning Center—will implement its own Striving Readers’ Literacy Plan, which have all been coordinated with the overarching district’s grant proposal.

**c. What Will Take Place in the Project Based on the “What” Document:** Early Learning Center: Vertical alignment with kindergarten and first grade (p. 4); improve transitions from one learning environment to another; additional reading materials; 4-Tier model (p. 15-16). Four elementary schools: Adopt DIBELS (pp. 11-12); 90-110 minutes of protected literacy time for grades K-3 and 2-4 hours per day for grades 4-5 (p. 15); vertical alignment with Pre-K and grades K-6; improve transitions from one grade to another (p. 11); additional reading materials. Coile Middle School: Alignment with fifth grade and ninth grade; improve transitions from one grade to another; additional reading materials; 2-4 hours of literacy instruction per day (p. 15); 4-Tier model (p. 15-16). Cedar Shoals High School: Adopt Scholastic Reading Inventory to obtain Lexile scores; focus on college and career readiness (p.7); improve transitions from one grade to another; additional and more complex reading materials (p.7); 2-4 hours of literacy instruction per day (p. 15); 4-Tier model (p. 15-16).

**d. Current Instructional Schedule:**

<b>Birth-Two:</b> 8:00 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.
<b>Head Start-3 and Pre-K:</b> 7:40-2:45
<b>Kindergarten - 5:</b> School hours are 7:40 a.m. – 2:35 p.m.
<b>Grades 6-8:</b> School hours are 8:25 a.m. – 3:45 p.m.
<b>Grades 9-12:</b> School hours are 8:25 a.m. – 3:35 p.m. Clarke County high schools are currently on a 4 x 4 block schedule. Credit recovery is available during zero and fifth periods.

**e. Plan for Tiered Instruction:**

<b>Tier 1:</b> 100% of students—universal screenings; GPS/CCGPS through a standards-based classroom structure; differentiation of instruction including fluid, flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, and demonstration of learning.
<b>Tier 2:</b> 10% of students—Tier 1 and standard intervention protocol process for identifying and providing research-based interventions based on need and resources; ongoing progress monitoring to measure RTI and to guide decision making.
<b>Tier 3:</b> 5% of students—Tiers 1 and 2 and SST-driven learning, including intensive, formalized problem solving to identify student needs; targeted research-based interventions tailored to individual needs; frequent progress monitoring and analysis of student RTI.
<b>Tier 4:</b> 2-5% of students—Tiers 1-3 and specialized programs, methodologies or instructional delivery; greater frequency of progress monitoring of student RTI.

**f. Materials Currently Used for Tier 1 Instruction:** Table 15 lists reading series and materials for all Clarke County schools. These materials, and others specific to individual schools, are used for reading/language arts instruction.

<b>Table 15: Literacy Materials Currently Being Used for Tier I (Universal) Instruction</b>	
<i>Age/Grade Levels</i>	<i>Materials</i>
<b>Birth – Five</b>	Infants and Toddlers: <i>1, 2, 3 READ</i> ; HS 3s: <i>Scholastic Early Childhood Program</i> ; All 4s: <i>Opening the World of Learning, Breakthrough To Literacy</i>
<b>Kindergarten</b>	<i>Rigby Literacy; Phonics Lessons</i>
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	<i>StoryTown; Rigby Literacy; Phonics Lessons; Writers Express</i>
<b>Middle Schools</b>	<i>KeyTrain; Nettekker; Renzulli Learning; Scantron Achievement Series; SOLO; TinkerPlots; FastForWord; Ticket to Read; SuccessMaker; Reading A to Z; Vocabulary A to Z; Destination Reading</i>
<b>High Schools</b>	<i>Nettekker; Scantron Achievement Series; SOLO</i>

**g. Time, Personnel and Strategies for Tier II, III, IV, and V Instruction:** CCSD uses a four-tier RTI strategy (see Appendix B). CCSD’s RTI plan is shown in Table 16:

**Table 16: Literacy Plan for Tiers II, III, and IV Instruction**

<i>Grade Levels</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Personnel</i>	<i>Strategies</i>
<b>Birth - 5</b>			
Tier II	Standard instructional time	All classroom & collab. teachers	Differentiation; small group targeted instruction in content areas and language and literacy development.
Tier III	Extended instructional time	All classroom and support personnel	Individualized instruction during cooperative learning work sessions (1:1 or 2:1); extended day/extended year
Tier IV	Extended/pre-scriptive	Classroom & SPED teachers	Special education services delivered according to IEP in the least restrictive environment
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
Tier II	90-120 min.	All classroom teachers	Universal screeners, benchmark assessments; small group, differentiated support/interventions; extended PL; add'l. engagement/motivational strategies
Tier III	Extended/prescriptive	Classroom teachers	Individualized or small groups; add'l. monitoring with frequent contacts; explicit vocab; comprehension strategies; add'l. engagement & motivational strategies.
Tier IV	Extended/Prescriptive based on IEP	Classroom & SPED teachers	Targeted remediation or acceleration instruction; push in, pullout; individualized instruction; explicit use of intervention, motivational and engagement strategies
<b>Middle and High Schools</b>			
Tier II	Standard instructional time	All classroom & collab. teachers	Differentiation; students in smaller groups; frequent monitoring of progress; in MS, <i>Voyager</i> is used in some small classes with all three RTI Tiers.
Tier III	Longer instructional time	All classroom & collab. teachers	Longer-term intervention; collaborative teaching; more frequent progress monitoring; content instructional materials; SOLO/Read OutLoud; Read 180.
Tier IV	Instructional time; time in labs	All classroom & collab. teachers	Individualized instruction with specialized programs and collaborative teaching processes; course instructional materials; SOLO/Read OutLoud; Read 180

**h. Statement Regarding Conflict with Other Initiatives:** CCSD's Striving Readers grant

implementation plan conflicts with no other CCSD, state, or federal initiative that the school district is currently implementing or anticipates implementing. The district's two key initiatives—International Baccalaureate for secondary schools and a Professional Development Schools Partnership with the University of Georgia—will be supported by a Striving Readers grant, providing the same level of rigor, focus, high expectations for teacher and student success.

## VII. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES BASED ON DOCUMENTED NEEDS

**a. Table Indicating the Professional Learning Activities That Staff Have Attended in the Past Year:**

<b>Table 17: Professional-Learning Activities That Staff Have Attended in the Past Year</b>			
PL Activities	Dates <sup>5</sup> / Hours	Purpose	# Teachers
Early Reading First Summer Institute	7-19-10/130	Routines and procedures; strategies to de-escalate inappropriate student behavior, classroom observations, ELL students;	91
Pre-K & ERF	8-3-10/48	Using GA Content Standards & GA Early Learning Standards	55
ERF	8-13-10/50	For ERF Interventionists; standards, assessments/progress monitoring, CCSD's framework for delivering lessons	12
Literacy Materials	7-28-10/34	<i>Voyager Passports</i> for ES; <i>Voyager Reading</i> for MS and HS; <i>Read 180</i> for HS	78
ESOL Students	8-3-10/110	Elementary ESOL teachers; MS/HS ESOL teachers; curriculum; use of data; instructional strategies based on needs.	42
Gifted Students	8-3-10/170	Human development, individual differences, developing talents, cultural factors	115
Benchmark Institute	5-24-10/40	Review and revise CCSD Benchmark tests; connections to CCSD's "Non-Negotiables" (See Appendix D) and Goals	40

**b. Number of Hours of Professional Learning That Staff Have Attended:** During the 2010-2011 school year, 1,929 Clarke County school administrators, teachers, and other professionals participated in 2,392 hours of district-provided professional learning (not including school-specific PL sessions). Of those, 458 of the sessions were literacy related and were attended by 407 teachers and others.<sup>6</sup> Topics ranged from specific literacy programs, such as *Read 180*, *Voyager Passports*, *Voyager Reading*, and *Headsprout*, to guided reading, writing data teams, and ESOL methods and materials.

<sup>5</sup> Starting dates; PL continued throughout the school year.

