

School Profile

Created Friday, December 05, 2014

Page 1

School Information

System Name:	Atlanta Public Schools
School or Center Name:	Slater Elementary School
System ID	761
School ID	4066

Level of School

Elementary (K-5 or Primary, Elementary)

Principal

Name:	Eunice Payne
Position:	Principal
Phone:	404.802.4050
Email:	ehjones@atlanta.k12.ga.us

School contact information

(the persons with rights to work on the application)

Name:	Calesia Grissom
Position:	RTI/SST Coordinator
Phone:	404.802.4070
Email:	cgrissom@atlanta.k12.ga.us

Grades represented in the building

example pre-k to 6

K-5

Number of Teachers in School

30

FTE Enrollment

510

Grant Assurances

Created Friday, December 05, 2014

Page 1

The sub-grantee assures that it has the necessary legal authority to apply for and receive a SRCL Grant.

-
- Yes
-

Sub-grantee certifies that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.

-
- Yes
-

The SRCL projects will target students who attend Title I schools or schools eligible for Title I schoolwide programs and their families.

-
- Yes
-

The SRCL project will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications.

-
- Yes
-

The Grantee will participate in all technical assistance/information-sharing opportunities and professional development activities provided through the STRIVING READER COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY GRANT Project Grant Program.

-
- Yes
-

All activities must be correlated with the development of STRIVING READER COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY GRANT goals for children birth through grade 12.

-
- Yes
-

The second year of funding is dependent upon successful program implementation and progress aligned with the components of the request for application submitted.

-
- Yes
-

Prior to any material change affecting the purpose, administration, organization, budget, or operation of the SRCL project, the Sub-grantee agrees to submit an appropriately amended application to GaDOE for approval.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee agrees to notify the GaDOE, in writing, of any change in the contact information provided in its application.

-
- Yes
-

The activities and services described in the application shall be administered by or under the supervision and control of the Sub-grantee. The Sub-grantee shall not assign or subcontract, in whole or in part, its rights or obligations without prior written consent of GaDOE. Any attempted assignment without said consent shall be void and of no effect.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee will use fiscal control and sound accounting procedures that will ensure proper disbursement of and account for Federal and state funds paid to the program to perform its duties.

-
- Yes
-

Funds shall be used only for financial obligations incurred during the grant period.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee will, if applicable, have the required financial and compliance audits conducted in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1966 and OMB Circular A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."

-
- Yes
-

The fiscal agent will adopt and use proper methods of administering each program, including: (A) the enforcement of any obligations imposed on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program; and (B) the timely correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, evaluation and/or technical assistance.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Georgia Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Education, or other state or Federal officials.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee will submit reports to GaDOE as may reasonably be required. The Sub-grantee will maintain such fiscal and programmatic records and provide access to those records, as necessary, for those departments to perform their duties.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee will submit an annual summative evaluation report no later than June 30.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee agrees that GaDOE, or any of its duly authorized representatives, at any time during the term of this agreement, shall have access to, and the right to audit or examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the Sub-grantee related to the Sub-grantee's charges and performance under the SRCL sub-grant.

-
- Yes
-

The property (e.g., computers, equipment, classroom desks, tables, and pilferable items) purchased with the SRCL grant funds must be managed in accordance with EDGAR section 74.34 through 74.37 (for non-profit organizations) and with EDGAR section 80.32 and 80.33 (for school districts).

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee certifies that it will abide by GaDOE's Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Policy. Applicants with a conflict of interest must submit a disclosure notice.

-
- Yes
-

The Sub-grantee will comply with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (34 C.F.R. 99).

-
- Yes
-

Sub-grantee will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which prohibits discrimination on a basis of disability.

-
- Yes
-

In accordance with the Federal Drug-Free Workplace and Community Act Amendments of 1989 and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, the Sub-grantee understands that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance, marijuana, or dangerous drug is prohibited at geographic locations at which individuals are directly engaged in the performance of work pursuant to the 21st CCLC grant.

-
- Yes
-

All technology purchases (software and hardware) will be approved by the LEA Technology Director for compatibility with current operating systems and building infrastructure. The Technology Director must ensure that any purchases for the building will be able to be implemented and sustained beyond the grant period.

-
- Yes
-

Preliminary Application Requirements

Created Friday, December 05, 2014

Page 1

Click on the [General Application Information](#) link below to assist you in the grant development process.

[SRCL General Information Packet-Cohort 4](#)

Did you download and read the General Information document to assist you with writing the grant?

-
- Yes
-

Click on the [SRCL Rubric](#) link below to assist you in the grant development process.

[SRCL Scoring Rubric-Cohort 4](#)

Did you download and read the SRCL Rubric to assist you with writing the grant?

-
- Yes
-

Click on the [Assessment Chart](#) link below to assist you in the grant development process.

[SRCL Required Assessments Chart](#)

Did you download and read the Assessment Chart to assist you in writing the grant?

-
- Yes
-

Assessments

I understand that implementing the assessments mentioned on page 6 in the General Information Packet is a necessary part of receiving SRCL funding.

-
- I Agree
-

Unallowable Expenditures

Preparation of the Proposal: Costs to develop, prepare, and/or write the SRCL proposal cannot be charged to the grant directly or indirectly by either the agency or contractor.

Pre-Award Costs: Pre-award costs may not be charged against the grant. Funds can be used only for activities conducted and costs incurred after the start date of the grant.

Entertainment, Refreshments, Snacks: A field trip without the approved academic support will be considered entertainment. End-of-year celebrations or food associated with parties or socials are unallowable expenditures. Game systems and game cartridges are unallowable.

Unapproved out of state or overnight field trips, including retreats, lock-ins, etc.

Incentives (e.g., plaques, trophies, stickers, t-shirts, give-a-ways)

Advertisements, Promotional or Marketing Items

Decorative Items

Purchase of Facilities or vehicles (e.g., Buses, Vans, or Cars)

Land acquisition

Capital Improvements, Permanent Renovations

Direct charges for items/services that the indirect cost rate covers;

Dues to organizations, federations or societies for personal benefits

Any costs not allowed for Federal projects per EDGAR, which may be accessed at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html>.

NOTE: This is NOT an all-inclusive list of unallowable expenses. If you have questions about unallowable expenses please e-mail your questions to jmorrill@doe.k12.ga.us

Upon approval by the State Board of Education, sub-grantees will be required to submit electronic budgets through GaDOE Consolidated Application Portal. All budget requests must be made in accordance with the use of funds for the SRCL project and must meet the requirements in EDGAR and OMB circulars.

• I Agree

Georgia Department of Education Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Policy

Georgia's conflict of interest and disclosure policy is applicable to entities conducting business on behalf of and /or doing business with the Department and entities receiving a grant to implement a program and/or project approved by the State Board of Education. This policy is applicable for entities receiving state and/or Federal funds.

Questions regarding the Department's conflict of interest and disclosure policy should be directed to the program manager responsible for the contract, purchase order and/or grant.

I. Conflicts of Interest

It is the policy of the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) to avoid doing business with Applicants, subcontractors of Applicants who have a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict of interest. The purpose of this policy is to maintain the highest level of integrity within its workforce, and to ensure that the award of grant Agreements is based upon fairness and merit.

a. Organizational Conflicts of Interest.

All grant applicants ("Applicants") shall provide a statement in their proposal which describes in a concise manner all past, present or planned organizational, financial, contractual or other interest(s) with an organization regulated by the GaDOE, including but not limited to Local Education Agencies (LEAs), or with an organization whose interests may be substantially affected by GaDOE activities, and which is related to the work under this grant solicitation. The interest(s) in which conflict may occur shall include those of the Applicant, its affiliates, proposed consultants, proposed subcontractors and key personnel of any of the above. Past interest shall be limited to within one year of the date of the Applicant's grant proposal. Key personnel shall include:

- any person owning more than 20% interest in the Applicant
 - the Applicant's corporate officers
 - board members
 - senior managers
 - any employee who is responsible for making a decision or taking an action on this grant application or any resulting Agreement where the decision or action can have an economic or other impact on the interests of a regulated or affected organization.
- i. The Applicant shall describe in detail why it believes, in light of the interest(s) identified in (a) above, that performance of the proposed Agreement can be accomplished in an impartial and objective manner.
 - ii. In the absence of any relevant interest identified in (a) above, the Applicant shall submit in its grant application a statement certifying that to the best of its knowledge and belief no affiliation exists relevant to possible conflicts of interest. The Applicant must obtain the same information from potential subcontractors prior to award of a subcontract.

Conflict of Interest & Disclosure Policy

- iii. GaDOE will review the statement submitted and may require additional relevant information from the Applicant. All such information, and any other relevant information known to GaDOE, will be used to determine whether an award to the Applicant may create a conflict of interest. If any such conflict of interest is found to exist, GaDOE may:
 1. Disqualify the Applicant, or
 2. Determine that it is otherwise in the best interest of GaDOE to make an award to the Applicant and include appropriate provisions to mitigate or avoid such conflict in the grant awarded.
- iv. The refusal to provide the disclosure or representation, or any additional information required, may result in disqualification of the Applicant for an award. If nondisclosure or misrepresentation is discovered after award, the resulting grant Agreement may be terminated. If after award the Applicant discovers a conflict of interest with respect to the grant awarded as a result of this solicitation, which could not reasonably have been known prior to award, an immediate and full disclosure shall be made in writing to GaDOE. The disclosure shall include a full description of the conflict, a description of the action the Applicant has taken, or proposes to take, to avoid or mitigate such conflict. GaDOE may, however, terminate the Agreement for convenience if GaDOE deems that termination is in the best interest of the GaDOE.

b. Employee Relationships

- i. The Applicant must provide the following information with its application and must provide an information update within 30 days of the award of a contract, any subcontract, or any consultant agreement, or within 30 days of the retention of a Subject Individual or former GaDOE employee subject to this clause:
 1. The names of all Subject Individuals who:
 - a. Participated in preparation of proposals for award; or
 - b. Are planned to be used during performance; or
 - c. Are used during performance; and
- ii. The names of all former GaDOE employees, retained by the Applicant who were employed by GaDOE during the two year period immediately prior to the date of:
 1. The award; or
 2. Their retention by the Applicant; and
 3. The date on which the initial expression of interest in a future financial arrangement was discussed with the Applicant by any former GaDOE employee whose name is required to be provided by the contractor pursuant to subparagraph (ii); and
 4. The location where any Subject Individual or former GaDOE employee whose name is required to be provided by the Applicant pursuant to subparagraphs (i) and (ii), are expected to be assigned.
- iii. "Subject Individual" means a current GaDOE employee or a current GaDOE employee's father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, half sister, spouse of an in-law, or a member of his/her household.

Conflict of Interest & Disclosure Policy

- iv. The Applicant must incorporate this clause into all subcontracts or consultant agreements awarded under this Agreement and must further require that each such subcontractor or consultant incorporate this clause into all subcontracts or consultant agreements at any tier awarded under this Agreement unless GaDOE determines otherwise.
 - v. The information as it is submitted must be certified as being true and correct. If there is no such information, the certification must so state.
- c. **Remedies for Nondisclosure**
The following are possible remedies available to the GaDOE should an Applicant misrepresent or refuse to disclose or misrepresent any information required by this clause:
- 1. Termination of the Agreement.
 - 2. Exclusion from subsequent GaDOE grant opportunities.
 - 3. Other remedial action as may be permitted or provided by law or regulation or policy or by the terms of the grant agreement.
- d. **Annual Certification**. The Applicant must provide annually, based on the anniversary date of Agreement award, the following certification in writing to GaDOE. The annual certification must be submitted with the grantees annual end of year program report.

ANNUAL CERTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIPS

The Applicant represents and certifies that to the best of its knowledge and belief that during the prior 12 month period:

A former GaDOE employee(s), current GaDOE employee, or Subject Individual(s) has been retained to work under the Agreement or subcontract or consultant agreement and complete disclosure has been made.

No former GaDOE employee(s), current GaDOE employee, or Subject Individual(s) has been retained to work under the Agreement or subcontract or consultant agreement, and disclosure is not required.

II. **Disclosure of Conflict of Interest after Agreement Execution**

If after Agreement execution, Applicant discovers a conflict of interest which could not reasonably have been known prior to Agreement execution; an immediate and full disclosure shall be made in writing to GaDOE. The disclosure shall include a full description of the conflict, a description of the action the Applicant has taken, or proposes to take, to avoid or mitigate such conflict. GaDOE may, however, terminate this Agreement for convenience if GaDOE deems that termination is in the best interest of GaDOE.

Conflict of Interest & Disclosure Policy

III. Incorporation of Clauses

The Applicant must incorporate the clauses in paragraphs A, B, and C of this section into all subcontracts or consultant agreements awarded under this Agreement and must further require that each such subcontractor or consultant incorporate this clause into all subcontracts or consultant agreements at any tier awarded under this Agreement unless GaDOE determines otherwise.



Signature of Fiscal Agency Head (official sub-grant recipient)

Chuck Burbridge, Chief Financial Officer

Typed Name of Fiscal Agency Head and Position Title

12-5-14

Date



Signature of Applicant's Authorized Agency Head (required)

Dr. Meria J. Carstarphen

Typed Name of Applicant's Authorized Agency Head and Position Title

12-5-12

Date

Signature of Co-applicant's Authorized Agency Head (if applicable)

Typed Name of Co-applicant's Authorized Agency Head and Position Title (if applicable)

Date (if applicable)

Fiscal Agent Memo of Understanding

The application is the project implementation plan, not simply a proposal. This project is expected to be implemented with fidelity upon SBOE approval. When completing the application, please remember that sub-grantees will not be permitted to change the project's scope that is originally outlined in the application, scored by reviewers during the application review process, and approved by SBOE. This policy is designed to provide basic fairness to applicants for discretionary sub-grants.

Fiscal Agent/Applicant Required Signatures:

I hereby certify that I am the an authorized signatory of the fiscal agent for which grant application is made and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, application guidelines and instructions, assurances, and certifications. I also certify that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of the program described in the attached application.

Please sign in blue ink.

Name of Fiscal Agent's Contact Person: **Dr. Meria J. Carstarphen**

Position/Title of Fiscal Agent's Contact Person: **Superintendent**

Address: **130 Trinity Avenue S.W.**

City: **Atlanta**

Zip: **30303**

Telephone: **(404) 802-2820**

Fax: **(404) 802-1803**

E-mail: **mjcarstarphen@atlanta.k12.ga.us**



Signature of Fiscal Agency Head (District Superintendent or Executive Director)

Dr. Meria J. Carstarphen

Typed Name of Fiscal Agency Head (District Superintendent or Executive Director)

Date (required)

System History and Demographics

Atlanta Public Schools (APS) serves a diverse student population in traditional and alternative classroom settings. The District is dedicated to providing each student with the best possible education through an intensive core curriculum and specialized, challenging, instructional and career programs. APS provides a full range of academic programs and services for its students. The various levels of education preparation provided include elementary and secondary courses for general, vocational, and college preparatory levels, as well as magnet programs and gifted and talented programs. Also, a variety of co-curricular and extracurricular activities supplement the academic programs.

The number of traditional schools has grown from the original seven to currently 106 as follows: 52 elementary (K-5); 12 middle (6-8), 2 single gender, and 19 high schools (9-12). There are 4 alternative and 2 evening school programs. Thirteen schools offer extended-day programs, and more than 40 offer after-school (expanded-day) programs. APS also supports two non-traditional schools for middle and/or high school students, an evening high school program, an adult learning center, and seventeen charter schools. APS is organized into nine groups called Clusters. The clusters are composed of dedicated elementary schools feeding into dedicated middle schools and ultimately into dedicated high schools. The active enrollment for Atlanta Public Schools is approximately 52,700 students. The District's ethnic distribution is 76.2% Black, 14.3% White, 6.7% Hispanic, and 2.8% Multi-Racial. More than 77% of APS students receive free and/or reduced-priced meals.

