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School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Information</th>
<th>District Name:</th>
<th>Bartow County School System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Information</td>
<td>School or Center Name:</td>
<td>Woodland High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of School

*High (9-12)*

Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Melissa Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>770-606-5870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:melissa.williams@bartow.k12.ga.us">melissa.williams@bartow.k12.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School contact information

(The persons with rights to work on the application)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School contact information</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td>Dr. Wes Dickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td>770-606-5870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School contact information</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wes.dickey@bartow.k12.ga.us">wes.dickey@bartow.k12.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades represented in the building

Example pre-k to 6

*9-12*

Number of Teachers in School

108

FTE Enrollment

1760
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: Elizabeth Williams

Position/Title of Fiscal Agent’s Contact Person: AnneMarie Wiseman

Address: 65 Gilreath Rd

City: Cartersville Zip: 30121

Telephone: (770) 606-5860 Fax: (770) 606-5166

E-mail: Buffy.williams@bartow.k12.ga.us

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

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

Date (required)
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 subcontract 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)

________________________________________
Typed Name of Fiscal Agency Head and Position Title

________________________________________
Date

________________________________________
Signature of Applicant’s Authorized Agency Head (required)

________________________________________
Typed Name of Applicant’s Authorized Agency Head and Position Title

________________________________________
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)
Preliminary Application Requirements
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Click on the General Application Information link below to assist you in the grant development process.

General Application Information

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 Rubric

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.

Assessment 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 5 in General Application Information 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


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
Grant Assurances
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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.
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Is there an Audit?</th>
<th>Audit Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>LEA Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IA</td>
<td>$2,005,305</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*Procurement and suspension and debarment – not considered to be a material weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IIA</td>
<td>$421,327</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>$54,238</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Cluster</td>
<td>$306,828</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>$324,690</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IA</td>
<td>$1,985,399</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IIA</td>
<td>$414,594</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>$60,073</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Cluster</td>
<td>$2,648,330</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>$324,690</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IA</td>
<td>$1,931,307</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IIA</td>
<td>$411,351</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>$110,089</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Cluster</td>
<td>$2,830,364</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>$333,938</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IA</td>
<td>$2,538,166</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IIA</td>
<td>$466,043</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Semi-annual Time and Effort Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>$110,840</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Cluster</td>
<td>$2,868,141</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>$342,944</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IA</td>
<td>$2,564,690</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IIA</td>
<td>$432,464</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>$110,074</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Cluster</td>
<td>$2,862,075</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Semi-annual Time and Effort Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKinney Vento</td>
<td>$31,214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>$345,478</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IA</td>
<td>$2,788,789</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title IIA</td>
<td>$449,844</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>$96,712</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Cluster</td>
<td>$2,811,108</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Semi-annual Time and Effort Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKinney Vento</td>
<td>$51,400</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>$303,785</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bartow County School System

System History

Bartow County School System (BCSS) is located in the Northwest Georgia Area in the foothills of Georgia’s Appalachian Mountains. It is home to Allatoona Lake, Etowah Indians Mounds, Red Top Mountain State Park, Booth Western Art Museum, Tellus Museum and Barnsley Gardens. Shaw Carpets, Toyo Tire, Anheuser Busch, Ameri-Steel, Cartersville Medical Center, Georgia Power Plant, Atlanta Sod and several other smaller industries make up our workforce. Local industries are supportive of a STEM program in our district.

BCSS continues to update its vision, mission, belief, and goals as part of Strategic Planning and SACS accreditation every four years. We have a strong commitment statement, \textit{Graduation and Beyond...Creating Lifelong Learners.} Bartow County historically has had a cycle of literacy poverty. Nine schools in our System and Cartersville City received the SRG in 2012, allowing our community to have a focus on literacy. Involvement of our remaining schools, local daycares, and private schools will build literacy community-wide.

System demographics

Bartow County’s population is 97,098 based on Census estimates; by 2013, Bartow County’s population will be 112,137 with a projected 2.92% growth per year.

Current Priorities

Literacy begins at birth and our plan is focusing on breaking the cycle of generational poverty in literacy. Root-cause analysis indicates that birth to 4 remains one of our weakest areas. Bartow County currently serves 396 Pre-K students with a waiting list of 100.

Part of our schools received Striving Reader Grants (SRG) last year. The literacy team conducted a needs assessment of non-striving reader schools; analysis of this assessment and
disaggregated data resulted in our application for a second grant, needed in order to build continuity and sustainability system and community wide. Forty-one percent of teachers do not use data to evaluate/adjust instruction to meet student needs. Forty percent of teachers do not use intervention programs to support struggling students or allow extra time/tutoring for them.