<sup>6</sup> Some teachers attended numerous PL sessions and therefore may be counted two or more times.

**c. The Percentage of Staff Attending Professional Learning:** CCSD has approximately 1,100 teachers, which means that about 37% of teachers participated in literacy-related professional-learning sessions last year—indicating a large gap in literacy training across the school district.

**d. Detailed List of Ongoing Professional Learning:**

- Content-specific curriculum renewal
- School-improvement planning
- Core Curriculum GPS
- PL provided by grants (e.g., Title I, Math & Science Partnership, Early Reading First, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers)
- Data/assessment/domain/root-cause analyses
- Special populations (e.g., special education, economically disadvantaged, ESOL)
- New Teacher Orientation/Mentoring
- Special initiatives/special focus (e.g., International Baccalaureate, Professional Development Schools)

**e. Preferred Method of Delivery of Professional Learning:** CCSD provides a wide range of professional-learning opportunities for teachers and building and district leaders, including face-to-face, small- and large-group sessions with local and nationally known experts; job-embedded instructional coaching in each school; webinars; and monthly professional-learning communities for many groups (e.g., ESOL teachers, Technology Integration Specialists, Counselors, Instructional Coaches) that incorporate intensive work sessions. In addition, some teachers enroll in graduate programs or endorsement programs.

**f. Programmatic Professional Learning Needs Identified in the Needs Assessment:** The results of the needs assessments carried out by the six target schools and Early Learning Center indicated a universal need for professional learning for teachers and administrators in the following areas: High-impact, research-based instructional methods of teaching reading and writing from birth through 12<sup>th</sup> grade; effective strategies for teaching literacy across the curriculum (especially the structure of texts, content vocabulary, and comprehension); reading

endorsements; assessments for high school students that provides Lexile scores; as well as school-by-school literacy needs.

## VIII. ASSESSMENT/DATA ANALYSIS PLAN

**a. Detailed Listing of the District’s Current Assessment Protocol:** CCSD’s current assessment protocol is based on the Assessment Strand of the *Georgia School Keys*. Tier 1 provides 100% of students with a standards-based classroom learning environment. Tier 2 provides a needs-based, standard intervention protocol for struggling students. Tier 3 provides intensive, SST-driven learning for approximately 5% of students, and Tier 4 provides, in addition to Tiers 1-3 services, specialized programs and instructional strategies, and a greater frequency of progress monitoring of RTI. For the district’s four-tier “CCSD Educator’s Guide for Response to Intervention (RTI)” pyramid and “Assessment Calendar” (see Appendix A).

**b. Explanation of the Current Data Analysis Protocol:** All CCSD schools implement the district’s Data Team Process for grade and subject area teams. The process involves five steps: **Step 1:** Collect/Chart Data Results (develop system for organizing data from a pre-assessment); establish levels of proficiency; prepare a graph/chart to include teacher and student data. **Step 2:** Analyze Data (identify skills and concepts proficient students use and understand by examining actual student work; list obstacles/reasons why students did not achieve a level of proficiency; prioritize the identified skill concept weaknesses to focus teaching). **Step 3:** Set, Review, or Revise Goals (using data from Step 1, generate a number/percentage to serve as a goal or desired outcome). **Step 4:** Design Instructional Strategies; Team agrees on 2-3 strategies to implement during next teaching period; model or demonstrate strategy to group. **Step 5:** Interpret Results Using Common Assessments, Teams will use this process on an ongoing basis with data reviews at least every three weeks. This process is not an add-on to grade-level functions but provides a structure for teacher teams to identify student academic

needs and changes to instructional delivery. Use of the Data Team Process can facilitate the steps of the RTI actions required during the 2011-2012 school year. For the 2011-2012 Assessment Calendar and further discussion of CCSD's Data Analysis, see Appendix A.

**c. Comparison of the Current Protocol with the Striving Readers Assessment Plan:** Table 18 compares the district's current assessment plan with a proposed assessment plan.

<b>Table 18: Comparison of Current and Proposed Assessment Protocols</b>	
<b>Current Assessment Plan:</b>	
Birth to 5	Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-III) 1 x per year (screening) for ages 0-5 (Early Head Start & Head Start); Developmental Profile (DP-III) 2 x per year Pre-K and 3 x year EHS (progress monitoring and outcome) for ages 0-5 (EHS, HS, Pre-K); BASQ-II 2 x per year (screening & progress monitoring) for ages 2-5 (EHS and HS); GELS Checklist – ongoing (progress monitoring) for ages 0-3; Get it, Got It, Go! – monthly (progress monitoring, outcome) for ages (Pre-K, EHS); Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-IV) 2 x year (3 x if below benchmark) (screening, progress, outcome) for ages 3-5 (Pre-K, HS, Early Reading First); Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for Preschool (PALS Pre-K) 3 x year (monitoring, outcome) for ages 3-5; Work Sampling System – ongoing (monitoring, outcome) for ages 4-5 (Pre-K, HS)
K	GKIDS
K-8	Ongoing diagnostic literacy assessments for grades K-8; scored writing samples quarterly.
Grade 1	Voyager Oral Reading Fluency
Grades 1 & 2	Phonics Test, Sight Word Tests, CCSD Fluency Assessment, Informal Running Record, Rigby Literacy Benchmarks; Scantron Performance Series provides norm-referenced, diagnostic summative ELA data in Dec. and May.
Grades 1-8	ACCESS for ELL students
Grades 2-8	Scantron Performance Series provides norm-referenced, diagnostic ELA data.
Grades 3-8 & 11	Benchmark assessments every 6 weeks; CRCT or CRCT-M, for specific students with disabilities
Grades 3, 5, & 8	State Writing Test annually in grades 3, 5, 8
Grades 6-8	<i>Read 180</i> ; <i>Voyager</i> , Quarterly Writing Samples
Grades 9-12	<i>Read 180</i> ; literacy assessments throughout year for 9 <sup>th</sup> grade students; GA High School Writing Test for grades 11 & 12; Literature & Composition, grades 9-11
<b>Striving Readers Assessment Plan:</b>	
<b>Grades</b>	<b>Assessments</b>
Birth to 2	DP-III, ASQ-III, GELS Checklist
3-Pre-K	WSS/WSO, PPVT-IV, PALS Pre-K or Locally Developed Literacy Measure, GGG
K	GKIDS
K-2	Writing Samples; Sight Vocabulary
K-5	1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Literacy Assessments (reading level)
K-8	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Literacy Assessment; Reading Level
K-9	Reading Level; 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Literacy Assessments

1-2	Writing samples; Spelling Inventory; Sight Vocabulary; Comprehensive Benchmark Assessments
1-8	Reading Fluency; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter ELA Benchmarks
2-8	Norm-referenced in Reading and Language Arts
3-8	CRCTs; CRCT-M; Writing Samples; Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
3-8 & 11	Georgia Alternative Assessment
5	Writing Test
8	Writing Test
6-8	CRCTs, GA Eighth-Grade Writing Test; <i>Scholastic Reading Inventory</i> ; <i>Read 180</i> Stage B
9-12	Advanced Placement; End-of-Course Tests, Graduation Test; Graduation Writing Test; PSAT (grade 10); <i>Scholastic Reading Inventory</i> (SRI) (Lexile Scores) for <i>Read 180</i> , Stage C
K-12	ACCESS (for ELL)
9-12	<i>KeyTrain</i> is used primarily in Career and Technical Education classes for literacy enrichment and building ELA skills.

**d. How the New Assessments Will Be Implemented into the Current Assessment Schedule:**

Elementary schools will incorporate an assessment, such as DIBELS, to identify students having difficulties with phonemic awareness and phonics. Coile Middle School and Cedar Shoals High School will adopt an assessment, such as the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), that will provide student Lexile scores for the first time to track students' RTI plans.

**e. Current Assessments That Might Be Discontinued:** For high school students, CCSD currently uses district-based screeners and assessments such as *STEEP MAZE* to identify reading levels. As a result of Striving Readers, CCSD will discontinue this assessment and use Scholastic Reading Inventory for all students and other interventional assessments as needed.