Current Priorities and Strategic Planning

Under the leadership of its 17th appointed superintendent, Dr. Meria Joel Carstarphen, APS is in the midst of a whole-school reform effort, which is changing the way the school

Atlanta Public Schools

system operates from the central office to the classroom. The Atlanta Public School system is committed to making steady, incremental improvements in our children’s performance with the goal of being recognized as one of the best urban school districts in the nation. The vision of Atlanta Public Schools is to be a high-performing school district where students love to learn, educators inspire, families engage and the community trusts the system. The district has built on the previous strategic plan and laid the foundation for this vision with the development of the 2015-2020 “Strong Students, Strong Schools, Strong Staff, Strong System” strategic plan. The five-year strategic includes the following strategic goals, objectives, and outcomes:

Strategic Goals	Strategic Objectives		Strategic Outcomes
Academic Program	Deliver a rigorous standards-based instructional program	Invest in holistic development of the diverse APS student body	Well-rounded students with the necessary academic skills
Talent Management	Recruit and retain the best talent at APS	Continually develop, recognize and compensate staff	Energized and inspired team of employees
Systems and Resources	Continually improve operating systems and processes	Prioritize resources based on student needs	Efficient systems and strategically aligned and data-driven resources
Culture	Foster a caring culture of trust and collaboration	Communicate and engage with families and stakeholders	Supportive stakeholders who trust and are invested in our mission and vision

Literacy Program

The APS Office of Literacy believes a high quality, comprehensive English Language Arts and Literacy curriculum is essential for students to develop the necessary skills to comprehend and communicate effectively. The development of language, upon which all learning is built, plays a critical role in students’ ability to acquire strong literacy skills that

Atlanta Public Schools

include reading, writing, speaking, listening, and the study of literature. Language skills serve as a necessary basis for further learning and responsible citizenship. We believe that all key stakeholders (students, teachers, administrators, parents and community members) share the responsibility and the accountability for educating our students to become literate adults.

An effective English language arts and literacy program includes:

1. Explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, print awareness, letter knowledge, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension
2. Develops thinking and language through interactive learning
3. Draws on literature in order to develop students' understanding of their literacy heritage
4. Draws on informational texts and multimedia in order to build academic vocabulary and strong content knowledge
5. Develops students' oral language and literacy through appropriately challenging learning
6. Emphasizes writing arguments, explanatory/informative texts, and narratives
7. Provides explicit skill instruction in reading and writing
8. Builds on the language, experiences, knowledge, and interests that students bring to school
9. Nurtures students' sense of their common ground as present or future American citizens and prepares them to participate responsibly in our schools and in civic life
10. Reaches out to families and communities in order to sustain a literate society
11. Holds high expectations for all students

Literacy must be viewed as the ability of individuals to communicate effectively in the real world. This view of literacy must involve teaching the abilities to listen, read, write, speak, and view things with thinking being an integral part of each of these processes. Ongoing support for

the implementation of the APS Literacy Content Framework is provided to instructional staff. APS educators will have ongoing professional learning focused on the key components of the Literacy Content Framework through district sessions and job-embedded, school-based opportunities. Cross department collaboration between Central Office staff also ensures consistency, coherence and alignment in messages, expectations and professional learning for literacy. Future work includes conducting literacy sessions and supports for families that are aligned, targeted, and focused on improving and strengthening literacy skills.

Need for a Striving Reader Project

The schools included in our district-wide submission for Striving Reader Comprehensive Literacy Cohort IV funding are among the lowest performing, highest-poverty schools in the district and the state. On average, 63% of students have a lexile score at or above grade level and less than 50% of students are proficient on any statewide examination. The schools and neighborhoods are also plagued by generations of poverty and low educational attainment. With the inclusion of our Pre-K program, 6 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, and 1 high school we demonstrate a clear need for literacy support that runs throughout an entire feeder pattern. With funding from the Striving Reader grant schools will be able to begin providing the resources necessary to improve literacy outcomes within this cluster of schools.

Plan for Striving Readers' (SR) Grant Implementation

With years of experience successfully administering large, competitive grants at the federal, state, and private foundation level Atlanta Public Schools is prepared to implement the Striving Reader grant. Mr. Larry Wallace, Project Director, will supervise the elementary/secondary literacy coaches, instructional technology coordinator and specialists during the grant period. The Project Director will provide grantees with technical assistance related to fidelity of implementation, budget inquiries, programmatic resources, educational technology, and professional learning. Striving Reader Principals will oversee grant-focused literacy activities as part of their commitment to whole-school literacy achievement. APS Finance Department will process all grant expenditures.

Individuals Responsible for Day-to-Day Grant Operations

- David Jernigan, Deputy Superintendent
- Chuck Burbridge, Chief Financial Officer
- Dr. Carlton Jenkins, Chief Academic Officer
- Dr. Linda Anderson, Assistant Superintendent
- Elementary, Middle, and High School Associate Superintendents
- Larry Wallace, Project Director
- Dr. Alisha Hill and Dr. Adrienne Simmons, K-5/6-12 Literacy Coordinators
- Courtney Jones, Early Learning Coordinator
- Literacy Coaches
- Principals
- Assistant Principals
- Accounts Payable Coordinator
- Budget Administrative Assistant
- Procurement Specialist

Responsibilities for Grant Implementation

Grant Activities	Person(s) Responsible
Alignment of grant goals and objectives with district strategic plan	All
Convene District Literacy Team for planning	Project Director, Chief Academic Officer, Assistant Superintendent
Convene school literacy team for overview and implementation	Principal, Instructional Coaches, School Literacy Team
Purchase and distribute instructional materials	Project Director, Procurement Specialist, Accounts Payable, Instructional Technology Director
Plan and implement professional learning	Chief Academic Officer, Assistant Superintendent, Associate Superintendents, Project Director, Literacy Coordinators, Instructional Coaches, Instructional Technology Director
Drawdown funds	Project Director, Finance Department
Meet regularly with school teams for monitoring visits	Project Director, Associate Superintendents, Principals, Literacy Coordinators, Literacy Teams
Submit reports to GADOE	Project Director, Principals, School Literacy Teams

Implementation of Goals and Objectives

All administrators, teachers, literacy coaches, and instructional technology specialists will be involved in implementing the Striving Readers grant program as described in school plans and the DOE’s “What”, “Why”, and “How” documents. Mr.

Atlanta Public Schools: District Management Plan and Key Personnel

Wallace will be available for implementation technical assistance throughout the grant period. All APS personnel are expected to work towards meeting the goals of the grant.

Involving Grant Recipients in Budget and Performance Plans

Grant recipients will meet monthly with the Project Director, Literacy Coordinators, and Literacy Coaches to review and adjust budgets and performance plans. All meetings will be documented with agendas, sign-in sheets and deliverables.

Evidence of Meetings with Grant Recipients

Grant recipients will be part of the District Literacy Team designed to support Striving Readers' schools with professional development and resources. This team will meet and report quarterly on grant implementation and meetings will be documented with agendas and sign in sheets. In addition, Mr. Wallace will serve as Striving Readers Project Director and will provide technical assistance with fidelity of implementation, budget inquiries, programmatic resources, educational technology, and professional learning.

Experience of the Applicant

A. Other Initiatives and State Audit Results

Atlanta Public Schools (APS) has a strong track record of effectively implementing large, competitive grants at the federal, state, and private foundation level. The table below summarizes our grant initiatives .

Competitive Grant Title	Award Amount
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	\$10.5M
Race to the Top	\$39M
Smaller Learning Communities Grant	\$2.1M
Connections for Classrooms	\$1.4M
School Improvement Grant (SIG)	\$4.1M
GE Foundation College Bound Grant	\$22M
GE Developing Futures	\$2.2M

APS also has a strong track record of resource stewardship and enabling students, teachers and administrators to meet strategic goals and objectives. The Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) awarded a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting to APS for its Comprehensive Annual Financial Reporting (CAFR) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. In order to be awarded a Certificate of Achievement, a government must publish an easily readable and efficiently organized comprehensive annual financial report. This report must also satisfy Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and applicable legal requirements.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports show no audit findings for the past five years.

Three Years of State Audit Results	
Fiscal Year	Financial Findings
FY 2013	No Audit Findings
FY 2012	No Audit Findings
FY 2011	No Audit Findings
FY 2010	No Audit Findings
FY 2009	No Audit Findings

B. Capacity to Coordinate Resources

As demonstrated through our history with successful implementation of multiple federal, state and private grants and internal initiatives, APS staff and faculty have the capacity and expertise to successfully implement large, complex initiatives. APS will implement the proposed Striving Reader project on time and within budget. The APS management team has extensive experience working across departments and schools as well as with external partners to achieve project goals. The APS management team has coordinator and managed grants such as Title I, Title II, Title III, Title VI-B, Title VI, School Improvement Grants (SIG), Lottery Grants, Smaller Learning Communities, Race to the Top (RT3), Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Head Start Collaborative, Charter School Federal Implementation and Planning, GE Math and Science Program, and many others.

C. Sustainability

Following the implementation of several grant funded initiatives APS has been able to sustain nearly all of the initiatives after the grant funded has ended. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Smaller Learning Communities grants provided funds to APS to accelerate and expand our high school transformation initiative. Today, four high school campuses are divided into small schools and the remainder of the schools are structured as career academies.

The RT3 and SIG grants provided funds to implement the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards and to assist out lowest performing schools. These initiatives have been sustained through local funds and continue to be implemented.

D. Internal Initiatives

- During the summer of 2012, APS rapidly expanded online classes for students by launching the Atlanta Virtual Academy (AVA). The classes allow students throughout the district to earn credit through AVA in addition to their regular schedule. All class content is aligned with the CCGPS
- All students have access to music, arts, world language, and core academic programs, from K- 12th grade
- Every APS middle and high school offers at least two world languages
- All APS middle schools offer accelerated math classes
- APS schools dramatically increased their inclusive practice and more students with disabilities are learning alongside their non-special needs peers
- Full continuum of International Baccalaureate curriculum.

School Narrative

A. School History

Thomas Heath Slater Elementary School was founded in 1953. Most of our students reside in five main areas: The Villages at Carver (Formally, Carver Homes), Polar Rock, Joyland, Amal Heights and Lakewood Heights. Approximately 10% of our student population is classified as homeless (this is the largest percentage of homelessness in the Carver Cluster). 74% of our students are being raised in single parent households and 82% of those single parent households are below the poverty line. 18% of our students are being raised by grandparents. 99% of our students are considered economically disadvantaged. Because 61% of the adults over the age of 25 (in the Carver Cluster) attained the education level of high school or less, many of our students don't see the value in education. Based on our SLDS data, Slater has consistently performed lower than the district and the state in all academic areas, since 2007

Slater was formally a Success For All (SFA) school from 2001-2010. SFA is a comprehensive reform model. Teachers followed a script, which didn't allow for any teacher autonomy or input. While using the SFA model, teachers did not write reading lesson plans for focus on the acquisition of reading standards. After teachers were no longer allowed to teach the SFA program, no structures were put in place to support their transition to standards-based planning and teaching.

B. Administrative and Teacher Leadership Team

In 2010 Mrs. Eunice Payne joined the Slater family as the interim principal and played a vital role in healing the culture of the school and community, after the fallout of the alleged testing scandal. Mrs. Payne was named principal of Slater in 2011. She has a special education background and was formally a Behavior Specialist, Special Education Coordinator and teacher.

Dr. Jeffery Copeland became the assistant principal at Slater in 2011. Prior to being named assistant principal, he served a Leadership Support Specialist (LSS). Dr. Copeland also served as a teacher at Slater for 6 years.

The remaining members of the Leadership Team are instructional coaches and teachers who have proven to be leaders on their grade level teams and in other areas.

Major work of the team and major goals/accomplishments:

The leadership team meets collectively once a month to address the instructional concerns for the previous or upcoming month, pervasive issues that are impeding the learning process, and specific concerns that need to be addressed jointly by the leadership team. The overarching goal of the leadership team is to ensure cohesiveness, collaboration, and a mutual spirit of excellence amongst all staff members. The Slater Leadership team, spearheaded by the Principal is working

towards more productive, quality meetings that will analyze data, view and set goals that promote changes in practice and build capacity amongst all staff members.

Goals:

- Establish a clear vision for the use of data school-wide
- Use real time data for decision making
- Examine students' achievement data to understand learning and make instructional decisions
- Teach students to examine their own data and develop learning goals
- Implement a school-wide balanced literacy plan
- Develop strong programs to encourage parent and community involvement
- Develop a student centered master schedule
- Create a safe, demanding, and supportive learning environment
- Participate actively in Professional Learning Communities
 - Analyze students' performance data
 - Plan for instruction
 - Review students' work samples
 - Create common assessments
 - Create and utilize rubrics
 - Share information and best practices with colleagues to improve practice
 - Collaborate with the larger community to access and share learning resources
- Promote active learning
 - Allow students to participate in individual thinking and writing exercises
 - Provide students with opportunities to uncover and process knowledge
- Develop a master schedule that allows for a 30 minute academic seminar period during the school day for tutorial, intervention, review, re-teaching and/or enrichment.

C. Past and Current Instructional Initiatives

Past Initiatives: Reading First, Success for All, REAL Men Read, Afterschool Book Club, Club Day Book Clubs, Peer Modeling of Effective Instructional Practices, Block Scheduling, Ability Grouping (for reading in kindergarten), Literature Circles, Summer Literacy Training, Reading Bowl

Current Initiatives: Genius Hour, Balanced Literacy, Content Integration

D. Professional Learning Needs

- Balanced Literacy
- Writer's Workshop
- Explicit Phonics Training (K-3rd)

E. Need for a Striving Reader Project

Currently, Slater does not have a core reading program or a systematic approach for supporting, monitoring, and implementing literacy instruction. In addition, Slater has not formed a literacy leadership or data team. Overall, the Striving Reader Project will support Slater's pending goals and expectations that align to ensuring college and career ready students with proficient literacy skills. The project provides the foundational support embedded with best practices and aligned professional development that ensures fidelity and building capacity amongst students and staff.

Needs Assessment, Concerns, and Root Cause Analysis

A. Needs Assessment Description

There was a 4- step process for determining the literacy needs and areas of concern at Slater Elementary School.

- *First, the Survey of Literacy Instruction for Elementary Teachers was administered during faculty meeting on Tuesday, October 14, 2014 to all certificated staff members, which includes the physical education, art, music and Spanish teachers. The speech/language pathologist, school counselor, ESOL teacher and gifted teacher also completed The Survey of Literacy Instruction for Elementary Teachers during that same faculty meeting. Teachers were told to bring their fully charged laptops to the meeting. Once in the meeting, the link for the survey was sent out, 2 questions were clarified and the survey was taken.*
- *The principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches and the SST/RTI Intervention Specialist were all emailed the link for the Administrators' Needs Assessment for Literacy Kindergarten to Grade 12 Survey on Wednesday, October 15, 2014 and given a deadline of completion of Friday, October 17, 2014.*
- *On Friday, October 24, 2014, The Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment for Literacy Kindergarten to Grade 12 was administered to the Leadership Team after school. The questions were displayed on the promethean board and each team member was given an active vote device. After each question and rating was read, each team member selected a rating of Fully Operational, Operational, Emerging or Not Addressed. After all team members selected a rating for each question, the percentage for each rating was displayed. In cases where there was a discrepancy, there was a discussion so the team could come to a consensus.*
- *Lastly, near the end of October 2014, the Literacy Leadership Team was established. The Literacy Leadership Team reviewed student/teacher data and data from the aforementioned surveys to identify areas of need and areas of concern.*

B. Assessment(s) Used

- *Georgia Literacy Plan for Needs Assessment for Literacy Kindergarten to Grade 12*
- *Georgia Survey of Literacy Instruction for (Elementary/Middle/High) Teachers*
- *Administrators' Needs Assessment for Literacy Kindergarten to Grade 12*
- *2012-2014 Student Achievement Data*

C. Disaggregated Data

The Needs Assessment Survey and review of our school literacy achievement data revealed the following needs and underlying root causes:

2014 Reading and ELA CRCT Results (% Meets and Exceeds)

Reading		ALL and EDS	SWD	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
Slater	3rd Grade	75	0	75	100	100
Slater	4th Grade	81	80	80	100	67
Slater	5th Grade	78	50	78	100	100

ELA

Slater	3rd Grade	64	0	64	100	0
Slater	4th Grade	65	33	63	100	33
Slater	5th Grade	74	25	74	100	100

2013 Reading and ELA CRCT Results (% Meets and Exceeds)

Reading		ALL and EDS	SWD	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
Slater	3rd Grade	73	60	73	100	100
Slater	4th Grade	72	40	71	100	100
Slater	5th Grade	76	50	77	50	NA

ELA

Slater	3rd Grade	66	33	65	100	67
Slater	4th Grade	67	60	66	100	100
Slater	5th Grade	86	100	86	100	NA

2012 Reading and ELA CRCT Results (% Meets and Exceeds)

Reading		ALL and EDS	SWD	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
Slater	3rd Grade	63	40	63	100	0
Slater	4th Grade	79	75	79	75	0
Slater	5th Grade	81	75	81	NA	100

ELA

Slater	3rd Grade	67	60	67	100	0
Slater	4th Grade	80	50	80	75	0
Slater	5th Grade	86	80	86	NA	100

2014 Spring Lexile Level (% of students at or above Lexile)

Reading		ALL and EDS	SWD	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
Slater	All Grades	68	11	67	100	60

The administrative team analyzed the current standardized testing performance and lexile levels of our students. This process allowed us to isolate areas of concern, identify the root causes of the isolated concerns, and formulate action steps outlined in the literacy plan that address areas of concern as identified through the many levels of needs assessment.