Reading is being interrupted and we do not have a sufficient amount of time for reading as indicated by 48% of staff. Professional development is needed as indicated by 47% of the staff to support assessment/instruction for reading priorities, and to identify reading interventions shown to be effective through documented research. Sixty-three percent of staff needs training on measurement administration, scoring and data interpretation. Teachers (51%) indicate need for time to analyze, plan, and refine instruction to meet student needs.

We are trying to complete a cycle between community and school so that each student has a personal laptop to use at home and school. Equal access to technology is urgently needed for all students to be successful. Receiving this grant will result in every school being part of a birth to high school community wide literacy initiative.

Large achievement gaps are evident with our Students With Disabilities (SWD) compared to students without disabilities, and students who are Economically Deprived (ED) compared to students who are not. The following tables show these patterns:

**Table 1: Gap Analysis for All Students and Subgroups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>% DNM Economically Disadvantaged (ED)</th>
<th>% DNM Not ED</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>% DNM Students with Disabilities (SWD)</th>
<th>% DNM SWD</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% DNM ED</td>
<td>% DNM Not ED</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>% DNM SWD</td>
<td>% DNM not SWD</td>
<td>Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOCT Literature</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSGT ELA</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Percent of Students in Grades 3, 5, and 8 not meeting standards on current CRCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Grade</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis showed weaknesses in disciplinary literacy at all grades. Increasing numbers of students do not meet standards in science and social studies. As we transfer from the CRCT to PARRC Assessment this existing gap may widen.

Table 3: Percent Not Meeting on Georgia Writing Test GAPS 5-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adairsville Middle</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass Middle</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Middle</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Middle</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Percent Not Meeting: High School Writing Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>S Without D</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adairsville High</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass High</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland High</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: District Graduation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adairsville High</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland High</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals of 10 target schools met with district leaders to discuss grant requirements related to needs assessment, identification of gaps in school literacy practices, and proposal writing.

Schools literacy teams examined data and revised their literacy plans.

System Priorities:

1. Expand a comprehensive literacy plan for birth to 4 year olds.
2. Improve learning outcomes for all students through Universal Design for Learning.
3. Improve student achievement in writing across all contents and grades
4. Integrate literacy with science and technology, engineering, and mathematics (L-STEM)
5. Develop an infrastructure to support new literacies through technology use and application in every classroom.
6. Summer Intervention Convention will include families with children ages birth to 4.

Strategic Plan

The goals and objectives of our plan reflect our priorities:

**Student Achievement**: Improve curriculum mastery (Rigor, Relevance, Relationships); completion rates; reduce student achievement gaps

**School and Community Relationships**: Increase parental, community, student, and staff engagement.

**Organizational Growth and Improvement**: Develop competent, accountable work force; effective organizational communications/culture

**Operational Support**: Provide safe/secure facilities, efficient/effective student support services; ensure effective administrative processes; sustain positive fund balance.
Professional learning (PL) is the key structure that supports literacy plan for BCSS in the area of the core reading program, writing, the four tiered literacy intervention continuum, RTI, depths of knowledge, thinking maps, and vocabulary development. Assessment PL supports screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostics. Teaching units have been developed to support the common core and benchmarks. System approved reading and gifted endorsements support disciplinary literacy.

**Table 6: Past/present district initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Reading First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America’s Choice; Literacy Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches position discontinued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Scott Foresman Reading Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System literacy survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary program alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Specialist hired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientifically evidence-based programs purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCGPS Math Units developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5 Science Units developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS Next</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Units developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRG (SRG) Cohort 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM-CERT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Reading Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literacy Curriculum**

- BCSS has a standards based literacy curriculum aligned to Common Core Standards. During the past 7 years the curriculum has been standardized throughout the system to address the frequent moves of many students between schools. A core program is used in grades PreK-5. Unit plans to support the implementation of the CCGPS are being developed K-12.
- Reading taught as a separate class in middle school. Some intervention programs are available to support middle school/high school struggling students.
- System-wide literacy assessments to screen and to progress monitor such as: PALS, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, DIBELS Next Benchmark/Progress Monitoring, Informal Phonics Inventory, OAS Benchmark Assessments, Scholastic Reading
Inventory for all middle schools and Cass High. We use ACCCESS for our ELL learners. Outcome based assessments are the CRCT and End of Course Tests.
Plan for Management of the Grant Implementation:

Dr. Buffy Williams, Executive Director of Elementary Curriculum and Literacy, has overall responsibility for managing the grant implementation and supervises the district's literacy specialist and the administrative assistant. Mr. Mark Bagnell, Director of Technology supervises the nine instructional technology specialists who will coordinate the installation and maintenance of technology and train teachers on the pedagogical uses of mobile technology. Dr. Williams' staff will be available to carry out grant activities, such as coordinating, scheduling, and, at times, providing professional-learning; training teachers on new formative and summative assessments; purchasing and distributing print materials. The principals of the Striving Readers' schools will oversee grant-focused literacy activities in their schools as part of a long-term strategy to institutionalize high-impact instructional practices. BCSS's Business Office has the capacity to drawdown Striving Readers grant funds as it currently does for numerous state and federal grant programs. Under the direction of Dr. Williams, the administrative assistant for curriculum and instruction and grant management will enter and process purchase orders, and will receive, inventory, and distribute purchased items and services.

List of Individuals Responsible for the Day-to-Day Grant Operations and responsibilities of the People Involved with the Grant Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual Responsible</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Todd Hooper</td>
<td>Dr. John Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-Level Coordinators</td>
<td>Dr. Buffy Williams</td>
<td>Dr. John Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>Janice Gordon</td>
<td>AnneMarie Wiseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Coordinator</td>
<td>Mark Bagnell</td>
<td>Dr. John Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Sabin</td>
<td>Dr. John Harper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsibilities of People Involved with the Grant Implementation:

The following table shows the format for Timeline of Grant Activities and Individuals Responsible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Budget Needs</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Training Dates</th>
<th>Method of Evaluation</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Directors of Curriculum, Dr. Buffy Williams and Mr. Jim Gottwald have read each individual school’s plan and reviewed each application with both the system and school teams. In reviewing the subgrants, we looked for continuity of professional learning and training; use of contractors for training and summer literacy plans and all budget plans. Upon reviewing all of this information we clearly understand each school’s plan and will support each school’s roll-out plan. The goals and objectives for each school will be a focus for our system literacy plan as the system literacy team meets monthly. Monthly reports will be sent to the system level of how each school is progressing on their implementation timeline. The system literacy team will review each monthly report to plan for the upcoming month on how to support each school. The budget will be reviewed monthly by the system team and a report will be given to our superintendent and chief financial officer. We will share these updates with our local board of education. This grant will be in accordance with all rules and regulations required by the GaDOE. The Fiscal Requirements of Internal, Operating, Accounting and Compliance Controls will be followed as a commitment to our project.

The system literacy team is composed of leadership from each school and from the school district. This team is involved in all aspects of budget development, performance plans, and professional learning.

Time for the Literacy Team to meet twice monthly is built into the annual calendar, and the team meets at least once monthly. Minutes are maintained of team meetings and shared with the Superintendent and School Board. The System Literacy Team has met on the following dates:
Bartow County School System

August 2, 2012; September 25, 2012; October 4 and October 30, 2012; November 9 and 29, 2012; December 14.
Other initiatives with which the LEA has been involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in initial Georgia Reading First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Georgia’s Choice; Literacy Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches position discontinued (budget constraints)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Scott Foresman Reading Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School surveyed to determine how literacy taught; 27 different programs used for reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary literacy program alignment begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Reading Focus (system funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Literacy Specialist hired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools begin to purchase scientifically evidence-based core and interventions (system funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS Next (system funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Initiatives the LEA has implemented internally and with no outside funding support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Scott Foresman Reading Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School surveyed to determine how literacy taught; 27 different programs used for reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary program alignment begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Focus (system funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Literacy Specialist hired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools begin to purchase scientifically evidence-based core and interventions (system funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System ELA Benchmarks aligned to GPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic Core Vocabulary Read Aloud Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS Next</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Approved Reading and Gifted Endorsements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop ELA Unit Plans aligned to CCGPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A description of the LEA’s capacity to coordinate resources in the past.

- The initiatives implemented by the Striving Reader Grant will continue to be supported through state and federal monies as a commitment of the district curriculum and leadership teams. Millions of dollars’ worth of formula and competitive grants are coordinated each year under the direction of Ms. AnneMarie Wiseman, Director of Title I, Ms. Janice Gordon, Coordinator of Professional Learning (Title II), and Ms. Paula Camp, Coordinator for ESOL (Title VII), and Dr. Scott Smith (Title VI). Dr. Buffy Williams manages Cohort 1 of the Striving Reader Grant and will manage Cohort 2. System personnel routinely coordinate grant budgets with other federal, state, and local fiscal resources.
A description of the sustainability of initiatives implemented by the LEA.