**f. Listing of Training That Teachers Will Need to Implement Any New Assessments:**

Teachers will need to be trained on DIBELS and the Scholastic Reading Inventory.

**g. How Data Is Presented to Parents and Stakeholders:** CCSD has a districtwide Family Engagement and Equity Plan for families of Clarke County students with seven components: family inclusiveness, effective communication, parenting skills, equitable school culture, shared decision-

making, community collaboration, and equity in human resources. Because all CCSD schools are Title I schools, they utilize a “School-Family Partnership Agreement” that clarifies goals, expectations, and shared responsibilities of the school and parents as partners for student learning. The Agreement or compact is signed and dated by the student, parents, and teacher. CCSD’s website provides teachers, students, parents, and community with AYP data, CCSD’s Strategic Plan with District Performance Measures and aggregate data, “Facts and Figures,” “Annual Performance Report,” and many other reports of interest to stakeholders. Report cards and parent-teacher conferences provide parents with academic data on their children.

**IX. EXPERIENCE OF THE APPLICANT**

**a. Table Describing Other Initiatives with which the LEA Has Been Involved:**

<b>Table 19: Other CCSD Initiatives</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CCSD partners with the Georgia DOE and University of Georgia College of Education to develop new model-learning environments with an emphasis on student use of technology embedded into everyday learning. DOE will provide instructional technology consultation, technical assistance, access to Georgia Virtual online content, professional learning, assistance with funding formulas and waivers, and statewide purchasing. UGA will assist with teacher preparation, professional learning, and research related to instructional design, student learning, and teacher practices.</li></ul>

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCSD partners UGA’s College of Education to develop and implement Professional Development Schools (PDS). Several schools are at various stages of implementing PDSs. Harris Elementary was the first PDS school. A Professor-in-Residence and many UGA faculty and students are in classrooms throughout the day.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCSD partners with the UGA College of Education and Franklin College of Arts &amp; Sciences to implement eight years of state Math and Science Partnership grants.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCSD partnered with Athens Technical College to construct and implement the Athens Community Career Academy, a charter program that opened in August 2011.</li> </ul>   |

**b. Initiatives the LEA Has Implemented Internally with No Outside Funding Support:**

- 1) Professional-Learning Communities for school and district leaders meet each month to engage in data analysis and professional growth as leaders.
- 2) International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme (grades 6-10).
- 3) Orchestra programs at Coile Middle School and another middle school and afterschool orchestra and band programs for several elementary schools.
- 4) CCSD’s Advanced Placement Fee Program pays for one AP exam for students.

**c. Description of the LEA’s Capacity to Coordinate Resources in the Past: CCSD**

Coordinates millions of dollars worth of formula and competitive grants each year under the direction of Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services and School Performance. Dr. Price and district directors in charge of Title I, Title II, Title III, Title VI, Head Start, Early Head Start as well as competitive grants, such as Math and Science Partnership grants, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers grants, and Early Reading First grants, routinely coordinate grant budgets with other federal, state, and local fiscal resources.

**d. Description of the Sustainability of Initiatives Implemented by the LEA:** Following the implementation of several state Math and Science Partnership grants, many of the instructional strategies for teaching math and science in grades 3-12 have been institutionalized in the Clarke County School District. The same is true of a Georgia Department of Human Services

afterschool and summer contract and four 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) grants. The original philosophy and instructional approaches (relevant, engaging, hands-on, project-based academic enrichment) that defined the district’s first 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC were subsequently adopted by all of the district’s out-of-school programs.

## X. RESOURCES

### a. Clear Alignment Plan for Striving Readers and All Other Funding:

<b>Table 20: Alignment of Funding Sources</b>		
	<b>Striving Readers Funding</b>	<b>Other Funding Sources</b>
Professional Learning	Intensive, aligned PL for all Striving Readers teachers	Title II, Part A; Title I, Part A; GA Staff Development Funds; QBE; Title III (ESL); Title VI, Part B; IDEA Pre-School
Print Materials	Additional books for all 7 Media Centers	Early Reading First (ERF); Title I, Part A;
Tier I Literacy Materials	Universal screener/progress monitoring; classroom libraries (K-5); core SBRR program for K-2; supplemental SBRR materials for small groups; technology	ERF; Early Intervention Program (EIP); QBE; Extended-Year
Tier II Literacy Materials	Supplemental SBRR intervention materials; high interest/low level trade books; technological resources	ERF; EIP/REP
Tier III Literacy Materials	Supplemental interventions materials; technological resources	ERF; EIP/REP
Tier IV Literacy Materials	Targeted classroom libraries; technological resources	ERF; EIP/REP
Formative and Summative Assessments	Additional assessments: Informal reading inventory, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency screener; (DIBELS; Scholastic – SRI)	EIP/REP; Extended Year; Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III; Title VI, Part B; IDEA, Part B (SWDs); IDEA Pre-School (SWDs)
Instructional Technology	Handheld computing devices	SPLOST IV
Parent/Family Communication	Striving Readers updates to parents/families via website, Channel 16 (school district TV channel), school newsletters, newspaper articles	QBE; Title I, Part A; Title III; Title IV, Part B; IDEA, Part B (SWDs)

### b. List of the Resources Available at Each Building:

- SmartBoards & overhead projectors

- Electronic student-response systems
- Media Center with fiction and non-fiction books
- Document cameras
- Literacy software programs (e.g., FastForward, SuccessMaker)

**c. Plan to Ensure That No Supplanting Takes Place:** During the grant-writing phase, as well as at the beginning of Years 1-3 of the performance period, all budget items in the participating school budgets will be examined by the Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services as well as the district-based Directors of Teaching and Learning, Special Education, Career and Technical Education, Title I, Assessment and Accountability, Gifted and ESOL Services, Grants and Research, Technology Services, and Business Services to ensure that supplanting will not take place, except as allowed by federal Striving Readers rules.

**d. Detail How Striving Readers Will Add Value to Existing Resources in Schools: A**

Striving Readers grant will provide intensive professional learning for teachers in six cluster schools and the district's Early Learning Center. Training will focus on emergent literacy skills, how children become proficient readers and writers, how to teach reading and writing across the curriculum, and how to identify and assist readers at all performance levels. A grant would also provide an opportunity for teachers and students in the target schools to explore the capabilities of handheld computing devices, such as iPads, to facilitate group writing projects, group research assignments, and communication and collaboration between teachers and their students and between and among the students themselves. For the first time, a Striving Readers grant would provide Clarke County teachers of students from birth through 12<sup>th</sup> grade with developmentally targeted, literacy-focused professional learning designed to facilitate the adoption of research-based, high-impact practices in every classroom within the six schools and Early Learning Center. In addition, technology purchased with grant funds will provide students with access to thousands of books, other materials in print, and online subscriptions to

which they would not otherwise have access. Handheld technology for students will also allow them to access educational apps and resources for the first time. Many students who do not typically read books would be far more likely to read the same books using e-readers. Striving Readers will offer these schools opportunities to instill 21<sup>st</sup> century literacy skills into all curricular areas and prepare students for college and career success.

## **XI. MANAGEMENT PLAN AND KEY PERSONNEL**

**a. Plan for Management of the Grant Implementation:** Dr. Mark Tavernier, Project Director, supervises the district's content specialists, including elementary and secondary literacy coaches; four instructional technology specialists; and two budget assistants. Tavernier's staff will be available to carry out grant activities, such as coordinating, scheduling, and, at times, providing professional-learning; training teachers on new formative and summative assessments; purchasing and distributing print materials; and training teachers on the pedagogical uses of mobile technology. The principals of the Striving Readers' schools will oversee grant-focused literacy activities in their schools as part of a long-term strategy to institutionalize high-impact instructional practices. CCSD's Business Office has the capacity to drawdown Striving Readers grant funds as it currently does for numerous state and federal grant programs. Under the direction of Dr. Tavernier, a part-time Budget Assistant (paid for with indirect funds) will enter and process purchase orders, timecards, and other time sensitive records; and will receive, inventory, and distribute purchased items and services.