D. Root Cause Analysis

The Needs Assessment, Survey of Literacy Instruction, and review of our school achievement data revealed the following needs and underlying root causes:

Building Block 1: Engaged Leadership

- A literacy leadership team has not been organized by the administrator or other leaders in the community are active.
- A school culture does not exist in which teachers across content areas accept responsibility for literacy instruction as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards.
- Literacy instruction is not optimized in all content areas.
- The community at large does not support schools and teachers in the development of college-and-career-ready students as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards.

Root Causes:

The literacy leadership team was recently established and there has not been adequate time to decide how to involve the community. We are currently creating a professional development calendar, which will include integrating literacy across the content. Teachers currently do not have the expertise or time to implement consistently.

Actions Taken:

- Teachers have been afforded the opportunity to participate in professional learning developments focused on literacy both in and out of state .
- There has been some implementation of integrating literacy across the content areas with continued collaborative planning amongst colleagues.

Building Block 2: Continuity of Instruction

- Active collaborative teams ensure a consistent literacy focus across the curriculum
- Teachers provide literacy instruction across the curriculum.
- Out-of-school agencies and organizations collaborate to support literacy within the community.
- Teachers do not have adequate materials and resources for teaching grade-level foundational skills that are explicit, systematic, and aligned to the CCGPS.

- Teachers do not have adequate materials and lessons plans aligned to the CCGPS to prepare students to read grade-level literature and informational texts.
- Teachers do not have adequate materials and resources for differentiation of reading skills for students at grade level, below grade level, and above grade level.
- Teachers do not have adequate materials and resources for teaching writing as laid out by the CCGPS.
- Teachers do not have adequate materials and resources for teaching language skills as required by the CCGPS.

Root Causes:

Because the district does not have a core reading program and there has not been a textbook adoption since the roll out of the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) teachers do not have adequate materials and resources that are properly aligned to or meet the rigorous demands of the new standards. The literacy leadership team is in the process of identifying resources that are aligned to the standards.

Actions Taken:

- Lesson plans contain a focus on literacy in the areas of fluency, vocabulary and reading comprehension.
- Professional Learning allows teachers to design lessons with a systematic and consistent literacy focus.
- More time has been built into the master schedule to provide opportunities for effective literacy instruction.

Building Block 3: Ongoing Formative and Summative Assessments

- There is no infrastructure for ongoing formative and summative assessments in place to determine the need for and the intensity of interventions and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction.
- There is no system of ongoing formative and summative assessments used to determine the need for and the intensity of interventions and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction.
- Problems found in screenings are not further analyzed with diagnostic assessment. Summative data is used to make programming decisions as well as to monitor individual student progress.
- Summative data is not used to make programming decisions as well as to monitor individual student progress.
- We are not following a clearly articulated strategy for using data to improve teaching and learning.

Root Causes:

Some formative and summative assessments are administered but those assessments are not reviewed consistently. Therefore, teachers do not change their practice based on the data.

Actions Taken:

- Teachers in grades K-5th have worked as a team to analyze data from formative and summative assessments to provide adequate instruction for students.
- Last school term, teachers met with Instruction Coaches on a weekly basis, to plan for instruction based on assessment results.

Building Block 4: Best Practices in Literacy Instruction

- All students do not receive effective writing instruction across the curriculum
- Extended time is not provided for literacy instruction.
- Teachers do not have ample time to teach literacy effectively, including whole group reading (literature, informational, foundational skills), small group for differentiated literacy instruction, writing, language skills and content area literacy.
- 51.7% of teachers need professional learning for small group differentiation for above-grade level.
- 61.3% of teachers need professional learning for writing.
- 50% of teachers need professional learning for content area literacy instruction.
- 89.5% of teachers do not have assistance during their regularly scheduled literacy block.
- 68.4% of teachers are not using an explicit, systematic phonics program that they are satisfied with.
- 57.9% of teachers say fewer than 20% of their students come to them with mastery of reading foundational skills from the prior grade.

Root Causes:

- Currently the district has not purchased a core literacy program that is aligned to Common Core Standards.
- Slater was a Success For All (SFA) school for almost a decade. SFA is a scripted reading program that allows very little to no teacher autonomy. Under the SFA reading reform model, teachers were “spoon-fed” in regards to teaching reading/ literacy because lessons were already created in a “one size fits all” format. Because of this, teachers had very little knowledge of teaching actual reading standards, creating standards-based lessons and effectively teaching reading in all content areas. When we were no longer using SFA, the transition to Common Core was very difficult for many of our teachers because they had taught a scripted program for so long. A true mind shift has to occur when such a drastic move is made within instructional practices.
- Some teachers may not have the skill set to integrate various content into the literacy block, which in turn causes isolated content instruction which takes more time. As such, teachers do not see social studies, math or science as a time to extend literacy instruction.

- Teachers spend more time working with the lower performing students and do not have the time to work with the higher performing students because 57.9% of the staff say only 20% of their class has mastered foundational reading skills.
- For years the focus has been on reading and math and writing got “left behind”.... (once again this could be a side effect of SFA- the program did not focus on writing)
- 89.5% of the staff felt they did not have assistance during their literacy block, this could be due to the fact that the school has a large population and the coaching staff and other support personnel are not able to meet the needs with such a high percentage of the population needing support

Actions Taken:

- Some teachers have an opportunity to participate in CORE Professional Learning. The course includes five sessions where learners become more knowledgeable about reading research and best practices supporting the five components of reading.
- Weekly meetings are held with coaches to discuss Best Practices in literacy and writing instruction across all content areas that will enhance instructional practices
- The school purchased Trait Crates for all grade level teachers to enhance writing instruction across all content areas.
- The district purchased Open Court materials to build foundational skills in K-2

Building Block 5: System of Tiered Intervention (RTI) for All Students

- Information developed from the school-based data teams is not used to inform RTI process.
- Tier I Instruction is not based upon the CCGPS in grades K-12 is provided to all students in all classrooms.
- Tier 2 needs-based interventions are not provided for targeted students
- In Tier 3, Student Support Team (SST) and Data Team do not monitor progress jointly.
- Tier 4-specially-designed learning is not implemented through specialized programs, methodologies, or strategies based upon students’ inability to access the CCGPS any other way.
- 78.9% of teachers indicated that they are the person providing intervention for their students.
- 57.9% of teachers indicated they are not using a program for intervention but pulling from a variety of resources.
- 76.3% of teachers indicated they need support teaching students who can “get the words up off the page” yet struggle to comprehend what they read.

Root Causes:

In the past, there was not one person in schools that focused solely on RTI/SST. The focus on RTI/SST was secondary because the persons responsible for its implementation had other

duties and responsibilities that related directly to their job title. There was also no clearly defined set of procedures for RTI/SST across the district.

Actions Taken:

Currently, there is full time RTI/SST Intervention Specialist on staff who will monitor student progress jointly with the data team. We are also reviewing the master schedule to identify an Intervention Block. The intervention block will consist of a 20 minute block, 3 days a week on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday of each week. We are also in the process of identifying some interventionists who will assist teachers with implementing Tier 2 interventions with targeted students.

Building Block 6: Improved Instruction through Professional Development

- Pre-service education does not prepare new teachers for all aspects of literacy instruction including disciplinary literacy in the content areas.
- In-service personnel do not participate in ongoing professional learning in all aspects of literacy instruction including disciplinary literacy in the content areas.

Root Causes:

- Inconsistent administrator participation in the professional development to ensure awareness and understanding of expectation.
- Several entities providing input, directives, and feedback regarding implementation of district, state, and school initiatives.
- Inconsistent monitoring and identification of teachers who need support.
- Attempting to address too many professional development needs at once which leads to limited implementation of major initiatives.

Actions Taken:

- Some teachers have an opportunity to participate in CORE Professional Learning. The course includes five sessions where learners become more knowledgeable on research and best practices supporting the five components of reading.

E. School Staff Involved in Needs Assessment

- Orchestra teacher
- Media specialist
- Physical education teacher
- Band teacher
- Music teacher
- Art teacher
- SST/RTI Intervention Specialist
- Spanish teacher
- School Counselor
- Gifted teacher
- Special education teachers
- General education teachers

Scientific, Evidence Based Literacy Plan

Building Block 1. Engaged Leadership

A. Action: Demonstrate commitment to learn about and support evidence-based literacy instruction in his/her school

WHY?

The Research:

“In 2009, the percentage of fourth-grade students in Georgia who performed at or above Proficient in reading was 29 percent. This was not significantly different from that for the nation's public schools (32 percent). “

“Georgia students are tested not only on how well they comprehend, but also on how well they write. Writing tests show nearly a quarter of students failing to demonstrate proficiency in grades five and eight.”

“As reported by Dole, Duffy, Roehler, and Pearson (1991), reading comprehension instruction can be highly effective when teachers focus on seven main strategies for readers...[visualizing, questioning, making connections, predicting, inferring, determining importance, and synthesizing/creating]. However, it is important to note that these strategies should not be taught as isolated units. Instead, strategies need to be taught as orchestrated strategies and the most important outcome of reading comprehension instruction should be a reader’s ability to self-monitor for understanding, thus motivating a reader to use the strategies flexibly and with purpose (Duke & Pearson, 2002).”

“The Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) require that students become proficient in three types of texts, argument, informative/explanatory, and narrative, beginning as early as kindergarten.”

WHAT?

Currently, our building administrators:

- Regularly monitor literacy instruction within the school
- Schedule a protected, 120-minute block of time for literacy and teacher collaboration
- Participates in literacy instruction with his/her faculty
- Serve as a model by studying literacy research and best practices, sharing professional resources among faculty, facilitating professional discussions, and training team leaders as facilitators
- Provide time and support for staff to participate in job-embedded professional learning (including coaching, if available, peer- mentoring, learning community, grade-level meetings focused on student work, etc.)

HOW?

As we move forward, the administration will:

- The principal and assistant principal will become endorsed in reading by taking the Reading Endorsement Courses, offered by Atlanta Public Schools and Metro RESA.
- Provide professional learning based on student data and teacher needs.
- Conduct literacy walk- throughs to monitor use of literacy strategies, student engagement and learning, as well as to ensure consistent use of effective instructional practices.
- Ensure continued growth through professional learning by providing opportunities for new staff to receive necessary support in becoming acquainted with programs, materials and previously learned strategies.
- Ensure continued excellence in professional learning by continuing to analyze data and adjusting professional learning accordingly

B. Action: Organize a Literacy Leadership Team

WHY?

The Research

“Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents (Torgesen, et al., 2007):

(Teacher Leaders) Establish a literacy leadership group with the responsibility to read and discuss both research and research-into-practice articles on this topic in order to acquire local expertise.”

“According to Shanklin (2007), administrative support is also needed to ensure that the strategies and suggestions that the literacy coach provided are seen by teachers as imperative. Shanklin (2007, pp. 1-5) outlines six ways in which administrators can support literacy coaches: (1) develop a literacy leadership team and vision which includes the literacy coach; (2) provide assistance in building trust with the faculty; (3) provide assistance in using time, managing projects, and documenting their work; (4) provide access to instructional materials; (5) provide access to professional learning; and (6) provide feedback to the coach.”

“The International Reading Association (IRA) position statement from 2000 states that the reading specialist has three specific roles in a school: instruction, assessment, and leadership (Moore et al., 1999). The specialized knowledge and skill set of reading specialists are achieved through certification coursework. In the 2006 revised IRA standards, reading specialists need to have a more formalized role in schools, which includes collaborating with peers.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- There is a shared literacy vision that has been agreed upon by the school and community and is aligned with the state’s literacy plan.
- We have identified research-based best practices, strategies and resources for literacy

instruction.

- Identify and prioritize a list of students to be targeted for intervention or support
- Rewrite/refocus School Improvement Plan goals, objectives, and actions according to student achievement results.
- Share student achievement data with parents and with the local community, through community open houses, newspaper articles, displays of student work, website, blogs, podcasts, news conferences, etc...

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Convene literacy, leadership team meetings with community stakeholders, afterschool providers, school faculty and parents
- Ensure that all stakeholders understand our literacy goals and their roles in ensuring that those goals are met.
- Ensure use of research- based, best practices aligned with CCGPS
- Provide professional learning and support for staff in making the transition to the CCGPS
- Use student achievement data to meet individual teacher needs through follow-up assistance and professional learning
- Continue to analyze formative and summative assessment data and refine literacy goals based on the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS), as well as focus on the goals and objectives of the School Improvement Plan to keep staff motivated, productive, and centered on student achievement.
- Incentivize strong, literacy leaders on faculty
- Utilize technology to maintain communication among team members, parents, community and all other stakeholders
- Use social media to involve community members and parents in literacy efforts and reach out to those not currently involved.

C. Action: Maximize the use of time and personnel through scheduling and collaborative planning

WHY?

The Research:

“The need for extended time for literacy has been recognized in numerous sources including *Reading Next*, *Writing to Read*, ASCD, Center on Instruction, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASCB), Kappan Magazine as well almost all other state literacy plans. Citing a study done in 1990 titled, “What’s all the Fuss about Instructional Time?” by D. C. Berliner, the authors of a report to the NASCB stated, “Providing extended time for reading with feedback and guidance across the curriculum has been well documented and conforms to the extensive literature on academic learning time.”

“The Library Media Specialist (LMS) is the classroom teacher’s partner in promoting reading and teaching literacy skills. The LMS and classroom teacher should collaborate in order to gear the monthly literacy events/school-wide literacy initiatives to the interests and needs of students and the classroom curriculum...The two can co-teach lessons in which strategies are modeled and jointly monitor students’ guided practice. They can give students more

individualized attention and integrate strategy lessons into inquiry-based units so that students can practice strategic reading while engaging in authentic learning experiences... Students must find relevance in what they read, and the LMS is committed to helping teachers select the most engaging resources to teach their curricula.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- A protected, dedicated 90-120-minute block is allocated for literacy instruction in grades K-3 for all students.
- In grades 4-12 students receive two to four hours of literacy instruction across language arts and in content area classes.
- Protected time for collaborative planning, within and across content areas, is outlined in the school-wide calendar.
- Intentional efforts have been made to identify and eliminate inefficient use of student and faculty time within the schedule.
- Ensure that teams meet for collaborative planning and examining student data/work during scheduled times by preparing agendas and taking meeting minutes.
- Require that agenda, meeting minutes and action plans are created for/during all meetings.

HOW?

As we move forward:

- Ensure that teams meet for collaborative planning and examining student data/work during scheduled times.
- Maximize the use of scheduled instructional time by identifying effective strategies for differentiating instruction, promoting active engagement, and teaching key areas of literacy and writing instruction.
- Study formative student assessment data and use the results to determine the impact of efforts and to examine our use of time
- Provide professional learning during team meetings and staff meetings.
- Establish a model, literacy classroom on each grade level.
- Encourage teachers to share stories of success with parents and the community at large, both online and through traditional outlets.

D. Action: Create a school culture in which teachers across the curriculum are responsible for literacy instruction as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards

WHY?