- **Project Focus.** The goal of Project Focus was to teach children to lift print from the page fluently while embedding comprehension strategies, vocabulary, and language syntax/structures in order to comprehend grade level expository text. The objective was to provide direct explicit targeted reading instruction to rising second grade students that are achieving below grade level so that they exited at or above end of the year grade level. Scientifically research based reading programs were selected to be used in the program, including an accelerated intervention program (Torgeson, 2007; and a scientifically evidence-based grade level core reading program (Pressley, Torgeson, 2006). Explicit vocabulary instruction and reading in the content area were embedded into the program using quality picture books aligned to science and social studies Georgia Performance Standards and writing in response to reading was incorporated multiple times daily. In order to identify eligible participants, student data was analyzed. Students were eligible if they meet the following criteria: 1) Three DIBELS scores showing students at-risk, 2) Progress monitoring showing progress in the RTI process, 3) CRCT Scores – Level I or borderline Level II. This program has been in place since 2008.

- **Core Reading Program** The system phased in a scientifically evidence based core program. When system monies were not available; principals used their monies to put the core in place system wide from Kindergarten through fifth grades.

- **DIBELS Next.** In 2011 the system made the decision to change the screening and progress monitoring instrument from the DIBELS 6th Edition to DIBELS Next. Accuracy of data is critical. The Literacy Specialist received training leading to certification as a DIBELS Next Trainer and Mentor. Official DIBELS Next Transition training was delivered during the summer and fall of 2011 to teachers responsible for administering and scoring the DIBELS Next in grades K-5.

- **Reading Endorsement.** Bartow County has many teachers with Reading Endorsement. Beginning in 2000, the county participated in the training of trainers for Reading Endorsement through Northwest Georgia RESA. In the interim years, 120 teachers in the county were endorsed in the area of reading. When professional learning funds were cut for budgetary reasons, in 2009-2010 Bartow County School System wrote and was approved as a Professional Standards Commission provider for the Reading and Gifted In-field Endorsements. The Reading Endorsement Program was written to reflect the scientific evidence base in reading and embeds theory to practice in application of new learning in the participants’ classrooms. Currently, twelve administrators and 11 teachers are completing the endorsement. This initiative has full sustainability beyond the life of the grant. This opportunity will be expanded next year and in subsequent years during and beyond the life of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant in order to infuse best practices in literacy in every school in our county.

- **Classic Core Vocabulary.** In 2010 the system implemented the Classic Core Vocabulary initiative. Two classic books were selected per grade level, tier 2 vocabulary identified, and explicit vocabulary instruction was developed by a team of teachers. The initiative has been expanded each year, and now four complex classic read alouds with accompanying instruction are in place at each grade level.

- **CCGPS Units.** The system is the processing of developing and revising units that align to the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. This work began in 2010, and is
continuing. Writing in response to reading and for research purposes is being expanded and aligned to the CCGPS.
Bartow County School System: Woodland High School

School Narrative

School History

Woodland High School (WHS) was established in 1997, in Cartersville, Georgia, a rural community 45 miles northwest of Atlanta, Georgia. WHS is one of nineteen schools that make up the Bartow County School System. WHS is fed from two different Middle Schools. Of the 1,706 students, 48.7% receive federal funds for free and reduced lunch, indicating our Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students. Approximately 11% of our students are Students with Disabilities, and 21.8% are at-risk students. The school population is 80% white, 10% African-American, 7% Hispanic, .5% Asian, and the remainder unclassified. We suspect a higher number of ED students in the school population than data suggests due to parents not completing paperwork as a matter of pride and the stigma associated with being on a free or reduced lunch program.

Leadership Team and Literacy Leadership Team

WHS is led by Dr. Melissa Williams (principal), Dr. Billy Wehunt (Associate Principal), Dr. Robert Butler, Ms. Lori Scifers (full time assistant principals). Dr. Wes Dickey serves as an assistant principal and head of the Freshman Academy. The WHS School Leadership Team is composed of administrators and department heads. This team analyzes student data with student achievement being the highest priority. For this reason, our leadership strives to create and maintain an environment that educates all students as lifelong learners.

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is composed of the principal, department heads, one classroom teacher from each department, media specialist, and a special education teacher. This team meets monthly for the purpose of identifying areas of weakness, ways to improve student achievement, and ways to engage the community stakeholders. The team discusses ways
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to improve communication among stakeholders to get them involved in initiatives impacting
student achievement and well being.

**Literacy Leadership Team Initiatives**

- Create and vertically align concept skill maps based on each grade level’s Georgia
  Performance Standards (GPS)

- Facilitate department training to address the new Common Core Georgia Performance
  Standards (CCGPS) with Webinars from the Georgia Department of Education.

- Monitor and create tutoring programs.

- Disaggregate data to improve instruction and give suggestions as to ways to improve.