**b. List of Individuals Responsible for the Day-to-Day Grant Operations:**

- Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent for Instructional Services
- Dr. Mark Tavernier, Project Director
- Carlyn Maddox, Secondary Literacy Coach
- Alita Anderson, Elementary Literacy Coach
- Linda Sprague, Office of Early Learning Professional Learning Coordinator
- Dr. Tony Price, Cedar Shoals High School
- Dwight Manzy, Coile Middle School
- Anissa Johnson, Fowler Drive Elementary
- Xernona Thomas, Harris Elementary
- Dr. Ingrid Gilbert, Stroud Elementary
- Debbie Haney, Winterville Elementary
- Tom Guthrie, Director of Business Services

- Carolyn Wolpert, Office of Early Learning Early Reading First Coordinator
- Kim Seabolt, Purchasing Coordinator
- Budget Assistant

**c. Responsibilities of the People Involved with the Grant Implementation:**

<b>Table 21: Timeline of Grant Activities and Individuals Responsible</b>									
	<b>Year 1 Quarters</b>				<b>Year 2 Quarters</b>				<b>Yrs. 3-5</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>Grant Activities (Persons Responsible)<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
Announce SR grant to CCSD and the community. (PD, PR)	x	x			x	x			x
Convene District Literacy Team for overview/planning.(PD)	x		x		x		x		x
Convene school Literacy Teams for overview/planning. (P)	x	x	x		x	x	x		x
Purchase new assessments. (BA)	x				x				x
Purchase and distribute instructional materials and instructional technology. (PD, BA)	x	x			x	x			x
Plan/implement professional-learning focused on literacy (curriculum, assessments, RTI, etc.) (PD, LC)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Teachers enroll in Reading Endorsement Programs. (PD)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Extend early learning instructional days from 164 days to 180. (EL)			x				x		x
Extended literacy time (afterschool/summer). (PD, P, LC)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Drawdown funds. (BO)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	?
Write and submit end-of-year reports (5 years). (PD, LC, E)				x				x	x

**d. Individuals Listed Understand the Goals, Objectives, and Implementation Plan:** All

of the administrators, teachers, literacy coaches, and instructional technology specialists involved in implementing the Striving Readers grant program as described in this grant proposal will have an orientation session focused on the details of CCSD’s Striving Readers implementation plan, as well as DOE’s “What” and “Why” documents (and the “How” document when it becomes available). At the orientation session, all CCSD personnel will sign a commitment statement pledging to work towards accomplishing the project’s goals and objectives and grant activities described in the district’s grant

<sup>7</sup> PD = Project Director; DL = District Literacy Team; SL = School Literacy Teams; P = Principals; BA = Budget Assistant; LC = Literacy Coaches; EL = Early Learning Literacy Team; ELA = ELA Teachers; CT = Content Teachers; PR = CCSD’s Public Relations; BO = Business Office

proposal, combined with each school's Striving Readers grant proposal/implementation plan with fidelity.

## XII. SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

**a. Plan for Expanding the Lessons Learned through the Striving Readers Project with Other Schools and New Teachers to the LEA:** During New Teacher Orientation every August, a summary of the Striving Readers Implementation Plan will be given to all new teachers. At the six target schools and Early Learning Center, a discussion of the grant program will be far more extensive, and all new teachers will be given a copy of this grant proposal that lists the instructional strategies, materials, and assessments that all teachers in the school will use in their classes, including teachers in other content areas, such as science, math, and social studies. Because the target schools in the Cedar/Coile cluster will serve as a pilot project for the entire district, CCSD intends to institutionalize the best literacy practices throughout the entire school district, as appropriate. Once CCSD's Striving Readers Literacy Plan is completed, using Georgia's Literacy Plan as a model, SR practices will be institutionalized in the school district.

To ensure sustainability of evidence-based, high-impact practices, the district-level Striving Readers Literacy Team compiled a list of no-cost activities that may be used during and beyond the grant-performance period. A partial list is provided below:

- Require 90 minutes per day of protected, uninterrupted reading time in elementary schools and two to four hours per day for middle and high school students
- Transition strategies horizontally and vertically across grade levels
- Knowing standards of grades before and after each teacher's grade
- Create Reading Growth Wall in every school that tracks student growth.
- Use DOE's Lexile Map to match reading materials to students' current lexile levels.
- Provide data summits to examine literacy assessment results at the domain and element levels
- Provide intensive in-house professional learning on literacy for struggling readers and RTI

- Facilitate reading and writing across the curriculum

These activities and others will sustain Clarke County's Striving Readers Literacy Plan well beyond the grant period.

**b. Plan for Extending the Assessments Protocol beyond the Grant Period:** Because CCSD expects the Striving Readers assessment protocol to result in increased student achievement in the area of literacy due to ongoing, monitored formative and summative assessments, the assessment protocol will be sustained in the target schools. As the results are shared with other schools, additional schools will adopt the Striving Readers assessment protocol, which is based on high-impact practices for raising student-academic achievement.

**c. Plan for Extending the Professional Learning Practices beyond the Grant Period and to New Staff to the System:** Assessment data is useful only if teachers actually use it to make instructional decisions and adjustments. Therefore, teachers will be shown through on-going professional-learning sessions how to use screening, diagnostic, and progress assessment data to guide instruction. Principals will ensure that grade-level and content-specific teacher groups understand and use student-achievement data at the domain level for designing lessons and student tasks.

**d. Plan for Sustaining Technology That Was Implemented with the SR Funds:** The technology and site licenses funded by a Striving Readers grant will include handheld computing devices for students, their teachers, and Media Centers. The Clarke County Regional Library provides K-12 students with access to over 300,000 e-books and audiobook titles that can be downloaded on handheld tablets and computers 24 hours a day, seven days a week. After grant funding ends following Year 3, this virtual library will continue to be available to students with purchased technology as well as with classroom and media center computers already in place. To sustain CCSD's investment in technology made possible with Striving Readers funding, CCSD's

SPLOST IV, approved by voters in November 2011, will provide significant funding to expand the reach of handheld computing devices into all schools and to refresh the mobile technology in the six target Striving Readers schools and Early Learning Center.

**STRIVING READERS**

**Cedar Shoals High School Grant Proposal**

**XIII. ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENT AND TEACHER DATA**

**d. Student EOCT and GHS GT Data School Year 2010-2011:** This data presents the assessment results for Cedar Shoals High School in grades 9-12. Tables 1-4 below indicate EOCT and GHS GT data as well as disaggregation of selected subgroups.

**Table 1: Ninth Grade Literature and Composition EOCT (Overall Average: 61.7%)**

Domain	% Overall	% Black	% SWD	% ELL	% EDS
Reading and Literature	60.4	56.2	39.3	66.6	59.1
Reading, Listening, Speaking & Viewing Across the Curriculum	65.1	61.2	40.8	68.2	63.8
Writing	53.6	49.4	34	54.3	52.1
Conventions	59.3	57.1	42.1	66.9	58.6

**Table 2: American Literature and Composition EOCT (Overall Average: 72.6%)**

Domain	Overall (%)	Black (%)	SWD (%)	ELL (%)	EDS (%)
Reading and American Literature	60.0%	56.7	45.6	40.4	57.5
Reading, Listening, Speaking & Viewing Across the Curriculum	67.8%	63.9	48.7	58.9	66.3
Writing	57.1%	53.3	40.4	41.1	55.9
Conventions	62.9%	59.5	43.7	49.1	61.2

**Table 3: English Language Arts GHS GT (Overall Average: 81%)**

Domain	Cedar Shoals	CCSD	RESA	State
Reading Comprehension	69%	70%	75%	76%

Literary Analysis	68%	69%	73%	74%
Conventions & Writing	75%	76%	81%	82%

**Table 4: Writing GHSWT**

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
State	89%	90%	95%	93%
CCSD	84%	84%	91%	86%
Cedar Shoals	81%	84%	94%	81%

The End of Course Test for Reading and Literature domain analysis reveals that ninth grade Cedar Shoals students met or exceeded this standard at 60%, and they met or exceeded at 54% for the writing standard. Cedar Shoals administrators estimate that approximately 25% of Clarke County ninth-grade students read two or more years below grade level. The American Literature EOCT scores reveal that students met or exceeded the Reading and American Literature standard at 60% and the writing standard at 57%. The GHSWT domain score in Reading and Literature is 69%, 7 points below the state average of 76%. In the Literary Analysis domain, students scored 68%, 6 points below the state average of 74%, and in the Conventions and Writing standard, students scored 75%, 7 points lower than the state average of 82%. On the Georgia High School Writing Test, Cedar Shoals students gained from 81% in 2008-2009 to 94% in 2010-2011. In 2011, first-time test takers scored 81%-- a significant drop from the previous year and 12 points lower than the state's 93%. The other EOCT overall average scores for Biology (55%), Physical Science (59%), US History (43%), and Economics (66%) indicate a strong correlation to reading performance, as these tests are text-rich and require increased levels of comprehension (see Appendix A). An examination of the disaggregated data show significant gaps in domain level achievement with Black students, ELL, EDS, and students with disabilities when compared to all other students.