The Research:

“Adolescents’ perceptions of how competent they are as readers and writers, generally speaking, will affect how motivated they are to learn in their subject area classes (e.g., the sciences, social studies, mathematics, and literature). Thus, if academic literacy instruction is to be effective, it must address issues of self-efficacy and engagement. (Alvermann, 2001)”

“In an IES Practice Guide on improving instruction, the following recommendations are presented on how to improve both how teachers organize instruction and help students learn

and retain information across disciplines. While these recommendations are not limited to literacy, they offer strategies for teaching that will strengthen instruction in all areas.

1. Space learning over time. Arrange to review key elements of course content after a delay of several weeks to several months after initial presentation of several weeks to several months after initial presentation.
2. Interleave worked example solutions with problem-solving exercises. Have students alternate between reading already worked solutions and trying to solve problems on their own.
3. Combine graphics with verbal descriptions. Combine graphical presentations (e.g., graphs, figures) that illustrate key processes and procedures with verbal descriptions.
4. Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts. Connect and integrate abstract representations of a concept with concrete representations of the same concept
5. Use quizzing to promote learning. Use quizzing with active retrieval of information at all phases of the learning process to exploit the ability of retrieval directly to facilitate long-lasting memory traces.
- 5a. Use pre-questions to introduce a new topic.
- 5b. Use quizzes to re-expose students to key content. (Pashler *et al.*, 2007)”.

WHAT?

Currently:

- Faculty and staff participate in targeted, sustained professional learning on literacy strategies within and across content area.
- Utilize all staff (including cafeteria workers, custodians and bus drivers) to support literacy instruction.
- Keep the focus (fiscal and instructional) on literacy development even when faced with competing initiatives.

HOW?

As we move forward:

- Create and provide an infrastructure of literacy guidance and support for students and families.
- Incorporate technologies to more creatively and effectively support stakeholder engagement (i.e., blogs, Twitter, electronic newsletters).
- Develop strategies for maintaining momentum and progress of a learning support system
- Solicit the support of local Sororities, Fraternities and churches to mentor students who need additional support.
- Provide parents and caregivers with links to websites that provide support and strengthen literacy
- Include academic supports such as tutoring, co- curricular activities, online learning opportunities and/or tutoring, and extended learning opportunities such as summer programs, after- school and Saturday academies to enhance literacy learning.
- Utilize social media to communicate and promote the goals of literacy across the curriculum, e.g. Twitter, Facebook, Google+, etc.
- Develop an in-house, “Real Men Read” program with all of the male members of our staff.

E. Action: Optimize literacy instruction across all content areas

WHY?

The Research:

“The CCGPS provide guidance as well for writing arguments and informative/explanatory texts and in the content areas...Such writing is not only necessary for the work place but has been shown to significantly support comprehension and *retention of subject matter when used to support content area instruction.* (*Writing to Read*, 2010)”

“*Reading Next* states that literacy instruction for adolescents should extend beyond a single language arts period and be integrated in subject area coursework. This extended time for literacy, anywhere from two to four hours, should occur in language arts and content-area classes. (Biancorosa & Snow, 2006, p. 20.)”

“Assisting content teachers to embed cognitive and motivational strategies into their instruction also enables them “to support deeper student literacy and understanding in the content-area reading” (Lewis et al., 2007). Professional learning in intervention techniques permits teachers to incorporate strategies that allow students to access texts, to practice communication skills, and to use information. Professional learning centered on cognitive strategies may include paraphrasing, summarizing, synthesizing, predicting, and drawing conclusions. These skills are consistent with focus of the Georgia Performance Standards and the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Teachers have adopted a common, systematic procedure for teaching academic vocabulary in all subjects.
- Writing is an integral part of every class every day. Fourth and fifth grade students receive intensive writing instruction, daily, from a writing specialist.
- Teachers have or will participate in professional learning on the following:
 - a. Integrating the use of literary texts in content areas.
 - b. Reading and writing across the curriculum
 - c. Incorporating writing instruction (narrative, argument, and informational) in all subject areas.
 - d. Selecting text complexity that is appropriate to grade levels as required by CCGPS
 - e. Balanced Literacy

HOW?

As we move forward:

- Ensure the use of research-based strategies and appropriate resources to support student learning of the CCGPS
- Support teachers in the integration of literacy instruction and skill development necessary for achievement in all subjects as articulated within CCGPS

- Ensure instruction in and opportunities for:
 - Writing opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons and information
 - Writing informative/ explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas and information clearly
 - Writing narratives to develop real or imaginary experiences
- Use a school-wide writing rubric that is aligned with the CCGPS to set clear expectations and goals for performance
- Provide teachers with resources to provide a variety and choice in reading materials and writing topics
- Ensure that teachers provide meaningful opportunities for students to write, speak, and listen
- Identify skills or knowledge that needs to be strengthened in the future for students to reach standards proficiency
- Monitor literacy instruction across the curriculum through:
 - Formal and informal observations
 - Lesson plans
 - Walkthroughs
 - Student work samples
- Expand meaningful opportunities for students to write, speak, and listen across the subject areas (e.g., contests, debates, speeches, wikis, blogs, creating YouTube videos, and drama)
- Differentiate literacy assignments by offering student choice ([http://daretodifferentiate.wikispaces.com/Choice Boards](http://daretodifferentiate.wikispaces.com/Choice+Boards))
- Host family nights that engage parents in activities that demonstrate the importance of proficiency in literacy and support parents in providing a print-rich environment at home.

F. Action: Enlist the community at large to support schools and teachers in the development of college-and-career-ready students as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards.

WHY?

The Research:

“The Lexile scores of both texts and students’ reading levels provide assistance to teachers and parents in matching content material to students...Lexile information and support are also provided through the public school library and the public community libraries.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Academic successes are publically celebrated through traditional and online media.
- Develop an agenda for each meeting to promote cooperation and communication among participants and the schools
- Continue to focus proactively on broad issues that may prevent student learning

HOW?

As we move forward:

- Create a mentoring system from within and outside of the school for every student who needs additional support
- Actively support teachers in their efforts
- Utilize social media to communicate and promote the goals of literacy throughout the community at large
- Pursue additional funding sources for specialized literacy staff and resources

Building Block 2: Continuity of Instruction

A. Action: Ensure a consistent literacy focus across the curriculum through the use of collaborative teams (See Leadership Sections I. D., E.)

WHY?

The Research:

“Curriculum alignment includes alignment between and among several education variables, including state standards, state-mandated assessments, resources such as textbooks, content of instruction, and instructional strategies. The studies reported in this review provide strong evidence from scientifically based research that aligning the various components can have positive and significant effects. (Squires, 2005, p. 5.)”

WHAT?

Currently:

- There is one cross-disciplinary team for literacy instruction.
- Scheduled time for teams to meet regularly for collaboration, to examine student work and analyze data.
- Team roles, meeting protocols, norms and expectations are clearly articulated.
- Specific, measurable student goals that are aligned with grade-level expectations are shared by teachers in all content areas
- Meet in disciplinary teams, either physically or virtually, according to regularly established times for collaborative planning, to examine student work and analyzing data

HOW?

As we move forward:

- Plan and teach lessons that address the literacy needs of all students
- Study formative student assessment data and use the results to continue to adjust instruction
- Utilize online options to provide ongoing professional learning to new and veteran teachers
- Share professional learning online and at grade level and staff meetings
- Showcase evidence of student success on the school or class websites and through blogs, e. g., writing assignments, improved test scores, awards or recognitions

B. Action: Support teachers in providing literacy instruction across the curriculum

WHY?

The Research:

“Georgia advocates strong writing skills beginning in elementary and continuing through high school. All content areas have writing components in their expectations for Georgia students. The implementation of strong writing programs is crucial to a literacy initiative.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Teachers use a school-wide, commonly adopted writing rubric that is aligned with the CCGPS to set clear expectations and goals for performance.
- All types of literacy are infused into all content areas throughout the day (e.g., print, non-print, online, blogs, wikis, and social media).
- Literacy instruction is the primary focus for the entire school

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Kindergarten through fifth grade reading teachers use core programs that provide continuity and a carefully articulated scope and sequence of skills that is integrated into a rich curriculum of literary and informational texts.
- Integrate literacy strategies and skill development necessary for achievement in all subjects as articulated within CCGPS
- Teach and have students practice writing as a process (pre-write, draft, revise, edit, and publish online and on hardcopy)
- Provide variety and choice in the types, media and genre of both reading and writing assignments
- Stay abreast of effective strategies for literacy instruction
- Celebrate and publish good student writing in a variety of formats (e. g., district and school websites and blogs, social media, local newspapers, literacy magazines, classroom and school libraries, etc.)
- Host family nights that engage parents in activities that demonstrate the importance of literacy proficiency.

C. Action: Collaborate with supporting out-of-school agencies and organizations within the community

WHY?

The Research:

“To facilitate relevance, another suggestion made in *Reading Next* was to coordinate assignments and reading with out-of-school organizations and the community to provide students with a sense of consistency between what they experience in and out of school. (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004, pp. 16 & 22).”

WHAT?

Currently:

- A comprehensive system of learning supports to enhance motivation and capability of the critical mass of stakeholders is in place.
- Technologies are utilized to more creatively and effectively support stakeholder

engagement, i.e., blogs, Twitter, electronic newsletters.

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Identify and contact learning supports in the community that target student improvement (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, out-of-school programming)
- Design and implement infrastructure to provide guidance and support for students and families
- Establish a work group (e.g., school counselors, psychologists, nurses, social workers, attendance and drop out counselors, health educators, special education staff, after school program staff, bilingual and Title I coordinators, safe and drug free school staff, union representatives, classroom teachers, non-certified staff, parents, older students, community representatives) that focuses specifically on how learning supports are used
- Develop a comprehensive system of learning supports to enhance motivation and capability of the critical mass of stakeholders
- Utilize all staff to support literacy instruction (e.g., assign non-academic duties to personnel not engaged in literacy instruction)
- Keep the focus (fiscal and instructional) on literacy development even when faced with competing initiatives
- Continue to focus proactively on broad issues that may prevent students from learning (e.g., health, nutrition, homelessness, drop-out, attendance)
- Include academic supports such as tutoring, co-curricular activities, and extended learning opportunities such as summer programs, online tutoring programs, after-school and Saturday academies to enhance literacy learning

Building Block 3. Ongoing formative and summative assessments

A. Action: Establish an infrastructure for ongoing formative and summative assessments to determine the need for and the intensity of interventions and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction

WHY?

The Research:

“Effective reading and writing instruction requires both summative and formative assessments. The key to a comprehensive assessment plan is conducive to the timing. According to the Center on Instruction 2009, three crucial timing categorizations exist:

- **Beginning of the year:** First, a screening helps determine the level of intervention needed to assist individual students; second, an informal diagnostic assessment helps the educator plan and focus on various interventions.
- **Throughout the year:** This process allows the educator to adjust the instruction. Because of new information with each assessment, the educator is able to provide a continual cycle for student improvement. Another benefit is the connection to targeted professional learning regarding the data driven information derived from the assessments.
- **End of the year:** The summative assessment component provides the information regarding grade level expectations. In Georgia, the CRCT, the GHSGT, and the EOCT assess the Georgia Performance Standards of certain content areas. (Torgesen & Miller, 2009, p. 16)”

“Educators must be able to do the following:

- identify students’ strengths and weaknesses
- determine if fundamental content-based literacy skills are lacking
- establish learning goals for students based on the Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS by 2014)
- match instruction to learning through effective instructional design supporting literacy performance standards
- evaluate effectiveness of the instruction in meeting the goals for the student
- monitor student progress toward goals and set new goals”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Implements common mid-course assessments that are available for use across classrooms and include a variety of formats (multiple choice, short answer, constructed response, and essay).
- A data collection plan for storing, analyzing, and disseminating assessment data is in place.
- Implements a calendar for formative assessments based on local, state, and program guidelines, including specific timeline for administration and persons responsible has been developed.

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Make a data collection plan for storing, analyzing, and disseminating assessment results
- Task the data team with developing procedures and expectations for staff to review and analyze assessment results
- Ensure that teachers understand the purpose for and use of formative assessment and how it differs from summative assessment
- Provide timely, descriptive feedback to students with opportunities to assess their own learning (e.g., graphing their progress)
- Use technology to share relevant student progress data with parents and caregivers in an easily interpreted user-friendly format
- Utilize online options such as Skype and Google+ for collaboration among teachers within the same and different schools
- Record online collaboration sessions for those who could not attend at the designated time
- Continue to research and select effective screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools to identify readiness levels of all students
- Continue to purchase assessment and intervention materials aligned with students' needs
- Use online training options to train/retrain all staff who will administer assessments to ensure standardized procedures and accurate data recording

B. Action: Use universal screening and progress monitoring for formative assessment

WHY?

The Research:

"...the need for a universal screener at all ages and grades. The other salient theme was that there needs to be coordination among those screeners and assessments that would permit the receiving teachers and/or schools to interpret the findings of the earlier grade or level. Teachers need intense professional learning on administering the screeners and then how to both interpret the data and determine the best course of instructional action."

"According to Jenkins (2007), the key feature in a screening measure is the accuracy in classifying a student as "at risk" or "not at risk." Additionally, a strong screener will address the issue of false negatives (students not identified as at risk who truly are at risk) and false positives (students identified as at risk who are not)."

"Citing J.R. Jenkins (2003), the following are identified as three criteria that should be found in screening approaches:

- Accurately identifies students at risk or not at risk for reading failure
- Must not be expensive, time-consuming or cumbersome to implement
- Must result in equitable, timely and effective intervention, thus having good outcomes for all students

One less frequently mentioned reason for the use of universal screeners is that they may allow administrators to detect patterns of achievement during the school year to provide additional support to particular teachers or classrooms. (NASDE, 2005)”

“...failing to screen young children can prove...[to be] risky. Research has clearly established the difficulties of remediating children’s reading skills after grade three. Catching problems early has been shown over and over that prevention is by far the better alternative. (National Reading Panel, 2000)”

“There are four essential core skills that research has shown to establish a positive trajectory for literacy acquisition. Those are: phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, concept of word, and letter-sound correspondence. A screening of these skills is vital for children at this age. However, they must be screened multiple times throughout the year with a valid and reliable instrument in order to track progress or lack of it. Any programmatic decisions need to be delayed until the issues of maturity and familiarity have been lessened. (Pool & Johnson, accessed Jan. 2011) However, teachers may use the results immediately to provide instruction and support where it is indicated.”

“In an article for the RTI Network, Lynn Fuchs of Vanderbilt University provides the following as necessary elements of progress monitoring:

- Data collected frequently, often weekly, but at least once a month
- Scores are plotted on a graph with a trend line drawn to show rate of improvement
- Data provided on the rate at which students are progressing toward competence in a skill necessary to grade-level curriculum
- May be used as a supplement to screening to determine the efficacy of an intervention”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Ensures the instructional levels of all students are screened and progress monitored with evidence-based tools.
- Has Implemented commonly shared mid-course assessments, which include a variety of formats (multiple choice, short answer, constructed response, and essay), are used across classrooms to identify classrooms needing support
- Universal screening, progress monitoring, and curriculum-based assessments are used to determine instructional decisions regarding flexible 4-tier service options for Response to Intervention (RTI).
- Ensure intervention materials aligned with students’ needs are in use and staff is trained.
- Has implemented a formative assessment calendar based on local and state guidelines includes times for administration and the persons responsible.

HOW?

Moving Forward:

- Research and select effective progress monitoring tools to measure general-outcome literacy competencies (e.g., phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, written expression, vocabulary)
- Research and select effective universal screening to measure literacy competencies for all

students across the curriculum

- Provide timely, descriptive feedback to students with opportunities to assess their own learning (e.g., graphing their progress)
- Provide continued professional learning to staff who administer assessments to maintain use of standardized procedures and accurate data recording

C. Action: Use diagnostic assessment to analyze problems found in literacy screening

WHY?

The Research:

“Once the pool of at-risk students is identified, more comprehensive assessments of their reading ability should be conducted to inform appropriate intervention placements. A student whose performance on a screening instrument is extremely low may require a different type and/or intensity of intervention than a student whose screening score is close to the cut-score. (Johnson, et al, 2011).”