- Distribute a School Level Needs Assessment

**Past Instructional Initiatives**

WHS has studied and implemented a myriad of strategies to improve school environment
and increase student achievement. Weaknesses in the past stem from the frequent change of
administration over the past fourteen years. These changes in vision have polarized faculty
members from consistency. The latest curriculum changes have been continued through training
Webinars for the new CCGPS. A literacy plan is needed to increase options for at-risk students
that will have a lasting impact throughout the school and community. To sustain and increase
achievement in language arts and improve math achievement, WHS received training for the new
CCGPS. From the CCGPS training, data from assessments, graduation, retention rates, and the
online and school needs assessments indicated a need to improve literacy across the school.

**Current Instructional Initiatives**

**Assessments & Determining Instructional Based Strategies**

WHS analyzes End of Course Assessments (EOCTs), Georgia High School Graduation
Test (GHSGT), and retention data to assess effectiveness of the implementation of Georgia
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Performance (GPS) and Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS). The GHSWT is administered to 11th graders in the fall. At the conclusion of each test and year, the Leadership Team disaggregates and then shares the data with the teachers, and from this EOCT data, teachers revisit their areas of weakness and the standards the students exceeded, met, or did not meet. Data is broken down into the various subgroups and from this data we build a School Improvement Plan. The collective data help to form the district plan. The school builds the plan from district and individual school data.

Needs Assessment for Literacy & a Scientifically Evidence-based Core Reading Program

This year WHS administered a survey called the Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment to determine needs. The survey indicated that all subjects lacked proficiency in reading and writing. In social science or science classes, students are not showing literacy proficiency. Universally, teachers agree for the need for a scientifically evidence-based core to improve reading. This year monies were used to provide the core throughout the school and met the need for an aligned evidence-based reading program that incorporates explicit strategy instruction, inquiry, and non-fiction text.

Professional Learning Needs

A Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment indicated a need for more training in implementing the core program. Additionally, training is needed in planning for differentiated instruction and inquiry and implementing comprehension strategies. Our needs assessment also revealed that teachers need better technology resources and training in writing across the curriculum.

Need for a Striving Readers Project
Concern voiced by teachers includes identification of students' oral language development and planning of instructional activities for acquisition of vocabulary and syntax. The Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy project will enable us to provide technology for all instructors who currently do not have access to adequate resources. The technology we use does not meet 21st Century classroom needs. This will allow integrated use of the scientifically evidenced based core for small group instruction. The lack of access to technology for the 21.8% of the students who are economically disadvantaged in our school is a problem. For example, students are equipped with many of the skills needed to type a report, but need to understand how to use the tools to communicate effectively, to research, and to collaborate as a member of a community of learners.

Due to our location, students have limited access to information resources to make real world connections. In addition, the economic downturn has impeded our ability to travel outside the confines of Bartow County. The ability to use Web resources to provide virtual field trips will aid in the development of needed background knowledge that many of our students are lacking.

Curriculum Needs

Although students have access to after-school tutoring, they have a very limited number of materials to support effective delivery of interventions. While a common planning block is used to help departments improve planning and instruction, teachers are addled without appropriate materials. According to the Needs Assessment Survey completed in departments, teachers need additional training in the use of the Bartow County Reading Intervention Continuum to provide needs-based instruction for struggling readers and writers. We need to not only identify and purchase sufficient intervention materials aligned to student needs, but must
provide training so teachers can implement them with fidelity. Without this curriculum change, we will sustain or worsen the EOCT passing and retention rate. Students also need the tools to meet or exceed standards on the EOCTs.

Technology Needs

Students

- Support of materials for the core reading program by each student in the WHS Freshman Academy having access to notebook computer.

- Desktop Publishing materials that support the core reading program and writing process.

Teachers

- 110 projectors and 116 notebook computers for instructors. At present, there are many components in our technology infrastructure that is outdated or is not working.

- Projection units for sharing and analyzing student work at the classroom and grade level. Rigor is increased as students can actively show their work during the closing of lesson segments. Students have the opportunity to effectively engage in reciprocal teaching using multiple modes.

- Professional Learning and development to increase literacy strategies and support in the classroom and to support the school-wide literacy plan.
# Building Block 1. Engaged Leadership

## A. Action: Demonstrate commitment to learn about and support evidence-based literacy instruction in the school

Woodland High School (WHS) has always demonstrated a commitment to learning, but literacy instruction has always occurred in elementary and middle school. The reality is that many students continue to make it to high school unable to read and write on grade level. “Twenty-five percent of students read below the basic, proficiency level, which means they do not have minimal reading skills to understand and learn from text at their grade level” (Kamil, Borman, Dole, Kral, Salinger, & Torgesen, 2008) (Why p28). Unfortunately, WHS has fallen behind in literacy instruction. While we have extremely talented teachers in all content areas, we are desperate for literacy instruction, techniques, and training within the content areas.

### Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Participating in state-sponsored Webinars and face-to-face sessions to learn about the transition to CCGPS (What 1.A.1 p5)
2. Scheduling protected time for literacy and teacher collaboration (What 1.A.5 p5)

### Best Practices to Implement

   - 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 (How 1.A p20)
2. Participating in literacy instruction with the faculty (What 1.A.3 p5)
   - Provide time and support for staff to participate in job-embedded professional learning (including coaching, peer-mentoring, learning community, grade-level meetings focused on student work, etc.) (How 1.A p20)
3. Regularly monitoring literacy instruction within the school (What 1.A.4 p5)
   - 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 (How 1.A p20)

## B. Action: Organize a Literacy Leadership Team

After looking at the data, Woodland High School’s administration and leadership team quickly realized that our school needs to effectively increase our disciplinary literacy. We are not prepared to help our students meet or exceed the Georgia Common Core Performance Standards. The first solution they had was to create a literacy team made up of stakeholders involved in all areas of the school to explore solutions to this problem. “The role of leadership in developing literacy in the nation, state, district, school and classroom cannot be overstated. It is a key piece in virtually every
literacy initiative undertaken at any level in education.” (Why pg 156)

**Current Best Practices to Continue**

1. Multiple forms of student, school, and teacher data (including results of the Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist or its equivalent) have been analyzed to develop a list of prioritized recommendations and goals for improvement. (What 1.B.3 p5)
2. The literacy leadership team consists of the following stakeholders and partners, at a minimum: (What 1.B.1 p5)
   a. Faculty
   b. Representatives from the school stakeholders (i.e., preschools, daycares, middle schools within our school’s feeder pattern as well as students and representatives from higher education)
   c. Community and government leaders
   d. Parents

**Best Practices to Implement**

1. Create a shared literacy vision for the school and community that is aligned with the state literacy plan. (What 1.B.2 p5; How 1.B p2)
   - Ensure that stakeholders understand literacy goals and their roles in meeting these goals. (How 1.B p21)
   - Utilize technology to maintain communication among team members. (How 1.B p21)
2. Research-based guidelines, strategies and resources for literacy instruction (as set forth in the “The Why” document of the most current iteration of the Georgia Literacy Plan) will be incorporated into all practices and instruction. (What 1.B.4 p5)
   - Provide professional learning and support for staff in making the transition to the CCGPS. (How 1.B p21)
   - Ensure use of research-based practices aligned with CCGPS. (How 1.B p21)
   - Evaluate current practices in all classrooms by using an observation or walkthrough tool (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA or some other instrument) to determine strengths in literacy instruction and to identify needs for improvement. (How 1.B p21)
   - Plan for ongoing data collection and analysis to inform program development and improvement. (How 1.B p21)
3. Identify and prioritize a list of students to be targeted for intervention or support. (How 1.B p21)
   - Develop a brochure or chart mapping community resources for families of adolescents to be shared in hardcopy and online. (How 1.B p21)

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

While reading and writing occurs in each classroom, WHS does not have any specific time allotted or required for disciplinary literacy. "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
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content-area classes.” (Biancorosa & Snow, 2006, p. 20.) (Why p58). The Striving Reader’s Grant will provide WHS with the resources for professional learning in discipline literacy instruction and interventions. WHS currently schedules the four core departments with a common planning period to aid in collaborative planning, so now we need to focus on providing teaching strategies across the content areas, including the electives.

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Protected time for collaborative planning teams within and across content areas is part of the school-wide calendar. (What 1.C.5 p6)
2. Intentional efforts have been made to identify and eliminate inefficient use of student and faculty time within the schedule. (What 1.C.6 p6)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Ensure that students in grades 9-12 receive two to four hours of literacy instruction across language arts and in content area classes. (What 1.C.2 p6; How 1.C p22-23)
2. Build time for intervention into the school schedule for each day. (What 1.C.3 p6)
   • Study flexible scheduling options to include additional time for reading intervention (double dosing) (How 1.C p23)
3. Leverage instructional time for literacy by scheduling disciplinary literacy in all content areas. (What 1.C.4 p6)

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

The high school culture has always thought that literacy belongs in elementary and middle school. If we want to do our absolute best for our students, we can no longer think that way. Literacy is the responsibility of every teacher and stakeholder in WHS. We need to change the way we think and teach at the high school level. But it doesn’t stop with the teachers. We must also change the culture and mindset of the students. “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) (“Why” pg 53). By learning literacy strategies and incorporating technology as well as a STEM focus, we will increase literacy and engagement within our school.