- e. School High School Graduation Rate:** Although the graduation rate has steadily increased from 58.1% (2006-2007) to the present rate of 71.7, Cedar Shoals' graduation rate is 9.2% lower than the state and illustrates our continued need for improvement. See Table 10 in Appendix A.
- f. Early Learning Readiness—**See Early Learning Center Proposal.
- g. Disaggregation of data in subgroups—**See section a. above for tables and explanation.
- h. Teacher Retention Data:** Cedar Shoals' certified staff consists of 118 members, and 86% of certified teachers were retained from the previous school year.
- i. Teacher Participation in Professional Learning Communities or On-Going Professional Learning at the School:** All teachers participate in job-embedded professional learning that occurs during common planning time, during our twice weekly collaborative data teams, or on the third Wednesday of each month after school. With Striving Readers funding, Cedar Shoals will focus on literacy initiatives from our Needs Assessment and Areas of Concern.

#### **XIV. NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- d. Description of the Materials Used in the Needs Assessment:** The school analyzed state testing data from Statewide Longitudinal Data System, End of Course Tests, and Georgia High School Graduation Tests in order to assess literacy needs for all students. The Literacy Committee also conducted a survey with all staff for input and areas of concern about literacy across content levels at Cedar Shoals. See Appendix B.
- e. Description of the Needs Assessment:** The Cedar Shoals High School's School Improvement Leadership Team participated in a data summit on July 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> to take a preliminary look at needs based on data. The Cedar Shoals' Literacy Team then met on November 28<sup>th</sup> and December 1<sup>st</sup> to examine literacy data and set goals based on this data. This Needs Assessment process focused the Literacy Team's goals and objectives with our data showing that 54% of

Cedar Shoals' teachers surveyed believe writing instruction is not taught in all content areas and 60.9% of teachers believe reading comprehension strategies are not taught in all content areas, and 60.9% believe that reading comprehension strategies are not taught in all content areas. See Appendix B for full survey results.

**f. Listing of Individuals Who Participated in the Needs Assessment** – Members of the School Leadership Team, The Literacy Team, and all staff participated in the needs assessment at Cedar Shoals. See Appendix C.

### III AREAS OF CONCERN

**a. Areas of Concern as They Relate to the Researched-based Practices:** The Department of Education's "What" document stresses systematic, explicit instruction, organizing instruction to improve learning, and instructional improvements to be implemented for literacy achievement. Based on the EOCT domain data, GHSGT domain data, and writing scores, Cedar Shoals' teams identified four areas of concern for students in Tiers I, II, III, and IV of instruction: 1) Increasing reading comprehension for all students across content areas; 2) Utilizing explicit vocabulary instruction across all content areas; 3) Utilizing writing strategies and processes for a variety of texts and purposes across all content areas; and 4) Implementing an ongoing system for monitoring formative and summative progress with all students. In the area of reading comprehension, direct and explicit reading strategies need to be embedded as part of each content area's instructional plan. This includes incorporating pre, during, and after-reading comprehension strategies in every class, using text-based collaborative learning and diverse texts. This also includes organizing instruction to include 2-4 hours of literacy instruction across content areas. Vocabulary instruction will be explicitly taught and embedded in context with more non-linguistic representations and multiple uses in varied contexts. The writing process and strategies taught will

include daily writing to learn strategies, writing to demonstrate learning, and weekly authentic writings for specific purposes that incorporate short or extended time frames. Research strategies and skills are paramount to adolescent writing proficiency, and these skills will be taught across content areas. Students will be continually assessed in order to identify needs and concerns for students requiring strategic, intensive, or due process interventions. This interdisciplinary approach will weave through all professional development in our Literacy plan, and these strategies will improve reading comprehension and writing proficiency at Cedar Shoals High School.

**b. Specific Age, Grade Levels, or Content Areas in Which the Concern Originates**

Concerns are found with students in grades 9-12 in all content areas and students identified as needing Tier II, III, or IV instruction.

**c. Areas of Concern and Steps the Schools Have or Have Not Taken to Address the Problems:**

<b>Table 5: Areas of Concern and Actions Taken or Not Taken at Cedar Shoals</b>	
<b>Areas of Concern</b>	<b>What Cedar Shoals Has Done or Has Not Done to Address the Problem</b>
Students need reading comprehension strategies taught across content areas as evidenced in EOCT and Graduation Test Scores of every content area.	Cedar Shoals <b>has implemented</b> collaborative classes to target students in Tier II as well as direct classes for students in Tiers III and IV. Cedar Shoals also utilizes Read 180 for students struggling with reading. Cedar Shoals <b>has not provided</b> professional learning on a school-wide level that provides teachers with necessary reading strategies to increase comprehension; Cedar Shoals <b>has not implemented</b> Read 180 with consistency.
Students need explicit vocabulary instruction taught across content areas as evidenced in EOCT scores of every content area.	Cedar Shoals <b>has not implemented</b> a school-wide professional learning or training that provides teachers with explicit vocabulary instruction and strategies.
Students need the writing process and writing strategies taught across content areas as evidenced in the Georgia High School Writing scores.	Cedar Shoals <b>has implemented</b> an advisement period every day to target areas of need; in particular, writing and preparation for the GHSWT during this time was implemented. Cedar Shoals <b>has not provided</b> school-wide professional development regarding writing to learn or writing across the curriculum strategies.

Teachers and students need an ongoing monitoring process in place to identify struggling students in order to intervene with instructional practices and intervention resources.	The data team process <b>is in place</b> for every content area and addresses instructional gaps and needs for all students; Cedar Shoals has <b>taken steps</b> to ensure all teachers understand and can implement the data team process. A systematic and ongoing progress monitoring of all students in reading comprehension and writing proficiency is <b>not present</b> at Cedar Shoals.
--	--

## IV. ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

### **a. Root or Underlying Causes of the Areas of Concern Found in the Needs Assessment**

During the planning and grant-writing stage, Cedar Shoals’ literacy team examined data from End Of Course Tests, Graduation Tests, Graduation Writing Tests, and the Needs Assessment. The domain analysis discovered 1) areas of concern, 2) specific gaps in the school’s literacy plan when compared to Georgia’s “Necessary Building Blocks of Literacy Plan Birth-to-12<sup>th</sup> Grade in Georgia,” and 3) what the school’s identified needs are as the literacy team designed a comprehensive literacy plan for the school. One major root cause of our literacy gaps is that most Cedar Shoals teachers lack expertise or knowledge in assessing or teaching struggling readers and writers. This is seen across grade levels and all content areas, and it underlies the discrepancies and gaps in our students’ achievement. Lack of professional development in these areas is an urgent concern, and teachers need ongoing support and coaching in these professional development initiatives. An-other root cause is a lack of sufficient processes in place to systematically and continually assess struggling readers and writers in our school. This process is critical, as insufficient progress monitoring of students in Tiers I, II, III, and IV undermine the efforts made by our teachers and do not offer the necessary information needed to address these student needs with interventions.