“In an article titled “Screening for Reading Problems in Grades 4 through 12: An Overview of Select Measures”, Johnson, et al, cite evidence that it is commonly thought that the primary obstacles faced by these older strugglers is lack of vocabulary and comprehension skills. However, there is evidence to suggest that they may actually be dealing with issues in decoding and fluency as well as in comprehension. (Johnson, Pool, & Carter, 2011)”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Where possible, diagnostic assessments isolate the component skills needed for mastery of literacy standards.
- Interventions include diagnostic assessments and multiple-entry points to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Develop a protocol for ensuring that students who are identified by screenings receive diagnostic assessment
- Use technology to differentiate learning within content areas (e.g., use Lexiles to match students to text; provide practice opportunities to strengthen areas of weakness; use gloss option on e-books to provide definitions for unknown words; translate material into student’s first language; support students whose disabilities may preclude them from acquiring information through reading)
- Use technology to share relevant student progress data with families in an easily interpreted format
- Use technology for communicating data to the district literacy leadership team in a timely manner
- Recognize and celebrate individual student’s incremental improvements toward reaching literacy goals

D. Action: Use summative data to make programming decisions as well as to monitor individual student progress
<p>WHY? The Research:</p> <p>“Having the “right” assessments in place is only one element of an effective literacy assessment plan (McEwan, 2007; Phillips, 2005; Torgesen, Houston, Rissman, Decker, Roberts, Vaughn, Wexler, Francis, & Rivera et al., 2007). Data must be easily accessible to school personnel in order for it to drive decision making. Educators and instructional support personnel must be able to sort, aggregate, and/or scan in sufficient time for data analysis and collaborative decision-making to occur.”</p> <p>WHAT? Currently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time is devoted in teacher team meetings to review and analyze assessment data to identify needed program and instructional adjustments. • During teacher team meetings, discussions focus on changes that can be made to improve the instructional program for all students. <p>HOW? Moving forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the capacity of technology infrastructure to support test administration and disseminate results • Analyze assessment data to identify teachers who need support • Upgrade the capacity of technology infrastructure, if necessary, to support administration of assessments and the dissemination of results • Plan lessons, re-teaching, and intervention activities that target areas of need • Utilize online options such as Skype and Google+ for collaboration among teachers within the same and different schools on lesson planning • Record online collaboration sessions for those who could not attend at the designated time • Using the school or classroom websites, recognize and celebrate individual student’s significant improvements and attaining designated standards of achievement
Action 3.E.: Develop a clearly articulated strategy for using data to improve teaching and learning (See V. A.)
<p>WHY? The Research:</p> <p>“Ensure that teachers are able to interpret data from their students former grade or school”</p> <p>“The Georgia Department of Education recommends the formation of a data team at each</p>

school. This team should be responsible for analyzing achievement and discipline data from all formative and summative measures in use. This team leads the work of using district and school performance norms to set criteria for expected growth and the identification of scientifically based interventions needed to support the learner. School level participants include the principal, grade level/content area representatives, counselors, and school psychologist.”

“Formative assessments are only effective if they are followed by effective instructional responses or appropriate types of feedback.” (Torgesen & Miller, 2009, p. 24) The “how to instruct” must be embedded in sound professional learning opportunities and training.”

“In the Georgia Literacy Plan, ongoing professional learning expectations center around the marriage of effective instructional strategies based on assessments and the alignment of instruction currently to the Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS by 2014). The focus is to ensure the following:

- High quality formative assessment practices that focus on a sound understanding of grade level academic standards. This can help alleviate some ‘information’ consequences of ‘high stakes’ test.
- A good formative assessment program that has ‘unpacked’ the state standards and identified the specific learning goals they contain can help focus classroom activities on real learning rather than on test preparation. (Abrams, 2007)”

“In a 2009 practice guide prepared for the National Center on Educational Excellence titled *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*, Hamilton, et al, posited five recommendations to schools and districts seeking to maximize the use of data to improve teaching and learning.

Classroom-level recommendations:

1. Make data part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement
2. Teach students to examine their own data and set learning goals

Administrative recommendations:

3. Establish a clear vision for school-wide data use
4. Provide supports that foster a data-driven culture within the school
5. Develop and maintain a district-wide data system”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Ensures procedures and expectations for staff to review, analyze, and disseminate assessment results are in place.
- Ensures protocols for team meetings, such as those found on <http://www.lasw.org/methods.html>, are regularly followed.

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Identify participants for data team at district level
- Develop a data storage and retrieval system
- Train teachers to use the decision-making protocol to identify student instructional needs and group them by instructional commonalities
- Using online options to continue to train new members of the meetings in the expectations

- and function of the established protocols
- Ensure that the data storage and retrieval system is effective and efficient

Building Block 4. Best Practices in Literacy Instruction

A. Action: Provide direct, explicit literacy instruction for all students

WHY?

The Research:

“According to the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE, 2006), reading complex text requires the ability to comprehend information, understand style and structure, dissect vocabulary, and infer implicit ideas.”

“For many students, explicit instruction in how to comprehend is necessary. In a 1995 survey of a number of studies of verbal protocols collected from good readers, Michael Pressley found that good readers activate strategies before, during and after reading. “The good reader can be active before reading (e.g., overviewing the text and making predictions), during reading (e.g., updating predictions, constructing mental images), and after reading (e.g., constructing summaries, thinking about which ideas in the text might be useful later.”

“...strategy instruction must be intertwined with assisting a reader to make sense of real text. These strategies must be used by the reader flexibly and called upon as needed. The goal is for a reader to be able to self-monitor meaning making, and use the strategies as tools to make sense of text (Duke & Pearson, 2002).“

“*Reading Next* (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004) has identified fifteen research-based program elements that improve literacy achievement of adolescent learners:

1. Direct, explicit comprehension instruction, which is instruction in the strategies and processes that proficient readers use to understand what they read, including summarizing, keeping track of one’s own understanding, and a host of other practices.
2. Effective instructional principles embedded in content, including language arts teachers using content-area texts and content-area teachers providing instruction and practice in reading and writing skills specific to their subject area.
3. Motivation and self-directed learning, which includes building motivation to read and learn and providing students with the instruction and supports needed for independent learning tasks they will face after graduation.
4. Text-based collaborative learning, which involves students interacting with one another around a variety of texts.
5. Strategic tutoring, which provides students with intense individualized reading, writing, and content instruction as needed.
6. Diverse texts, which are texts at a variety of difficulty levels and on a variety of topics.
7. Intensive writing, including instruction connected to the kinds of writing tasks students will have to perform well in high school and beyond.
8. A technology component, which includes technology as a tool for and a topic of literacy instruction.
9. Ongoing formative assessment of students, which is informal, often daily assessment of how students are progressing under current instructional practices.
10. Extended time for literacy, which includes approximately two to four hours of literacy instruction and practice that takes place in language arts and content-area classes.

11. Professional learning that is both long term and ongoing.
12. Ongoing summative assessment of students and programs, which is more formal and provides data that are reported for accountability and research purposes.
13. Teacher teams, which are interdisciplinary teams that meet regularly to discuss students and align instruction.
14. Leadership, which can come from principals and teachers who have a solid understanding of how to teach reading and writing to the full array of students present in schools.
15. A comprehensive and coordinated literacy program, which is interdisciplinary and interdepartmental and may even coordinate with out-of-school organizations and the local community.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Student data is examined regularly to identify areas of instruction with greatest needs (e.g., phonological awareness, word identification, fluency, vocabulary, word study, comprehension, motivation and engagement).
- Administration conducts classroom observations (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA, the FCRR Literacy Walkthrough, or some other instrument) using an assessment tool to gauge current practice in literacy instruction.
- Daily literacy block in K-3 includes the following for **all** students:
 - a. Whole group which includes explicit instruction in word identification, vocabulary, and comprehension
 - b. Small groups for differentiation
- Various aspects of literacy instruction students have been allocated for instruction within specific content areas.
- Faculty participates in professional learning on the following:
 - a. Using of data to inform instructional decisions and explicit teaching
 - b. Selecting appropriate text and strategies for instruction
 - c. Telling students specific strategies to be learned and why
 - d. Modeling strategy usage
 - e. Providing guidance and independent practice with feedback
 - f. Discussing when and where strategies are to be applied
 - g. Differentiating instruction

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Use online options where feasible, provide professional learning on research-based differentiated instructional strategies that support diverse needs
- Use videotaping and peer-to-peer coaching, ensure that teachers receive frequent feedback and coaching
- Use videotaping of differentiated lessons to share with other educators
- Stay abreast of current research and new findings related to differentiated instruction by developing a library of professional books, journals, and online sources
- Continue analyzing data to determine the impact of teaching strategies on student achievement
- Continue to provide ongoing training to all pertinent and new staff in the use of the core

program

- Provide support to new teachers on differentiated instruction for all learners, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities
- Provide opportunities for teachers to learn more about how to make adolescent curriculum more accessible to all learners (e.g., participate in professional learning provided by district and state, attend conferences and/or institutes)
- Encourage teachers to participate in online professional communities to share ideas, questions, lesson plans and videotapes of classes

B. Action: Ensure that students receive effective writing instruction across the curriculum

WHY?

The Research:

“The following are effective instructional and assessment strategies for writing:

1. Require all students--especially those less experienced--to write extensively so that they can be comfortable writing extended prose in elementary school and writing essays in high school (minimum five pages) and college (ten pages). Create writing assignments that ask students to interpret and analyze a variety of texts and to write in various genres.
2. Employ functional approaches to teaching and applying rules of grammar so that students understand how language works in a variety of contexts.
3. Foster collaborative writing processes.
4. Include the writing formats of new media as an integral component of writing.
5. Use formative assessment strategies that provide students with feedback while developing drafts.
6. Employ multiple assessment measures, including portfolios, to assess students’ development as writers. (NCTE, 2008, p. 5)”

“The effect size for writing about text that was read (0.40) exceeded [other]...effects, providing additional validation of its effectiveness as a tool for improving students’ reading comprehension (Graham & Hebert, 2010, p. 14).”

“The recommendations from this report are as follows (listed in order of their supporting evidence):

A. Have students write about the texts they read.

1. Respond to a text in writing (writing personal reactions, analyzing and interpreting the text)
2. Write summaries of a text
3. Write notes about a text
4. Answer questions about a text in writing, or create and answer written questions about a text

B. Teach students the writing skills and processes that go into creating text.

1. Teach the process of writing, text structures for writing, paragraph or sentence construction skills (improves reading comprehension)
2. Teach spelling and sentence construction skills (improves reading fluency)
3. Teach Spelling Skills (Improves Word Reading Skills)

C. Increase how much students write.

1. Students' reading comprehension is improved by having them increase how often they produce their own texts ((Graham & Hebert, 2010, p. 5)"

WHAT?

Currently:

- Has a plan for instruction in writing is consistent with CCGPS that is articulated vertically and horizontally.
- Has implemented a coordinated plan has been developed for writing instruction across all subject areas that includes:
 - a. Explicit instruction
 - b. Guided practice
 - c. Independent practice

HOW?

Moving forward:

1. Providing students with opportunities to self-select reading material and topics for research
 2. Taking steps to provide students with an understanding of the relevance of their academic assignments to their lives
 3. Increasing opportunities for collaborating with peers
 4. Increasing access to texts that students consider interesting
 5. Scaffolding students' background knowledge and competency in navigating content area texts to ensure their confidence and self-efficacy
 6. Leveraging the creative use of technology within the learning process to promote engagement and relevance.
- Ensure that incentive programs, if used, are:
 1. Voluntary and not required
 2. Not tied to grades
 3. Incentives are minimal and are connected to reading, such as books
 4. Are used with students who are unmotivated to read rather than with those who are already excited about reading
 - Teachers explore ways to use peer collaboration with and discuss within the context of PLCs (e.g., literature circles, cross-age interactions)

C. Action: Teachers work to develop and maintain interest and engagement as students' progress through school.

WHY?

The Research

"One of the most salient issues raised in *Reading Next* is that of motivation...Two recommendations are contained in that document. The first is to provide students with a certain amount of autonomy in their reading and writing. To the extent possible, they need

opportunities to select for themselves the materials they read and topics they research as well as time during the school day to read. A second is to take deliberate steps [to] promote relevancy in what students read and learn.”

“In the 2008 Center on Instruction Practice Brief titled *Effective Instruction for Adolescent Struggling Readers*, the recommendations are derived from a summary of the research by Guthrie and Humenick on improving students’ motivation to read. Those recommendations are: 1) providing content goals for reading; 2) supporting student autonomy, 3) providing interesting texts, and 4) increasing social interactions among students related to reading. (Boardman *et al.*, 2008).”

“The literature on adolescent literacy links the establishment of learning goals to the development of self-efficacy (Roeser, Midgley, & Urdan, 1996). Implicit in the establishment of goals is the need to provide students with timely information on their progress toward the achievement of those goals. Both of these issues involve the need to provide students with a sense of autonomy. Deci and Ryan identified the need for a sense of autonomy, relatedness and competence as being key to the development of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1992).”

“In confirmation of the last item in her list, a policy brief on Adolescent Literacy cites Merchant (2001) saying, “Many adolescents are drawn to technology, and incorporating technology into instruction can increase motivation at the same time that it enhances adolescent literacy by fostering student engagement.” (National Council of Teachers of English, 2006)”

WHAT?

Currently:

- A protected, dedicated 90-120-minute block is allocated for literacy instruction in grades K-5 for all students in self-contained classrooms.

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Provide professional learning on best practices in writing instruction in all subject areas
- Create a plan that describes how technology will be used for production, publishing, and communication across the curriculum
- Provide professional learning on best practices in writing instruction in all subject areas
- Create a plan that describes how technology will be used for production, publishing, and communication across the curriculum

Building Block 5. System of Tiered Intervention (RTI) for All Students

A. Action: Use information developed from the school-based data teams to inform RTI process (see Section 3. E.)

WHY?

The Research:

“The Georgia Department of Education recommends the formation of a data team at each school. This team should be responsible for analyzing achievement and discipline data from all formative and summative measures in use. This team leads the work of using district and school performance norms to set criteria for expected growth and the identification of scientifically based interventions needed to support the learner. School level participants include the principal, grade level/content area representatives, counselors, and school psychologist.”

“Screening for reading problems, monitoring progress, using intervention strategies for intensive small reading groups, varying extensive vocabulary instruction, developing academic language, and providing regular peer-assisted learning opportunities are valuable intervention tools. Providing ongoing support for teachers and interventionists (Title I personnel, reading coaches, literacy coaches, etc.) is critical for the intervention strategies to work (Gersten et al., 2007).”

“Student Movement to Tier 3:

- The data team will confirm the fidelity of implementation of the intervention through frequent contact and observation during instruction.
- Additional Tier 2 interventions may be required if little or no progress is documented. The data team will follow previously established protocols to determine if additional Tier 2 interventions should be implemented.
- After the appropriate amount of time (time in weeks dependent on the intervention), the data team should assess student progress and determine if continued support through Tier 2 is required, if additional Tier 2 interventions are required, or if Tier 3 support, in addition to Tier 1 and Tier 2, is required.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Interventions are monitored frequently to ensure that they occur regularly and with fidelity.
- Protocols for identifying students and matching them to the appropriate intervention are in place.
- The results of formative assessment are analyzed frequently to ensure students are progressing or adjusting instruction to match their needs.

HOW?

Moving forward:

Use the Georgia Department of Education problem-solving checklist to evaluate:

- Personnel providing interventions
- The ease with which students move between tiers

Use Guiding Questions for RTI to inform and evaluate our work:

- How and when (flex group time, before school, connections pull-out, support class, lunch and learn, etc.) will students receive instruction for Tier 2 issues?
- Who will teach the interventions? Which Specific strategies and techniques (re-teaching the entire group, flexible groups, cooperative learning, direct instruction, anchor assignments, warm-ups, sponge activities, computer assisted instruction, and/or tiered assignments) will be included? Stress the need for research-based strategies (Marzano) and fidelity of implementation. What curriculum resources (activities, games, websites, materials, etc.) that have proven results will be used?
- Who will schedule (and re-schedule) student groups for Tier 2 interventions? How often will the intervention occur (frequency)? Which assessment tools will be used? How will progress be tracked? What level of performance is acceptable for students to demonstrate mastery?
- How will fidelity of implementation for interventions be monitored or measured (awareness walks, peer observation, student performance, etc.)?
- How will the team identify any problems with curriculum maps, assessment tools, instructional units, instructional methods, resources used for teaching, alignment of curriculum units, assessments and instructional pedagogy to standards and elements as described in CCGPS or GPS that may have contributed to the student learning problems?
- How often will the team meet to review data on progress of students and revise instruction?
- How will EIP (intervention) teachers and classroom teachers communicate about students?
- Was the data from three or more sources examined to verify the problem is real? Have trends, patterns, or problems been identified?
- Has the teacher team(s) reviewed aggregate data by grade level, team or class to determine if 80% of students were successful to determine if the problems are Tier 1 or Tier 2 issues? Remember, if less than 80% of students were successful, there is a Tier 1 issue.