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Evaluate the school culture and current practices by surveying strengths and needs for improvement (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA or some other instrument) (How 1.D p24)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Faculty and staff will participate in targeted, sustained professional learning on literacy strategies within the content area. (What 1.D.1 p6)
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- Study current research on disciplinary literacy in the content areas. (How 1.D p25)
2. A walk-through and/or observation form (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA or some other instrument) will be used to ensure consistency of effective instructional practices that include disciplinary literacy across content areas. (What 1.D.2 p6)
  - Monitor instruction to ensure consistent use of effective instructional practices that include disciplinary literacy and active student engagement across content areas (How 1.D p25)

E. Action: Optimize literacy instruction across all content areas

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) (“Why” pg 124).

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Teachers have or will participate in professional learning on the following:
  - Using informational text in English language arts classes. (What 1.E.3.b p6)

Best Practices to Implement

1. The school will agree upon a plan to integrate literacy in all subjects as articulated within CCGPS. (What 1.E.1 p6)
  - Identify research-based strategies and appropriate resources to support student learning of the CCGPS as well as for differentiated instruction through tiered tasks. (How 1.E p26)
  - Support teachers in the integration of literacy instruction and skill development necessary for achievement in all subjects as articulated within CCGPS. (How 1.E p26)
2. Develop and require a common, systematic procedure for teaching academic vocabulary in all subjects using a systematic process such as those developed by the Georgia architects (What 1.E.2 p6; How 1.E p26).
3. Require writing as an integral part of every class every day. (What 1.E.3 p6)
  - 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 (How 1.E p26-27)
  - Identify or develop a school-wide writing rubric that is aligned with the CCGPS to set clear expectations and goals for performance. (How 1.E p27)
4. Teachers will participate in professional learning on the following: (What 1.E.4 p6)
  - Incorporating the use of literary texts in content areas
    Provide teachers with resources to provide a variety and choice in reading materials and writing topics (How 1.E p27)
  - Incorporating writing instruction (narrative, argument, and informational) in all subject areas
  - Selecting text complexity that is appropriate to grade levels as required by CCGPS
  - Selecting text complexity that is adjusted to the needs of individual students
- Instructing students in the following:
  - Conducting short research projects that use several sources
  - Identifying and navigating the text structures most common to a particular content area (e.g., social studies, cause and effect; science, problem/solution)
  - Supporting opinions with reasons and information
  - Determining author bias or point of view

5. Implement a system of videotaping to develop the infrastructure for peer-to-peer coaching, modeling, co-teaching, observing and providing feedback to fellow teachers on the development of disciplinary literacy in all content areas. (How 1.E p26)

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.

“The role of leadership in developing literacy in the nation, state, district, school and classroom cannot be overstated. It is a key piece in virtually every literacy initiative undertaken at any level in education.” (Why pg 156)

**Best Practices to Implement**

1. A community advisory board will actively participate in developing and achieving literacy goals. Members include governmental, civic, and business leaders, as well as parents. (What 1.F.1 p7)
   - Create a shared vision for literacy for the school and community, making the vision tangible and visible (e.g., number of students involved in active book clubs; graphing scores; rewards for improvement in literacy) (How 1.F p28)

2. Create an active network of learning supports within the community that targets student improvement (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, afterschool programming). (What 1.F.2 p7)
   - Identify and contact learning supports in the community that target student improvement (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, afterschool programming)
   - Establish a mentoring system from within and outside of the school for every student who needs additional support
   - Enlist members of the various participating entities to provide leadership by:
     - Serving as mentors
     - Speaking to groups of students
     - Publicizing efforts within the community
     - Visiting classrooms to support teachers and students
     - Adoption of different schools by civic groups (How 1.F p28)

3. Utilize social media to communicate and promote the goals of literacy throughout the community at large. (What 1.F.3 p7)

4. Publically celebrate academic successes through traditional and online media. (What 1.F.4 p7)
### 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.)

WHS currently has each core department share a specific planning period to be used for collaboration. We will continue to offer that and provide specific professional learning and practice literacy strategies across the curriculum.