b. **Specific Grade Levels That Are Affected:** Students in grades 9-12 and identified in Tiers I, II, III, and IV at Cedar Shoals High School are affected by the gaps identified in the Areas of Concern.

c. **Specific Rationale for the Determination of the Cause:** Eighty-five percent of Cedar Shoals students receive free or reduced lunch, and many are doubly disadvantaged because they come from economically disadvantaged homes that also lack a print-rich or strong literacy environment. These causes, and the lack of teacher expertise in teaching reading comprehension or writing strategies, factor into why many of our students' struggle with texts in all content areas.

d. **What Has Been Done in the Past to Address the Problem:** Cedar Shoals has taken many steps to address the areas of concern and root causes of struggling readers and writers at our school. The present schedule incorporates collaborative classes for many Tier II and III students, and Read 180 is offered to selected students. Direct ELA instruction is given for selected Tier III or Tier IV students, and daily student advisement time targets areas of need for each student. Each year, students are identified early in the fall for remediation in writing using the writing assessment, and their needs are targeted in small class settings. These steps address the problems to some degree, but there is a great need for more awareness and professional development among all teachers as well as training in assessing, monitoring, and responding to student progress.

e. **New Information the Needs Assessment Uncovered:** The staff at Cedar Shoals identified areas of need as reading comprehension strategies in every content area, vocabulary instruction strategies, and writing strategies that enhance comprehension in content areas. The staff also noted needs for engaging technology to support these strategies, such as one-to-one computing and constructing knowledge through writing and use of iPads or other handheld devices. Cedar

Shoals' teachers are eager to learn new technologies and marry them with research skills and strategies for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning.

## **XV. SCHOOL LITERACY TEAM**

- a. Listing of the Members of the Site-Based Literacy Team** – See Appendix C.
- b. Function of the Site-Based Literacy Team in Terms of the Needs Assessment:** The site-based Literacy Team will provide ongoing input and support of literacy initiatives in reading and writing across curricular areas at Cedar Shoals High School. Through collaboration and cooperation, the team will review materials, engage in data analysis of students' reading and writing progress, and reflect periodically upon progress toward achieving the goals targeted in the Striving Readers Grant. The Team will support all 9-12 teachers at Cedar Shoals High School in increasing literacy achievement and proficiency with all students.
- c. Minutes of the Meeting of the Site-Based Literacy Team** See Appendix D for minutes.
- d. How the Site-Based Literacy Team Communicates and Includes All Members of the Staff in the Decision-Making Process:** Cedar Shoals High School conducted a literacy survey to receive feedback from all participating staff members, developed a Literacy Team representing each school department, and shares all SILT and Literacy Team minutes with all staff while soliciting feedback. Decisions made about the Striving Readers grant will be discussed and communicated through faculty meetings, team meetings, SILT meetings, Literacy Team meetings, and to all staff.

## **VI. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

- a. Project goals directly related to the identified needs:** Cedar Shoals' project goals are as follows: 1) To increase best practices with teachers of every content area in direct, explicit reading comprehension instruction, vocabulary instruction, and writing proficiency; 2) To instill

ongoing formative and summative assessments so reading comprehension and writing proficiency is monitored for all students in Tiers I, II, III, and IV; and 3) To clearly articulate vertically and horizontally common core standards and standards-based practices so that alignment is experienced between grades and schools.

**b. List of project objectives that relate to implementing the goals identified: Goal 1--**

**Objective 1:** All students in Tiers I, II, III, and IV will receive direct and explicit reading strategies. This includes application of strategies to diverse texts, guided practice of strategies appropriate to the difficulty level of texts, and extended reading time with an instructional focus.

**Objective 2:** All students in Tiers I, II, III, and IV will receive explicit vocabulary instruction. This includes learning new words by multiple exposures in a variety of contexts, and strategies to become independent vocabulary learners (knowledge of word components, use of reference materials).

**Objective 3:** All students in Tiers I, II, III, and IV will receive writing strategies in every content area on a daily basis and engaging in the writing process for specific audiences or purposes. Quarterly research-based writing will be required in all content areas. **Goal 2—**

**Objective 1:** All students will be assessed quarterly on reading comprehension and writing proficiency and will receive strategic instruction through Tier I, II, III, and IV interventions.

**Objective 2:** All students will be monitored through the data team process so learning goals are set where needed.

**Objective 3:** All students in all content areas will receive differentiated literacy instruction through collaborative teaching models and practices. **Objective 4:** Identified students will receive intensive literary instruction through Tier III through explicit instruction and materials.

**Objective 5:** Identified students will receive targeted and individualized support in Tier IV.

**Goal 3--Objective 1:** The Common Core English standards and Literacy standards in all content areas will be implemented and vertically aligned in grades 9-12. This includes

comprehensive training and redelivery of common core training with job embedded follow-up for all teachers by coaches, department leaders, and administrators. Best practices for reading instruction, vocabulary instruction, and writing strategies will be integral to these literacy common core standards. Our effectiveness indicators of these goals to measure our progress will be as follows: 1) Increased achievement in Literacy Scores; 2) Increased graduation rates; 3) Increased training of staff; and 4) Number of students passing and exceeding State Assessments.

**c. Research-based practices in the “what and the why” document as a guide for establishing goals and objectives:**

<b>Table 6: Research-based Practices that Supports Goals &amp; Objectives</b>	
<b>Goals &amp; Objectives</b>	<b>Research-Based Practices</b>
Goal 1 Objectives 1-3	All content area teachers at Cedar Shoals will engage in ongoing PL to incorporate literacy instruction that includes strategies for explicit reading comprehension (“Why,” pages 43-45), direct, explicit vocabulary instruction, and writing strategies that include writing processes and strategies for different purposes and texts (“Why” pages 47-48). All content area teachers will engage in the data teams process and PL to increase Tiers I, II, III, and IV achievement in literacy; some teachers will receive reading professional endorsements, professional training by reading specialists and writing across content area consultants.
Goal 2 Objectives 1-5	Grade-level or content groups will utilize formative and summative assessments to identify achievement of all students in reading comprehension and writing proficiency, as outlined in pages 97-100 of the “Why” document. Teachers will use “Lexile Ranges Aligned to CCR Expectations” and other screeners (“Why,” p. 50 and pages 105-108); and update growth charts following formative assessments. Ongoing progress monitoring will be utilized through the data team process as well as use of screeners and assessments as outlined in pages 105-108 of the “Why” document.
Goal 3 Objective 1	All content teachers will be trained with Common Core standards and with literacy standards in all content areas; this professional learning will translate into vertical and horizontal alignment (See p. 18 of “What” document) across grade levels and schools.

**d. Practices already in place when determining goals and objectives.**

- Our entire faculty is engaged in data team processes and collaborative planning so that needs of students and teachers are easily identified.
- Students are screened quarterly and placed into tiered instructional services due to identified needs on Individual Education Plans.

- Professional learning during selected collaborative planning by instructional coach provides training as outlined by School Improvement Plan.
- Daily advisement time targets content areas of concern for all students with specified teachers.

**e. Goals to be funded with other sources.** Goals 1, 2, and 3 will also be funded by Title 1, Title II-A, III, VI-B, Professional Learning Funds, as well as District and Local funding.

## **VII. SCIENTIFIC, EVIDENCE-BASED LITERACY PLAN**

**i. Proposes a Plan to Implement the Goals and Objectives Identified:** Over the past year, Cedar Shoals' leaders and teachers have been developing a school-wide, evidence-based literacy plan. A five-year Striving Readers plan for Cedar Shoals is as follows: **Year 1:** Provide professional learning to teachers and building administrators through summer institutes or during Pre-service and Professional development days in reading comprehension strategies and writing strategies in all content areas; provide screening, diagnostic, and progress assessments to monitor and target struggling students; determine and track Lexile levels for all students; implement Reading RTI for all students; use new instructional and intervention materials; create reading and writing growth charts; provide professional learning with new Common Core GPS and Literacy Common Core in all content classes; and utilize technology for reading, writing, and research based learning for student engagement. **Year 2:** Provide continued professional learning to teachers and building leaders for implementation of reading and writing strategies across the curriculum; continue to implement screening, monitoring, growth charts, and common core initiatives for Tiers I, II, III, and IV students; and reflect on progress and improvement thus far. **Years 3-5:** Continue implementation of Striving Readers Literacy Plan; collect and report Cedar Shoals' data to all stakeholders; continue monitoring of instructional practices so professional learning needs are targeted and addressed.