Consider the options available through technology to provide ongoing, job-embedded support for data collection and analysis as well as for intervention, e.g., videotaping, videoconferencing, online collaboration

B. Action: Provide Tier I Instruction based upon the CCGPS in all grades to all students in all classrooms (See Sections 4. A & B)

WHY?

The Research:

“Adolescents who struggle to read in subject area classrooms deserve instruction that is developmentally, culturally, and linguistically responsive to their needs. To be effective, such instruction must be embedded in the regular curriculum and address differences in their abilities to read, write, and communicate orally as strengths, not as deficits...Adolescents’ evolving expertise in navigating routine school literacy tasks suggests the need to involve them in higher level thinking about what they read and write than is currently possible within a transmission model of teaching, with its emphasis on skill and drill, teacher-centered instruction, and passive learning. Effective alternatives to this model include participatory approaches that actively engage students in their own learning (individually and in small groups) and that treat texts as tools for learning rather than as repositories of information to be memorized (and then all too quickly forgotten). (Alvermann, 2001)”

“All students participate in general education learning that includes:

- Universal screenings to target groups in need of specific instructional support
- Implementation of the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards by 2014 in a standards-based classroom
- Differentiation of instruction including fluid, flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, and demonstration of learning
- Progress monitoring of learning through multiple formative assessments”

“Standards-based learning environments which are implemented with fidelity are necessary to ensure all students have access to quality instruction. This fidelity of implementation ensures that 80-100% of students are successful in the general education classroom.”

“Tier 1 represents effective, strategic, and expert instruction that is available in all classrooms. The use of effective questioning skills is critical in responding to student performance. Bloom’s Taxonomy can be a guide to the types of questions asked by teachers for student feedback.”

WHAT?

Currently:

If fewer than 80% of students are successful in any area:

1. Student data is examined to determine instructional areas of greatest need (e.g., decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, written expression).
2. Current practice in literacy instruction in each subject area has been assessed using a checklist (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA or some equivalent instrument) and a review of teachers’ lesson plans.

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Encourage the use of technology to support proactive communication between students and teachers, parents and teachers (e.g., cell phones, texting, email)

- Ensure that communication between teachers and administrators is ongoing and effective
- Establish protocols to support professional learning communities and use decision-making model to evaluate effectiveness
- Select the top math and reading priorities to be addressed in the Tier 1 classroom.
- Review aggregate data by grade level, team or class to determine if 80% of students were successful. Areas where less than 80% of students were successful will be determined to be Tier 1 issues.
- Establish priority for interventions, beginning with foundational skills and concepts that are required for success at the current grade level (Essential or Foundational CCGPS standards)

C. Action: Implement Tier 2 needs-based interventions for targeted students

WHY?

The Research:

“More specifically, the CIERA researchers, Taylor, et al., found that the most effective elementary schools provided an average of 60 minutes a day of small, ability-grouped instruction. That was instruction that provided differentiation at the students’ achievement level and therefore presumes additional time for grade-level instruction as well.”

“Once the pool of at-risk students is identified, more comprehensive assessments of their reading ability should be conducted to inform appropriate intervention placements. A student whose performance on a screening instrument is extremely low may require a different type and/or intensity of intervention than a student whose screening score is close to the cut-score. (Johnson, et al, 2011).”

“Interventions may include supplemental materials that embed literacy skills in all content areas.”

“Movement between Tier 1 and Tier 2 is fluid and flexible. Adequate time should be given for the Tier 1 instructional program to be implemented before determining Tier 2 support is needed.”

WHAT?

Currently:

Effectiveness of interventions is ensured by the following:

- a. Providing sufficient blocks of time in the daily schedule for intervention
- b. Providing adequate space in places conducive to learning
- c. Providing competent, well-trained teachers and interventionists

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Use technology to track and endure the movement of students between T1 and T2 based on response to interventions.
- Ensure that teachers consistently provide research-validated interventions designed to meet individual student's needs
- Document data points to monitor student response to intervention
- Encourage the use of technology to ensure proactive communication students and teachers, parents and teachers, e.g., cell phones, texting, email
- Establish protocols to ensure consistent progress monitoring, data collection, and reporting
- Teachers will conduct grade level tier 2 meetings. During these meetings they will discuss data, interventions, and student movement through the tiers.

D. Action: In Tier 3, ensure that Student Support Team (SST) and Data Team monitor progress jointly

WHY?

The Research:

“The role of progress monitoring in RTI is to:

- Determine whether primary prevention (i.e., the core instructional program) is working for a given student.
- Distinguish adequate from inadequate response to the secondary prevention and thereby identify students likely to have a learning disability.
- Inductively design individualized instruction programs to optimize learning at the tertiary prevention in students who likely have learning disabilities.
- Determine when the student's response to tertiary prevention indicates that a return to primary or secondary prevention is possible. (Fuchs, Retrieved Jan, 2011)”

WHAT?

Currently:

In addition to everything that occurs at T1 and T2, data teams (expanded to include school psych, ESOL teacher, SLP, etc.) meet to:

- Verify implementation of proven interventions.
- Ensure that interventionists have maintained fidelity to intervention protocol prior to referral to SST.

T3 SST/data teams meet at least once a month to discuss student progress based on daily interventions that include a minimum of four data points.

Interventions are delivered 1:1 – 1:3 during a protected time daily by a trained interventionist.

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Data points are documented to monitor student response to daily intervention (NOTE: 12 weeks of data collection with four data points are required prior to referral for special education if a specific learning disability is suspected)
- Teachers consistently provide research validated interventions designed to meet individual student's needs

Ensure that T3 includes proven interventions that address behavior

E. Action: Implement Tier 4 specially-designed learning through specialized programs, methodologies or instructional based upon students' inability to access the CCGPS any other way

WHY?

The Research:

"Scientifically proven research-based and evidence-based interventions are specialized strategies for individual students or groups of students with varying types of academic and behavioral problems. Implementation of these strategies has become imperative as schools strive to comply with the imperatives of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005)."

"Effective adolescent instruction and intervention practices include explicit vocabulary instruction, implementation of strategies that develop independent vocabulary learners, opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation, students' motivation and engagement in literacy learning, and intensive individualized interventions for struggling readers. Thus, highly qualified specialists are recommended for struggling readers (Kamil et al., 2008)."

"With three effective tiers in place prior to specialized services, more struggling students will be successful and will not require this degree of intervention. Tier 4 does not represent a location for services but indicates a layer of interventions that may be provided in the general education class or in a separate setting."

WHAT?

Currently:

- School schedules are developed to ensure least restrictive environment (LRE)
- Building and system administrators are familiar with funding formulas affecting students in special programming.
- Most highly qualified and experienced teachers support the delivery of instruction for students with the most significant needs (i.e., best Math II teacher teams with best special education teacher for team-taught instruction).

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Special education, ESOL, and gifted teachers participate in professional learning

communities to ensure strict alignment with delivery of CCGPS, even in separate settings

- IEP teams include key members required to support students' individualized transition plans and/or attainment of College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards
- Special education, EL, or gifted case managers meet plan and discuss students' progress regularly with general education teachers
- Case managers regularly participate in open houses, parent conferences and college and career planning activities

Building Block 6. Improved Instruction through Professional Learning

A. Action: Ensure that pre-service education prepares new teachers for all the challenges of the classroom

WHY?

The Research:

“The NABSE study group, who was responsible for the report *Reading at Risk: The State Response to the Crisis in Adolescent Literacy* (2006), stresses the importance of teaching literacy skills within the context of core academic content. This requires the revision of how teacher training is currently done at the college/university level. Content literacy strategies and reading instructional best practices need to be the focus in pre-service courses.”

“According to *The Report of the Committee to Improve Reading and Writing in Middle and High Schools* (SREB, 2009), “states need to ensure that teacher-preparation programs in colleges and universities help all *aspiring* middle grades and high school teachers and school leaders learn how to embed reading instruction into classrooms” (p.18).”

“The reading training should align to the subject in which the teacher will be certified. All professional learning should focus on effective instructional strategies and best practices for literacy.”

WHAT?

Currently:

- Pre-service teachers receive coursework in disciplinary literacy within content areas

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Provide professional learning, where necessary, for postsecondary faculty
- Ensure that mentoring teachers are fully trained in providing instruction in disciplinary literacy
- Enlist support from institutions of higher education to require pre-service teachers to demonstrate competency in reading theory and practice as well as in the development of disciplinary literacy
- Provide literacy training new teachers or teachers new to the school during an orientation process

B. Action: Provide professional learning for in-service personnel

WHY?

The Research:

Effective professional learning is linked to higher student achievement. In a policy brief on reform in adolescent literacy, the authors cite Greenwald, Hedges & Lane, 1996, (NCTE Policy Brief, *Adolescent Literacy Reform*, 2006, p. 7) stated:

Teachers possess the greatest capacity to positively affect student achievement, and a growing body of research shows that the professional development of teachers holds the greatest potential to improve adolescent literacy achievement. In fact, research indicates that for every \$500 directed toward various school improvement initiatives, those funds directed toward professional development resulted in the greatest student gains on standardized achievement tests (Greenwald et al., 1996)."

"Teachers need to be provided professional learning in interpretation of the assessment data that they receive from their students' former grade and/or school."

- identifying how to use existing assessment data
- identifying other assessment tools for further diagnostic and/or progress monitoring feedback
- designing and using daily classroom instruction as a means of ongoing formative assessment
- learning how to interpret and analyze results from multiple sources to set goals for students and to identify appropriate instructional strategies

"According to Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast (REL), "interventions designed to provide support to teachers can have impacts at two levels: teacher practices and student outcomes" (Lewis et al., 2007). Thus, professional learning in intervention strategies must be aligned with the needs of the students and the goals of the school's leadership team."

WHAT?

Currently:

- The school calendar includes protected time for teachers to collaboratively analyze data, share expertise, study the standards, plan lessons, examine student work, and reflect on practice.
- Teachers participate in professional learning in the CCGPS based on the needs revealed by student data as well as by surveys, interest inventories and teacher observations.
- Teachers participate in ongoing professional learning on the use of the core program.
- Teachers' instruction is monitored through classroom observations or walkthroughs using a variety of assessment tools tied to professional learning.
- An instructional coach provides site-based support for administrators, faculty and staff, where possible.
- Intervention providers receive program-specific training before the beginning of the year to prepare teachers and staff for implementation.

- Administrators, faculty, and staff have received training in administering, analyzing and interpreting results of assessments in terms of literacy.
- Some or all of the following personnel participate in all professional learning opportunities:
 - a. Paraprofessionals
 - b. Support staff
 - c. Interventionists
 - d. Substitute teachers
 - e. Pre-service teachers working at the school
 - f. Administrators
 - g. All faculty

HOW?

Moving forward:

- Analyze student data to evaluate effectiveness of current professional learning on student mastery of CCGPS in all subgroups
- Revisit professional learning options to utilize experts within the school to develop and support colleagues
- Ensure that new personnel receive vital professional learning from earlier years
- Videotape important professional learning sessions for staff to review and share with colleagues within and out of the school
- Expand and strengthen school-university partnerships to build networks of support for literacy programs through the use of online collaborations, blogs and professional organizations
- Continue to encourage “professional talk” among staff and provide time for discussions

Analysis and Identification of Student and Teacher Data

A. Student Achievement Data

Third Grade Reading Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	50	79	63%	2	5	40%	48	76	63%	2	2	100%	0	1	0%
2013	63	86	73%	3	5	60%	62	85	73%	2	2	100%	3	3	100%
2014	56	91	62%	2	10	20%	55	90	61%	2	2	100%	2	3	67%

A1.) Analysis of the data reveals that third graders evidenced an increase of 10 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 11 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in reading proficiency for students who either met or exceeded the standards.

Fourth Grade Reading Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	77	98	79%	3	4	75%	74	94	79%	3	4	75%	0	1	0%
2013	56	78	72%	2	5	40%	55	77	71%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%
2014	34	82	41%	1	9	11%	33	81	41%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%

A2.) Analysis of the data reveals that fourth graders evidenced a decrease of 7 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 31 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in reading proficiency for students who either met or exceeded the standards.

Fifth Grade Reading Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	62	77	81%	3	4	75%	62	77	81%	0	0	#DIV/0!	1	1	100%
2013	60	79	76%	1	2	50%	59	77	77%	1	2	50%	0	0	#DIV/0!
2014	55	87	63%	1	10	10%	54	85	64%	1	3	33%	0	0	#DIV/0!

A3.) Analysis of the data reveals that fifth graders evidenced a decrease of 4 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 13 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in reading proficiency for students who either met or exceeded the standards.

B. Disaggregation into Subgroups

Third Grade Reading Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	50	79	63%	2	5	40%	48	76	63%	2	2	100%	0	1	0%
2013	63	86	73%	3	5	60%	62	85	73%	2	2	100%	3	3	100%
2014	56	91	62%	2	10	20%	55	90	61%	2	2	100%	2	3	67%

B1.) Analysis of the data reveals that third graders overall, evidenced an increase of 10 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 11 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in reading proficiency for students who either met or exceeded the standards. Students with disabilities evidenced an increase of 20 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 40 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black, third grade students evidenced an increase of 10 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 12 percentage

points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students maintained an average of 100 percent pass rate from 2012 to 2014. White students evidenced a 100 percentage point increase from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 33 percentage points from 2013 to 2014.

Fourth Grade Reading Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	77	98	79%	3	4	75%	74	94	79%	3	4	75%	0	1	0%
2013	56	78	72%	2	5	40%	55	77	71%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%
2014	34	82	41%	1	9	11%	33	81	41%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%

B2.) Analysis of the data reveals that fourth graders overall, evidenced a decrease of 7 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 31 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in reading proficiency for students who either met or exceeded the standards. Students with disabilities evidenced a decrease of 35 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 29 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black, third grade students evidenced a decrease of 8 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 30 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students evidenced an increase of 25 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and maintained a 100 percent pass rate from 2013 to 2014. White students evidenced a 100 percentage point increase from 2012 to 2013; and maintained 100 percent pass rate from 2013 to 2014.

Fifth Grade Reading Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	62	77	81%	3	4	75%	62	77	81%	0	0	#DIV/0!	1	1	100%
2013	60	79	76%	1	2	50%	59	77	77%	1	2	50%	0	0	#DIV/0!
2014	55	87	63%	1	10	10%	54	85	64%	1	3	33%	0	0	#DIV/0!

B3.) Analysis of the data reveals that fifth graders overall, evidenced a decrease of 4 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 13 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in reading proficiency for students who either met or exceeded the standards. Students with disabilities evidenced a decrease of 25 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 40 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced a decrease of 4 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 13 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students evidenced a decrease of 17 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. White students scored 100 percentage points in 2012.

Third Grade Science Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	33	82	40%	0	6	0%	31	79	39%	2	2	100%	0	1	0%
2013	47	91	52%	3	10	30%	46	90	51%	2	2	100%	2	3	67%
2014	47	102	46%	0	1	0%	46	101	46%	1	1	100%	0	1	0%

B4.) Analysis of the science data reveals that third graders overall, evidenced an increase of 12 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 6 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in science

proficiency for students who either met or exceeded standards. Students with disabilities evidenced an increase of 30 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 30 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced an increase of 4 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 13 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students evidenced a decrease of 17 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. White students scored 100 percentage points in 2012.