**j. Establishes Who Will Implement:** Cedar Shoals' Striving Readers Leadership Team, under the direction of Dr. Tony Price, Principal, and co-facilitated by Angela Owen, Instructional

Coach, will include representatives from the School Literacy Team, members of SILT, and all teachers at Cedar Shoals. Together, this Striving Readers Team will implement the site based Literacy Plan.

**k. Clearly Defines What Will Take Place in the Project Based on the “What” Document:**

Components from the “What” document p. 1	Activities to Take Place
1. Students will learn and apply Common Core standards.	Teachers will engage in ongoing professional learning with Common Core GPS and Literacy in all content areas in order to ensure implementation with fidelity and facilitate student learning (see pages 7-10 of “What” document).
2. Literacy at Cedar Shoals will incorporate components unique to adolescent literacy.	Teachers will organize six infrastructural components required for a strong literacy program (see A-F in the “What” p. 14).
3. Teachers will use ongoing formative and summative assessments to target students for interventions	Teachers and leaders will use screening diagnostic assessments, progress monitoring, summative assessments, and the data team processes for targeting students (see pages 11-12 of “What” document).
4. Teachers will implement best practices in instruction.	Teachers will utilize best practices unique to adolescent literacy that include direct, explicit instruction in the areas of reading comprehension and vocabulary; writing instruction that includes writing processes for varied purposes in all content areas; and extended time of 2-4 hours for literacy daily in all content areas (see pages 14-15 of the “What” document).
5. Teachers will use the four-tiered response model to target instructional needs.	Teachers and leaders will use daily formative assessments, weekly data team processes, common formative assessments, benchmark assessments, and annual summative assessments to target students for Tiers I, II, III, and IV interventions (see p. 15-16 of “What” document).
6. Leadership will facilitate all parts of implementation.	Leaders will attend all professional learning and redelivery of training; leaders will commit to monitoring processes and support of teachers and coach.
7. High quality teachers and coaches will implement the plan.	Pre-service programs and professional learning for teachers and instructional coach will ensure fidelity of the Literacy plan school-wide.
8. Cedar Shoals’ Literacy plan will be articulated vertically	Establish collaborative planning vertically and horizontally to ensure that reading requirements are utilized; reading and

and horizontally across grades and schools.	writing strategies are taught across content areas; access to diverse texts is used; students have opportunities to collaborate with peers; and technology is incorporated into the learning process.
9. Intentional strategies and practices will be used to promote engagement.	Teachers will increase opportunities for students to self-select reading material, topics, and research; access texts that are interesting; collaborate with peers; and use technology in ways that construct meaning and research.

**l. Details the Current Instructional Schedule:** Cedar Shoals’ instructional day is centered around four blocks each semester with a twenty-seven minute advisement/remediation period scheduled every day after second period. The Striving Readers Grant will allow us for extended literacy time in all content areas. See Appendix E.

**m. Details a Plan for Tiered Instruction:**

Tier I: All students are universally screened in reading and writing comprehension, taught standards-based instruction, and receive feedback on progress following formative classroom assessments. With Striving Readers grant, all students in Tier I will receive reading and writing strategies to ensure access with fidelity to Common Core standards.
Tier II: Students are targeted for instruction based on needs and resources, and ongoing progress monitoring is part of differentiated and collaborative classroom instruction. With Striving Readers, students in Tier II would also utilize Read 180 classrooms, FastForWord software for struggling comprehension needs, and all Special Education teachers would receive reading endorsements.
Tier III: More intensive and specialized programs are used to target students based on individual need. Smaller groups are implemented, Read 180, and direct classrooms are tailored for targeted students. With Striving Readers funding, Tier III students will be more aggressively monitored and teachers will receive professional learning in administering assessments and monitoring progress for intensive intervention purposes.
Tier IV: Pervasive and intensive intervention is needed with one-on-one instruction, direct classroom instruction, Read 180, and FastForWord software program. With Striving Readers funds, gifted students in this tier will be able to engage in more technology in order to construct meaning and complete research.

**f and g:** See Table 7:

**Table 7: Literacy Materials used for Strategies for Tiers I, II, III, and IV instruction & Literacy Plan for Tiers I, II, III, and IV Instruction**

<b>Grades 9-12</b>	<b>Materials</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Strategies</b>
Tier I	Content area instructional materials	Standard instructional time	All classroom teachers	Differentiation/Flexible grouping/Progress monitoring
Tier II	Content area instructional materials; Read 180	Instructional time; collaborative teaching processes	All Gen ED teachers/Collaborative teachers	Differentiation; students in smaller groups; frequent monitoring of progress
Tier III	Content instructional materials; SOLO/Read Out Loud/ Read 180	Instructional time; collaborative teaching processes; time in labs	All Gen Ed teachers and collaborative teachers	Longer term intervention; more frequent progress monitoring
Tier IV	Course instructional materials; SOLO/Read OutLoud; Read 180	Instructional time; collaborative teaching processes; time in labs	All Gen Ed teachers and collaborative teachers	Individualized instruction w/ specialized programs.

**h. Includes a Statement Regarding Conflict with Other Initiatives:** Cedar’s Striving Readers grant implementation plan conflicts with no other initiative at Cedar Shoals High School. The district’s two key initiatives—International Baccalaureate for grades 6-10 and Professional Development Schools Partnership with the University of Georgia will be supported by a Striving Readers grant, providing the same level of rigor, focus, and high expectations for literacy achievement in all content areas.

**VIII. STRATEGIES AND MATERIALS (EXISTING AND PROPOSED)  
INCLUDING TECHNOLOGY TO SUPPORT THE LITERACY PLAN**

**a. General List of Current Classroom Resources for Each Classroom in the School – Grades 9-12:**

- Content area instructional texts—class sets of texts, supplemental texts
- SmartBoards in every room with mounted LCD projector
- 2 laptop carts (32 each) for each department

**b. Generic List of Shared Resources**

- Class sets of books
- Class sets of novels and supplemental instructional texts
- E2020 (Credit recovery) lab
- 4 other computer labs that can be accessed by all staff.

**c. General List of Library Resources or a Description of the Library as Equipped**

- Cedar Shoals' Media Center houses 22,501 books.
- The technology infrastructure in the Library Media Center consists of high-speed connectivity to internal and external network-based resources with one in-house server.
- There is a circulation desk computer and the media specialists have CCSD teacher laptops.
- There are 24 computers for student use, a Symposium, a scanner and a color and black and white laser-jet printer.
- Technology items available for teacher checkout include: fourteen SMART response systems, six LCD projectors, twenty digital still cameras, two mini-dv digital video cameras, one external dvd burner, six iPod touches, five digital flip cameras, two tripods, ten CPS systems and four dvd/vhs players.
- Galileo search data base
- In 2012, GoogleDocs will be used for mail, collaborative learning and housing data, and all data team processes.

**d. List of Resources Needed to Implement the Literacy Plan Including Student**

**Engagement:**

- Reading/ELA consultants for Professional Learning
- Diverse texts for each classroom or added to media center—these to include dual language texts, up-to-date non-fiction texts, and other resource materials.
- iPads or other handheld devices for every student for engagement and research purposes in reading and writing.
- Professional learning materials for teachers engaged in professional learning.
- Read 180 program for interventions in Tiers II, III, and IV students
- FastForWord software as an intervention program for Tiers II, III, IV students.

**e. Generic List of Activities that Support Classroom Practices:**

- District classroom walkthroughs, focus walkthroughs, and peer walkthroughs to address fidelity to Clarke County School District's Non-Negotiables (see LEA proposal).

- Beginning in August 2012, classroom walkthroughs will focus on literacy and literacy across curriculum for two years; feedback from district and school leaders will target celebrations and areas of concern in the program.
- Site-Based Literacy Team meetings to analyze data and monitor progress of literacy initiatives.

**f. Generic List of Activities that Support Literacy Intervention Programs:**

- Administration of diagnostic screeners for all students in reading and writing proficiency.
- Students are targeted for Tiered instruction and interventions; schedules are built and maintained for sustained tiered intervention.
- Administration of quarterly literacy benchmarks so progress can be monitored.
- Selection of texts that motivate students and build confidence in reading
- Use of data team process for analysis of literacy initiatives and achievement with each student; teachers analyze student work for data and targeted instructional needs.
- Use of technology to extend skills, reinforce research skills, and engage students.
- Utilization of tutoring to assist students when needed.
- Ongoing professional learning of Common Core standards and Striving Readers grant initiatives for interdisciplinary literacy.
- Lesson plans developed according to intervention Tiers and instructional needs.

**g. Generic List of Additional Strategies Needed to Support Student Success:**

- Cedar Shoals' teachers in grades 9-12 need professional learning on how to give screening assessments and how to use data to successfully target students with literacy skill gaps.
- Teachers in all content areas and grades 9-12 need intensive professional learning on the 9 elements of a comprehensive literacy program, how to incorporate reading and writing strategies in every class, and how to support Tiers I-IV literacy interventions through screening, analyzing data, and creating growth plans for each student.
- Students need 2-4 hours per day for literacy instruction and practice across the content areas in grades 9-12; this practice will utilize diverse texts and focuses instructionally on reading strategies and writing proficiency across content areas.

## **IX. PROJECT PROCEDURES AND SUPPORT**

**a. Details a Sample Schedule by Grade Level Indicating a Tiered Instructional Schedule**

The tiered schedule is as follows: Tier 1: All 9-12 students will receive universal screenings; GPS/CCGPS through a standards-based classroom structure; differentiation of instruction including fluid, flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, and demonstration of learning.

Tier 2: Tier I and 10% of students will receive standard intervention protocol process for identifying and providing research-based interventions based on need and resources; ongoing progress monitoring to measure RTI and to guide decision making. Tier 3: Tiers I and II and 5% of students will receive SST-driven learning, including intensive, formalized problem solving to identify student needs; targeted research-based interventions tailored to individual needs; frequent progress monitoring and analysis of student RTI. Tier 4: Tiers I, II, and III and 2-5% of students will be involved in specialized programs and methodologies that have a greater frequency of monitoring through RTI.

**b and c. Shows a Schedule That Is Designed for RTI:** See Appendix F for Instructional Schedule with RTI.

## **X. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED ON THE BASIS OF DOCUMENTED NEEDS**

**a and b. Table Indicating the Professional Learning Activities That Staff Have Attended in the Past**

**Year:** See Appendix G.

**c. The Percentage of Staff Attending Professional Learning** The attendance rate for all professional learning is 97%.

**d. Detailed List of On-Going Professional Learning** The ongoing professional learning at Cedar Shoals centers around improving the effectiveness of data teams, quality instruction using the instructional framework, effective collaborative teaching, and International Baccalaureate training. See Appendix H.

**e. Preferred Method of Delivery of Professional Learning** – At Cedar Shoals, professional learning is preferably given in a small learning collaborative team or by common planning period.

**f. Programmatic Professional Learning Needs Identified in the Needs Assessment** – As a result of the staff survey given on literacy, professional learning is needed in reading comprehension across content areas, writing strategies across contents areas, and vocabulary instruction across content areas.

#### **a. ASSESSMENT/DATA ANALYSIS PLAN**

**h. Detailed Listing of the School’s Current Assessment Protocol:** See Appendix I for Assessment Calendar.

**i. Explanation of the Current Data Analysis Protocol:** Clarke County School District requires that all schools conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for all subject areas before the beginning of each school year. Cedar’s School Improvement plan will serve as the foundation for all ongoing school improvement efforts and is based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. This plan is reviewed annually by the Cedar Shoals’ School Improvement team and adjustments are made if necessary. Cedar works in conjunction with the Division of Instructional Services & School Performance to conduct an Implementation & Impact Check of its school improvement plan during January or February. The Annual Performance Report and the Implementation & Impact Check will serve as the major components of the district’s internal quality assurance review. The results of Cedar Shoals’ performance report is shared with the school staff, parents, and the Board of Education at the beginning of the school year via Annual Title I meetings, school council meetings, or other methods. A district data notebook that summarizes school and district performance on all state and district assessments is generated in

July of each year. Data in this notebook is as follows: Historical Data with growth by Grade & School (Domain Data), EOCT--Performance Level Information, Domain Data, and Subgroup Data (CRCT and GHSGT), and STATE/RESA/District Comparisons (CRCT, GHSGT). Cedar Shoals routinely uses walkthrough data to monitor the implementation of fifteen key indicators of standards-based classrooms. Clarke County benchmarks are administered in the following courses/grades: Grades 9-12: US History, World History, Gov't/Civics, Math I, Math II, Biology, Physical Science, Lit/comp 9, Lit/comp 10 (administered at approximately week 6 and 12 of each term). Diagnostic classroom assessments are routinely administered to students in grades 9-12 to measure student growth in the areas of writing, reading comprehension, reading fluency, math computation, and math fluency. Each assessment has target scores for every quarter in order to assess if students are progressing in that area.

**j. Comparison of the Current Protocol with the Striving Readers Assessment Plan:** Cedar Shoals' assessment plan mirrors the district's literacy assessment plan and protocol as outlined and detailed above in section a. With Striving Readers' funds, our assessment plan will coincide with the Scholastic Reading Inventory that all students will take.

**k. Brief Narrative Detailing How the New Assessments Will Be Implemented into the Current Assessment Schedule:** Cedar's Literacy Team will, in conjunction with the district's Director of Teaching and Learning, explore how SRI compares to the STEEP MAZE assessment that we currently use and that teachers have been trained on. If it is necessary for all Striving Readers schools to adopt the same assessment, Cedar will do so.

**l. Brief Narrative Listing Current Assessments That Might Be Discontinued as a Result of the Implementation of Striving Readers:** Cedar Shoals presently uses district based screeners and assessments such as STEEP MAZE to indentify reading levels. As a result of Striving

Readers, we would discontinue this assessment and use Scholastic Reading Inventory for all students and any other interventional assessments as needed.

**m. Listing of Training That Teachers Will Need to Implement Any New Assessments**

Training will be required if Read 180 is expanded in ninth-grade academy or with other grade levels; The Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) would be used with Read 180 implementation, and training would be required.

**n. Brief Narrative on How Data Is Presented to Parents and Stakeholders:** Data is presented to parents and other stakeholders through progress reports in four week increments, updates on major exam scores, the CCSD web site and Cedar Shoals' web site.

## **b. RESOURCES**

**a. Clear alignment plan for Striving Readers and All Other Funding:** Striving Readers funding will align with Title I, Title II-A, Local and School district funds, Title VI-B, and Title III funds.

**b. List of Resources available at Cedar Shoals**

- SmartBoards in every classroom
- Electronic student-response systems
- Document cameras
- Media center with diverse texts
- School leadership teams/School Improvement Leadership Team
- Read 180 Lab and Voyager Literacy

**c. Plan to Ensure that No Supplanting Take Place** During Years 1 and 2 of the performance period, all of Cedar Shoals' budget items will be examined by the School Leadership team as well as Clarke County District personnel and Business Services to ensure that no supplanting of materials or resources will take place, except as allowed by the Striving Readers grant program.

**d. Detail how Striving Readers Will Add Value to the Existing Resources in the School:**

Striving Readers will add value to existing resources at Cedar Shoals through comprehensive professional learning on adolescent literacy needs, addition of print and digital resources that will engage student learning, and Tiered instructional materials. The Striving Readers Grant will not only increase instructional expertise with all teachers and student achievement; it will create a lifelong literacy community at Cedar Shoals that prepares each student for 21<sup>st</sup> century college and career success.