Fourth Grade Science Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	59	104	57%	57	100	57%	57	100	57%	2	4	50%	0	1	0%
2013	26	82	32%	25	81	31%	25	81	31%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%
2014	50	100	50%	47	97	48%	47	97	48%	3	3	100%	2	3	67%

B5.) Analysis of the science data reveals that fourth graders overall, evidenced a decrease of 25 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and an increase of 18 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in science proficiency for students who either met or exceeded standards. Students with disabilities evidenced a decrease of 14 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and an increase of 18 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced a decrease of 14 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and an increase of 17 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students evidenced an increase of 50 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and maintained 100 percent pass rate from 2013 to 2014. No white students were tested in 2012. In 2013, 100% of white students met or exceeded standards; and decreased by 33 percentage points from 2013 to 2014.

Fifth Grade Science Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	53	82	65%	1	8	13%	53	82	65%	0	0	#DIV/0!	1	1	100%
2013	54	87	62%	2	10	20%	53	85	62%	1	3	33%	0	0	#DIV/0!
2014	29	84	35%	0	8	0%	29	83	35%	0	1	0%	1	1	100%

B6.) Analysis of the science data reveals that fifth graders overall, evidenced a decrease of 25 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and an increase of 18 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in science proficiency for students who either met or exceeded standards. Students with disabilities evidenced a decrease of 14 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and an increase of 18 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced a decrease of 14 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and an increase of 17 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students evidenced an increase of 50 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and maintained 100 percent pass rate from 2013 to 2014. No white students were tested in 2012. In 2013, 100% of white students met or exceeded standards; and decreased by 33 percentage points from 2013 to 2014.

Third Grade Social Studies Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	41	82	50%	1	6	17%	39	79	49%	2	2	100%	0	1	0%
2013	56	91	62%	2	10	20%	55	90	61%	2	2	100%	2	3	67%
2014	60	102	59%	0	1	0%	59	101	58%	1	1	100%	0	1	0%

B7.) Analysis of the social studies data reveals that third graders overall, evidenced an increase of 12 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 3 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in social studies proficiency for students who either met or exceeded standards. Students with disabilities evidenced an increase of 3 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 20 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced an increase of 12 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 3 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students remained the same from 2012 to 2013; and maintained 100 percent pass rate from 2013 to 2014. No white students were tested in 2012. In 2013, 67% of white students met or exceeded standards; and decreased by 67 percentage points from 2013 to 2014.

Fourth Grade Social Studies Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	56	104	54%	1	10	10%	54	100	54%	2	4	50%	0	1	0%
2013	34	82	41%	1	9	11%	33	81	41%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%
2014	51	100	51%	1	10	10%	48	97	49%	3	3	100%	1	3	33%

B8.) Analysis of the social studies data revealed that fourth graders overall, evidenced a decrease of 13 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 10 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in science proficiency for students who either met or exceeded standards. Students with disabilities evidenced an increase of 1 percentage point from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 1 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced a decrease of 13 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and an increase of 8 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Hispanic students evidenced an increase of 50 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and maintained 100 percent pass rate from 2013 to 2014. One white student was tested in 2012. In 2013, 100% of white students met or exceeded standards; and decreased by 33 percentage points from 2013 to 2014.

Fifth Grade Social Studies Trend Data

	ALL & EDS			SWD			BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE		
	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E	Meets & Exceeds	# of Students	% M&E
2012	44	82	54%	1	8	13%	44	82	54%	0	0	#DIV/0!	1	1	100%
2013	55	87	63%	1	10	10%	54	85	64%	1	3	33%	0	0	#DIV/0!
2014	50	84	60%	1	8	13%	49	83	59%	1	1	100%	1	1	100%

B9.) Analysis of the social studies data revealed that fifth graders overall, evidenced an increase of 9 percentage points from 2012 to 2013; and a decrease of 3 percentage points from the 2013 to the 2014 assessment in science proficiency for students who either met or exceeded standards. Students with disabilities evidenced a decrease of 3 percentage point from 2012 to 2013 and an increase of 3 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. Black students evidenced an increase of 10 percentage points from 2012 to 2013 and a decrease of 5 percentage points from 2013 to 2014. No Hispanic students were tested in 2012. In 2013, 33% of Hispanic students met or exceeded standards; and in 2014, 100% of Hispanic students met or exceeded standards. One white student was tested in 2012 and met or exceeded standards on the CRCT. In 2013, no white students were tested; 1 white student was tested in 2014 and met or exceeded standards.

C. Identifies Strengths and Weaknesses Based on Prescribed Assessments

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 82% of all students scored at the meets/exceeds level in the Reading CRCT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decrease in Reading CRCT scores from 2012-2013 in 3rd through 5th grades
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in 3rd grade reading CRCT scores from 63% in 2012 to 73% in 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decrease in 3rd grade reading CRCT scores from 73% in 2013 to 62% in 2014

D. Data for All Teachers including CTAE, Special Education, and Media

The data included throughout this section includes all teachers at T. H. Slater Elementary School.

E. Teacher Retention Data

Teacher Attrition:

- 2014- Lost 9 out of a total of 24 homeroom teachers. 3 of the 9 teachers retired. Six teachers transferred.
- 2013-Lost 2 out of a total of 24 homeroom teachers. 1 teacher got married and moved out of state. The other, transferred within the district.
-

F. Develops Goals and Objectives based on Formative and Summative Assessments

Based on the 2013-2014 CRCT and CAAS data our goals and objectives were determined. We looked at the data trends for the past three years and selected math as our focus. We determined that we needed an uninterrupted math block and implemented school-wide number talks from 8:00-8:30 a.m., followed by uninterrupted math class period. We now have a “Balanced Approach to Math as well as Literacy/Reading.

G. Additional District-Prescribed Data

CAAS scores are disaggregated and used for some grouping, to focus on individual student prescriptions, as a benchmark to chart student development. Write Score was used for 3-5th graders in writing.

H. Teacher Participation in Professional Learning Communities

Professional learning communities are not fully operational at this time, however; grade level teams meet weekly to discuss student progress and challenges. PLC’s require additional implementation support. Teacher

conversations at this time are more student-focused rather than teacher-reflective. More professional development is needed in this area.

Project Plan-Procedures, Goals, Objectives and Support Going Forward- what will certain things look like in our school (Chart/ needs assessment/ literacy plan align)

A. Project Goals and Objectives

A. Project Goals	B. Project Objectives
Goal 1: Build literacy leadership by creating a shared vision for literacy. (GLP-The What-1B)	1.1: Establish school literacy leadership team made up of administrators and literacy specialists. 1.2: Enlist members of community universities, organizations, and agencies to collaborate to support literacy within the community.
Goal 2: Foster collaborative teams that ensure a consistent literacy focus across the curriculum (GLP-The What-2A)	2.1: Develop protocols for team meetings 2.2: Utilize components of the professional learning community model 2.3: Communicate and share measureable student achievement goals aligned with grade-level expectations in all subjects
Goal 3: Ongoing formative and summative assessments used to determine the need for and the intensity of interventions and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction (GLP-The What 3B)	3.1: Screen and progress monitor the instructional level of all students with evidence-based tools 3.2: Create a formative assessment calendar based on local and state guidelines, including times for administration and persons responsible 3.3: Ensure the use of shared mid-course assessments across classrooms to identify classrooms needing support 3.4: Based on assessments, identify high achieving/advanced learners who would benefit from enrichment or advanced coursework
Goal 4: Effective writing instruction across the curriculum (GLP-The What 4B)	4.1: Literacy leadership team develop a writing plan consistent with CCGPS and articulate it vertically and horizontally 4.2: Provide explicit, guided, and independent practice with writing instruction across all subject areas 4.3: Teachers participate in professional learning on best practices in writing instruction in all content areas 4.4: Use technology for production, publishing, and communication across the curriculum
Goal 5: Needs-based interventions are provided for targeted students in Tier 2 (GLP-The What 5C)	5.1: Identify interventionists to support Tier 2 instruction 5.2: Interventionists participate in professional learning 5.3 Provide sufficient blocks of time in the daily schedule for intervention

<p>Goal 6: Ongoing professional learning in all aspects of literacy instruction, including disciplinary literacy in the content areas (GLP-The What-6B)</p>	<p>6.1: Protected time available for teachers to plan collaboratively, analyze data, share expertise, study standards, plan lessons, examine student work, and reflect on practice 6.2: Teachers participate in professional learning with CCGPS based on student needs revealed through data, surveys, interest inventories, and teacher observations 6.3: Conduct classroom observations or walkthroughs using assessment tools tied to professional learning</p>

B. Performance Targets

By implementing the goals and objectives above it is the expectation that the student achievement and/or teacher performance targets below will be met:

	Performance Targets				
Performance Measures	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019
ELA Milestone	60%	62%	64%	66%	68%
SWD ELA Milestone	60%	62%	64%	66%	68%
GKIDS-ELA	80%	82%	84%	86%	88%
District Benchmarks- Reading	70%	72%	74%	76%	78%

C. Alignment of Goals, Objectives and Assessment

Formative/Summative Measures	Associated Goals
Dibels Next	3, 5
Scholastic Reading Inventory	3,5
CAAS	3,4, 5
DRA	2,3,4,5,
Reading Performance Task	2, 3, 4, 5

D. 120 Minutes of Tiered Literacy Instruction

Insert Balanced Literacy approach for appropriate grade level

READING (90 minutes)	
READ ALOUD (5 minutes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher reads a variety of texts aloud to students modeling skills and strategies efficient readers use and what fluent, expressive reading sounds like. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>FREQUENCY- Daily / STRUCTURE – Whole class or small group</i></p>
SHARED READING/MINI LESSON (15 minutes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher selects a strategy, skill or element to introduce and reinforce. Teacher selects a delivery method (direct, indirect, inquiry, etc.) for instruction with students. Teacher expects or requires practice of the strategy, skill, or element during the guided and independent work portions of the lesson. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>FREQUENCY- Daily / STRUCTURE – Whole class or small group</i></p>
GUIDED READING/STRATEGY GROUPS (60 minutes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher provides support for small, flexible groups of readers. Readers are grouped according to their reading level and their specific needs relating to skills and strategies. Teachers work with students at their instructional level to guide them in using the text to generate meaning. Teacher helps students learn using reading strategies as they read a text or book that is unfamiliar to them. Students have the opportunity to develop reading strategies, and reading for meaning.
INDEPENDENT READING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students work individually or with a partner to read and discuss text (self-selected or teacher recommended). Students apply and practice the skills and strategies learned in the whole group and guided reading lesson. Students learn to independently select books and respond on book logs and response journals. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>FREQUENCY- Daily / STRUCTURE- Small group, partner, or individual conferencing</i></p>
SHARING (10 minutes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students summarize, demonstrate new knowledge (or at least their attempts) as evidence of the new understandings of reading. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>FREQUENCY- Daily / STRUCTURE – Whole Class</i></p>
WRITING (30 minutes)	
<i>Grammar, usage, mechanics, and spelling are taught strategically as a part of the real writing situation.</i>	
Day 1 - Writing Aloud / Shared Writing (Whole class)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher models writing for students while verbalizing thinking (and reasoning). Focus on conventions
Day 2 - Shared Writing (Whole class)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher and students work together interactively to compose texts with the teacher serving as a scribe. Topic, audience, purpose, word choice, genre, content, and format are selected in a negotiated process between teacher and students.
Day 3 - Guided Writing/Independent Writing (Small group or partner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher provides differentiated small group instruction as students rotate through guided writing and independent writing groups. Teacher provides explicit instruction and continuous feedback during all stages of the writing process as needed to individual students or small groups of small students.
Day 4 - Guided Writing/Independent Writing (Small group, partner, or individual conferencing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher provides explicit instruction and continuous feedback during all stages of the writing process as needed to individual students or small groups of small students. Students write about self-selected topics as they compose, revise, and edit their own texts. Students talk about their writing in a conference with the teacher and/or peer.
Day 5 - Independent Writing/ Sharing (Small group, partner, or individual conferencing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students talk about their writing in a conference with the teacher and/or peer. Students share writing (or at least their attempts) as evidence of their attempt to use new writing skills and strategies.

Tier	Literacy Interventions That Occur Within Each Tier
I	Small group instruction, guided reading, close reading strategies
II	Small group instruction, guided reading, close reading strategies, monitored interventions
III	Guided reading, close reading strategies, individualized instructional, small group instruction
IV	Specialized programs and strategies, guided reading, close reading strategies, small group instruction

E. RTI Model

	Strategies	Personnel
Tier IV Specifically Designed Learning	Specialized and/or Individualized Instruction More Frequent Progress Monitoring Diagnostic Assessments Assistive Technology All Tier I-III Strategies	Special Education, IEP, ELL, Gifted, ESOL Program, Assistive Technology
Tier III SST Driven Learning	Differentiation Small/Flexible grouping Computer interventions Collaborative Teaching Extended Day Instruction Long Term Interventions Frequent Progress Monitoring Universal Screening CCGPS Instruction Balanced Literacy Reading Support	All Classroom Teachers Gifted Special Education Literacy Coach ELL Advanced Placement Hospital Homebound
Tier II Needs Based Learning		
Tier I Standards Based Classroom Learning		

F. Inclusion of Teachers and Students

All teachers and students are included in the activities of this application.

G. Current RTI Practices

	Strategies	Personnel
Tier IV Specifically Designed Learning	Specialized and/or Individualized Instruction More Frequent Progress Monitoring Diagnostic Assessments Assistive Technology All Tier I-III Strategies	Special Education, IEP, ELL, Gifted, ESOL Program, Assistive Technology
Tier III SST Driven Learning	Differentiation Small/Flexible grouping Computer interventions Collaborative Teaching Extended Day Instruction Long Term Interventions Frequent Progress Monitoring Universal Screening CCGPS Instruction Balanced Literacy Reading Support	All Classroom Teachers Gifted Special Education Literacy Coach ELL Advanced Placement Hospital Homebound
Tier II Needs Based Learning		
Tier I Standards Based Classroom Learning		

H. Goals Funded With Other Sources

Title I: Professional Development, books and materials
 General Funds: books and materials

I. Sample Schedule

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G			
1		K	K	1	1	2	2			
2		Drayton & Turner	Jackson & Stevenson	Joiner Swain Alcala	Graham	McKeithen & Kazadi	Nero			
3	8:00 - 8:15	Specials 8:00 - 8:50		Intervention 8:00-8:30		Literacy 8:00 - 9:30	Intervention 8:00-8:30			
4	8:15 - 8:30			Science 8:30 - 9:10				Social Studies 8:30 - 9:10		
5	8:30 - 8:45	Math 8:50 - 10:20	Science 8:50 - 9:30	Literacy 9:10 - 10:40	Social Studies 9:10 - 9:50	Social Studies 9:30 - 10:10	Science 9:10 - 9:50			
6	8:45 - 9:00							Literacy 9:30 - 10:30	Math 9:50 - 10:35	Science 10:10 - 10:50
7	9:00 - 9:15		Lunch 10:20 - 10:50	Lunch 10:30 - 11:00	Lunch 10:40 - 11:10	Lunch 10:35 - 11:05				
8	9:15 - 9:30						Social Studies 10:55 - 11:35			
9	9:30 - 9:45		Literacy 11:35 - 1:05	Math 11:35 - 1:05	Social Studies 12:05 - 12:45	Math 12:05 - 12:45				
10	9:45 - 10:00	Science 1:05 - 2:00					Social Studies 1:05 - 2:00	Math 12:45 - 2:25	Literacy 12:45 - 2:25	
11	10:00 - 10:15		Recess	Intervention	Dismissal	Dismissal				
12	10:15 - 10:30	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
13	10:30 - 10:45	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
14	10:30 - 10:45	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
15	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
16	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
17	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
18	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
19	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
20	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
21	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
22	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
23	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
24	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
25	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
26	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
27	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
28	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
29	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								
30	10:45 - 11:00	All School Meeting and Professional Development Block								

Assessment and Data Analysis Plan

A. Current Assessment Protocol

When	Assessment
August 2014 and January 2015	Computer Adaptive Assessment System
October 2014	Cluster Math and Science Benchmark
December 2014	District Reading and Math Benchmark
Monthly, bi-weekly, and weekly as needed	Aims Web Probe
Monthly, bi-weekly, and weekly as needed	easyCBM
April 2015	Georgia Milestone Assessment
End of each Unit of study	Local school created Reading, Math, and Writing Assessment

B. Current Assessment vs. SRCL Assessments

Slater Elementary currently utilizes the Computer Adaptive Assessment System (CAAS) as a universal screener for all students. The assessment is administered in the fall and winter. The results garnered from CAAS identify students’ ability below, at, or above grade level regarding mastery of common core standards. The CAAS assessment is a tailored system. Student answers and ability are matched with the questions that are presented. In addition, teachers administer Aims Web probe and/or easy CBM to monitor reading fluency. These assessments are administered monthly, bi-weekly, or weekly, based on the individual student needs. The addition of striving reader assessments (dibels and scholastic reading inventory) offers more intimate details regarding the reader. Teachers and support personnel will have the opportunity to identify the intricate needs of each learner. These assessments drill down to specific issues and deficiencies that are not as evident with the CAAS assessment. While the scholastic reading inventory is tailored as well, the entire program encompasses benchmarking, progress monitoring, and instructional placement as well. Likewise, dibels offers quick one-minute assessments that may be utilized by the teacher to

assess initial sound recognition, letter recognition, oral fluency, comprehension, word usage, and phonemes. These skills are critically important in the development of readers, and dibels encompasses all of these skills.

C. New Assessment Protocol

When	Assessment
August 2014 and January 2015	Computer Adaptive Assessment System
October 2014	Cluster Math and Science Benchmark
December 2014	District Reading and Math Benchmark
Monthly, bi-weekly, and weekly as needed	Aims Web Probe
Monthly, bi-weekly, and weekly as needed	easyCBM
April 2015	Georgia Milestone Assessment
End of each Unit of study	Local school created Reading, Math, and Writing Assessment
August 2014 and January 2015	Computer Adaptive Assessment System
September, January, April	Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)
September, January, April	DIBELS Next (FSF, LNF, PSF, NWF, ORF)

D. Current Assessment Discontinued

The state of Georgia will no longer use the Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT), as a result of the full implementation of common core standards. The state of Georgia has adopted a more rigorous assessment that integrates reading and writing together to assess student learning. In addition, the state of Georgia has discontinued the use of the third and fifth grade Writing Assessment. Through the common core Georgia performance standards, students are equipped with opportunities to integrate their learning with a literacy rich experience. The Georgia Milestone will assess students' writing through constructed response questions, and students' knowledge of various genres of writing will be measured through extended response questions.

E. Professional Learning Needs

- Direct, explicit instruction
- Cross-curricular instruction
- Writing instruction
- Text dependent questioning
- Guided reading instruction
- Teacher led feedback
- Student led feedback
- Utilizing rubrics to guide instruction
- DIBELS Next
- Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)

F. Presentation of Data to Parents and Stakeholders

Slater Elementary will provide parents with preliminary feedback regarding the Georgia Milestones assessment. The expectation is for scores to become available in the fall 2015. Prior to this date, parents will receive ongoing information, flyers, and robo-calls regarding what to expect, how to analyze scores, and the overall language of Georgia Milestone. In addition, the parent liaison and instructional coaches will provide sessions for the parents regarding what to expect and how to best interpret student scores. Upon the arrival of student scores, Slater Elementary will follow the procedures as outlined by the District. Also, Slater will host an early curriculum event to discuss student data and how it impacts individual, class, and school goals.

G. Data Used in Instructional Strategies

The Georgia Milestone will serve as a tool to support instructional decisions regarding student needs, as well as teacher needs. This data will be utilized to identify areas that require additional professional development, changes in practice, and remedial skills with the student population. In addition, this data will be considered baseline because it is an initial assessment. Slater Elementary will transform this data into a platform for instructional practices and a decision factor for where attention should be directed. All exclusionary factors will be included: attendance, behavior, student/teacher ratio, teacher quality, teacher content knowledge, marginal growth, as well as specific student groups, i.e., special education, gifted learners, and EL learners.

Slater Elementary will utilize the expertise of the literacy leadership team and data team to begin to focus and scaffold support and attention in the appropriate areas to ensure desired results.

H. Assessment Plan and Personnel

Certified teachers in all content areas, inclusive of special areas as well as special education teachers, will administer assessments. In addition, assessments will be analyzed by collaborative teams of teachers, student support specialist, instructional coaches, and the media specialist. Professional learning opportunities will be dictated by the data that will be reflected in the Georgia Milestone data, as well as the adoption of dibels and scholastic reading inventory.

Slater Elementary plans to use a formative assessment calendar and form an effective data team with well-articulated goals and expectations for the members. As a result, teachers will collaborate more effectively and communicate desired goals based

on data collected and student performance, rather than pacing or prior teaching experiences. To ensure the fidelity of this process, the literacy leadership team will engage in on-going literacy walkthroughs and observations. Likewise, support personnel including specialists and instructional coaches, will redeliver the necessary literacy strategies to support deficiencies or areas to accelerate based on the data provided by the Georgia Milestone, dibels, and scholastic reading inventory.

Resources, Strategies, and Materials Including Technology

A. Resources Needed

- Professional Development for Teachers from a consistent source on the following topics:
 1. Using data to inform instructional decisions
 2. Explicit teaching
 3. Selecting appropriate text
 4. Strategies for literacy instruction
 5. Teacher and Student led feedback
 6. Differentiation of Instruction (small groups, guided reading)
 7. Text complexity
 8. Cross-curricular instruction
- Leveled Library
- Phonics Kits
- Technology equipment that reads text aloud
- Recording devices
- Listening stations
- Classroom sets of trade books
- Nonfiction text aligned to social studies and science

B. Activities Supporting Literacy

- Reading Campaign Kick-off (reading challenge for students to read books on his/her grade level)
- Monthly book reports submitted to be featured in the media center
- Principal's book of the month
- Parent "Lunch & Learn" ...teaching parents strategies to use with their readers
- Muffins for Moms...a celebration of students' written works
- Donuts for Dad...a celebration of students' written works
- Reading parades
- Accelerated Reader celebrations
- Reading certificates/awards for top readers, highest points earned, most improved
- School-wide newspaper...generated by students with student writing samples
- Friday Literacy "Make and Takes"
- Book Fairs
- Featured read-aloud guests
- Curriculum Nights / Overviews

C. Shared Resources

- Leveled readers
- Ipad cart
- Macbook cart
- Ipad tables
- Computer labs
- Guided readers with teacher handbook
- Professional learning books

- Touchstone books
- Media resources

D. Library Resources

- Leveled readers
- Touchstone books
- Variquest poster maker
- Computers

E. Activities Supporting Classroom Practices

- After-school tutorial
- Informal walk-throughs
- Peer observations
- Collaborative planning
- Long term professional development
- Ongoing formative and summative assessments
- Vertical alignment sessions
- Open forum discussions (“courageous conversations”/chat & chew)

F. Additional Needed Strategies

- Social studies and science integration in literacy
- Writing craft lessons

G. Current Classroom Resources

- Grade level textbooks
- Four computer stations
- One promethean board
- One document camera
- Limited leveled readers

H. Alignment of SRCL and Other Funding Sources

Resources, Strategies, and Materials	Existing Funding Resources	SRCL Will Provide
Leveled Library	Title I funds	additional leveled books
Professional learning	Title I funds	Professional learning
Diagnostic Assessments	None allocated	Diagnostic assessments
Typing software	None allocated	typing software

I. Technology Purchases

The use of technology is advancing on a daily basis. Students are expected to respond to text, compute, and evaluate their learning with the use of technology.

Consequently, technology has become the leading resource in promoting and enhancing student engagement. Technology purchases will support RtI, student engagement, and instruction through its flawless system of tailored, timely, and individualized support.

Students have the opportunity to respond to programs designed specifically to meet their needs. In addition, technology provides teachers with endless resources to activate student learning and streamline explicit instruction.

Professional Learning Strategies

A. Professional Learning Activities

Topic	Time Frame	Participants	Provider
Balanced literacy	45 minutes	k-5 teachers	Mrs. Mitchell
Dr. Cupp	3 hours	Kindergarten teachers	Dr. Cindy Cupp
Open Court	90 minutes	k-2 teachers	Parks, Bowden, Nolan
RACE to respond-short constructed response	15 minutes	K-5 teachers	K. Paggett
RACE/Balanced Literacy	90 minutes	3 rd grade teachers	D. Mitchell
Introduction to Achieve 3000	45 minutes	3 rd , 4 th and 5 th grade teachers	D. Mitchell
Writing	30 minutes	3 rd grade teachers	D. Mitchell
Writing	45 minutes	5 th grade teachers	D. Mitchell
Thinking Maps		K-5 teachers	

B. Percentage of Staff Participating in Professional Learning

100% of instructional staff attended grade level or building specific professional learning.

C. Detailed List of On-Going Professional Learning

Topic	Time Frame	Participants	Provider
Performance Based Task	August 2014-May 2015	All Teachers	Instructional Coaches and Grade Level Chairs
Book Studies	August 2014-May 2015	All Teachers	Instructional Coaches and Grade Level Chairs
Intervention RTI Meetings	August 2014-May 2015	All Teachers	Kimberly Jones (RTI Coordinator)

D. Professional Learning Needs

- Pre Service Education- Preparing new teachers for literacy
- Integrating literacy in all content areas
- Tier 2 needs based intervention
- Tier 4 specially designed learning
- School based data team creation
- Strategies to use data to inform teaching
- How to develop interest and engagement as student progress through school

E. Professional Learning Evaluation

Professional learning is evaluated by teacher feedback, informal walkthroughs, and tangible artifacts gathered as a result of sessions held. Teacher feedback forms, surveys, walkthroughs, and implementation observations will become a part of the professional learning evaluation process.

F. Alignment of Professional Learning to Project Goals

Topic	Time Frame	Participants	Provider	Goal Number
Guided Reading Training	July 2015 -May 2016	Instructional Staff	Scholastics	4
A -Pal Social studies and literacy integration	July 2015 -May 2016	Instructional Staff	Instructional Coaches	4
Shurley English	July 2015 -May 2016	Instructional Staff	Shurley English	4
Phonics Training	July 2015 -May 2016	Instructional Staff	GA ETA	4
Words Their Way	July 2015 -May 2016	Instructional Staff	Instructional Coaches	4
New Teachers Network	July 2015 -May 2016	New Instructional Staff	Instructional Coaches	6
Engaging Lessons	July 2015 -May 2016	Instructional Staff	Instructional Coaches	4, 5

G. Effectiveness of Professional Learning

The goals of the project plan reflect the core needs of Slater Elementary. The effectiveness of professional learning will be analyzed through various measures. Data notebooks, progress monitoring charts, and detailed anecdotal notes will be utilized to support the identification of student needs and the intensity of interventions. Direct feedback from the participants, as well as session leaders will be used to identify the effectiveness of professional learning topics. Results garnered from mid-course assessments will serve as an indicator for professional learning effectiveness with direct instruction. District level analysis of student writing with the adopted rubric will assess the effective writing instruction professional development. Overall, teacher

evaluations will reflect a collection of the practices demonstrated and taught throughout the professional learning sessions.

Sustainability Plan

A. Plan for Extending Assessments

District assessment tools and tools attained through the grant will continue to be administered annually. DIBELS Next, IPI, and SRI will be funded using Title I or QBE funds. New teachers will receive training on how to administer assessment tools and interpret results

B. Developing Community Partnerships

APS currently has partnerships between several businesses, civic organizations and schools. These organizations supplement teaching by sponsoring activities (field trips, displays, or speakers). Many of these members serve on the school councils and PTOs and these partnerships will continue beyond the life of this grant.

C. Expanding Lessons learned

Lessons learned will be expanded through ongoing PL, a library of professional texts, journals and online sources (GLP - The How, p.40). The instructional coach and teachers will provide home learning connections and training to support the effective use of these resources, including differentiated support for students (GLP - The How, p.39). We will use classroom observations/ videotaping to identify and support individual teachers with follow-up coaching, conferencing, and mentoring (GLP, The How, p.49).

- **Extending Assessment Protocols**

We will train staff members on the DIBELS Next, informal running records, and other diagnostic tools at the beginning of the SRCL grant period. Staff hired after the grant expires will be trained using a “Train-the-Trainer” model (training by instructional coach and existing staff). The instructional coach and Literacy Team will be responsible for

Atlanta Public Schools

providing professional learning on assessment protocols annually to all staff. District and school funds (Title I and discretionary) will be utilized to purchase assessments.

- **New System Employees Training**

Currently, new district employees have a three day New Teacher Orientation, as well as a monthly orientation and mentoring program. Part of this training for new teachers will be to share our Literacy Plan and provide focused professional learning on instructional strategies and assessment protocols outlined within the plan.

- **Maintaining and Sustaining Technology**

SPLOST funds will maintain technology with district personnel responsible.

- **Ongoing Professional Learning** Staying abreast of current research and best practices in literacy instruction, including differentiated instruction, will continue by developing a professional library (texts, journals and online resources) (GLP - The How, p.40) and utilizing resources (webinars and professional learning videos from the GaDOE website) to ensure our literacy instruction stays current. Professional learning will be revisited regularly and revised yearly based on student mastery of CCGPS and classroom observations (GLP - The How, p.48).

D. Print Materials Replacement

Currently, print materials are funded through other sources. Funding to continue and sustain necessary print materials will be provided after the life of this grant through other sources (Title I and principal discretionary funds).

E. Extending Professional Learning

The school intends to video record professional learning and differentiated lessons (GLP - The How, p.40) in order to create a digital resource library. Digital resources provided

by the GaDOE and a “train-the-trainer” model will be utilized to sustain professional learning. The instructional coach and designated staff will re-deliver and facilitate these trainings with new staff members. Time will be allotted during district New Teacher Orientation for administrators and the instructional coach to share the Literacy Plan and provide targeted training on instructional strategies and assessment protocols outlined within the plan.

F. Sustaining Technology

SPLOST funds, Title I and building level discretionary funds will maintain technology with district personnel and building administrators responsible.

G. Expanding Lessons Learned - New Teachers & LEA

Lessons learned will be shared with other schools and new teachers through professional learning communities, such as APS New Teacher Orientation, Summer Leadership Institutes, and Expanded Cabinet Meetings.

Budget Summary

Professional Learning

We request funding for consultants for professional learning identified in previous sections for all teachers. These areas of professional learning will extend beyond building-level professional learning that will be provided by the instructional coach, district personnel, and/or literacy team members. Funding is requested for targeted teachers to attend content-specific professional learning, and for substitutes that can effectively lead instruction while allowing targeted teachers to attend professional development. Funding will cover all travel and registration expenses.

We request funding for teaching artists from the Woodruff Arts Center to work with classroom teachers to promote drama and arts strategies that promote literacy skills. Teachers will attend a full-day orientation and instructional session presented by the Alliance Theater. Funding will cover registration fees, stipends, coaching, demonstration lessons, and observations.

Selected staff members will attend literacy related conferences to support the literacy plan. Funding will cover all travel and registration expenses.

Stipends

Funding is requested for stipends to pay teachers to work beyond their contract time to engage in crucial training and professional learning that supports our school's literacy plan.

Professional Library

We request funding for professional learning materials to support the literacy plan. These are not consumables, but resources that will be used to train new teachers in subsequent years or to refresh or retrain the entire staff as necessary.

Print Materials/Supplies

We request funding for print materials, including core literacy program materials, non-fiction informational texts, leveled readers, novels, graphic novels, and subscriptions to developmentally appropriate literary magazines and Common Core aligned periodicals to ensure literacy-rich environments for our children at home and at school. In addition, printing/copying supplies will be purchased as necessary to support the literacy program. Other tools or supplies will be purchased as needed. The Media Center will receive funding to upgrade content collections and informational text to meet the needs of CCGPS. In addition, the media center will purchase non-print literacy materials to support the literacy program.

Home School Connections/Literacy Events

We request funding for school wide events that promote literacy within our community and increase student motivation and interests in reading.

Student Instructional Support - Beyond the Regular Instructional Day

Funding will be used to support student literacy instruction beyond the regular school day. In addition, funding will be used to purchase instructional program materials, supplies, stipends for teachers, and transportation costs.

Pupil Travel/Field Trip

Funding is requested for students to attend arts integration programming through the Woodruff Arts Centers. The funding requested will cover transportation costs and ticket prices for students and staff.

Technology

SRCL funding will be used to supplement APS technology purchases in order to provide access to digital media for all students. This includes, but is not limited to increasing technology

Atlanta Public Schools:
access grades K-5, accessories, software, and other technology supplies as needed.