#### Best Practices to Implement

1. Create cross-disciplinary teams for literacy instruction. (What 2.A.1.p7)
   - Administration will establish expectations for shared responsibility for literacy across the curriculum. (How 2.A.p29)
   - Establish cross-disciplinary teams for literacy instruction. (How 2.A.p29)
2. Establish and select protocols for team meetings. (What 2.A.2.p7) (How 2.A.p29)
3. Schedule time for teams to meet for regularly scheduled collaboration and examination of student data/work. (What 2.A.3.p7)
   - Create and meet with disciplinary teams, either physically or virtually, according to regularly established times for collaborative planning for the purpose of examining student data/work. (How 2.A.p29)
4. Identify and clearly articulate team roles, protocols, and expectations. (What 2.A.4.p7)
   - Define and use protocols to examine student work (e.g., collaborative assessment, conference, consultancy, tuning protocols). (How 2.A.p29)
5. Research and define the components of the professional learning community model developed by the Georgia architects in order for staff to understand and implement the model appropriately. (What 2.A.5.p7)
6. Identify specific, measurable student achievement goals aligned with grade-level expectations are shared by teachers in all subjects. (What 2.A.6.p7)
   - Plan and implement lessons that address the literacy needs of students. (How 2.A.p29)
7. Develop and design infrastructure for shared responsibility of the development of literacy across the curriculum. (How 2.A.p29)

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

"In order to help students become more proficient at comprehension, teachers should model the seven habits of good readers in the classroom. Read-Aloud/Think-Aloud (RATA) is one of several effective strategies for modeling strategies for students." (Why p55) All teachers will need professional learning in this area.

#### Best Practices to Implement

1. Teachers coach, model, co-teach, observe, and give feedback to fellow teachers using videos and social media where possible on the use of literacy strategies in the classroom. (What 2.B.1.p7)
Integrate literacy strategies and skill development necessary for achievement in all subjects as articulated within CCGPS. (How 2.B.p30)

- Use videos and social media where possible to enhance literacy strategies in the classroom. (How 2.B.p30-31)

2. Teachers use a school-wide, commonly adopted writing rubric that aligns with the CCGPS to set clear expectations and goals for performance. (What 2.B.2.p7)

- Study and assess a variety of strategies for incorporating writing in all content areas (How 2.B.p31)

3. Infuse all types of literacy are infused into all content areas throughout the day (e.g., print, non-print, online, blogs, wikis, social media). (What 2.B.3.p7)

- Discuss ways to infuse literacy throughout the day including the use of technology. (How 2.B.3.p31)

- Provide variety and choice in the types of media and genre for both reading and writing assignments. (How 2.B.p31)

- Develop meaningful opportunities for students to write, speak, and listen using social media for both face-to-face and online options. (How 2.B.3.p31)

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

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Continue the use of various models of communication (both virtual and face-to-face) that are active with key personnel in out-of-school organizations and governmental agencies that support students and families. (What 2.C.1.p8)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Various models of coordinating “wrap-around” services have been studied, (e.g., Community Schools, http://dhs.georgia.gov/portal/site/DHS-DFCS). (What 2.C.1.p7)

- Identify and contact learning supports in the community that target student improvement (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, out-of-school programming). (How 2.C.1.p32)

2. Develop a comprehensive system of learning supports to enhance motivation and capability of the critical mass of stakeholders is in place. (What 2.C.2.p8)

3. Technologies are utilized to more creatively and effectively support stakeholder engagement, i.e., blogs, social media, electronic newsletters. (What 2.C.3.p8)

- Establish a means of continual communication e.g., texting, social media, email, etc.) between teachers and out of school providers. (How 2.C.3.p32)
Building Block 3. Ongoing formative and summative assessments

“The Georgia Literacy plan promotes the use of ongoing, frequent, and multiple measures that will be used as diagnostic and monitoring tools to plan for instruction. It is necessary to examine both summative and formative assessments, to determine how that data positively affects instruction, and to see how formative assessments enhance the overall picture of assessment.” (Why p94-95)

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

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. A calendar for formative assessments based on local, state, and program guidelines, including specific timeline for administration and persons responsible has been developed. (What 3 A.5 p 8)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Research and select effective screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools to identify achievement levels of all students, advanced as well as struggling. (What 3 A.1 p8)(How 3A p34-35)
2. Locate or develop common mid-course assessments used across classrooms that include a variety of formats (multiple choice, short answer, constructed response, essay). (What 3 A.2 p8)(How 3.A p34-35)
3. Create assessment and intervention materials that align with students’ needs, and provide training for personnel. (What 3 A.2 p8)
4. Update technology infrastructure, if necessary, to support assessment administration and dissemination of results. (What 3 A.4 p8) (How 3A. 34-35)

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

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. A formative assessment calendar based on local and state times for administration and the persons responsible has been identified. (What 3 B.2 p8)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Research and select effective screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools to identify achievement levels of all students. (What 3B.1 p8) (How B p. 36)
2. Develop commonly shared mid-course assessments, which include a variety of formats (multiple choice, short answer, constructed response, essay), are used across classrooms to identify classrooms needing support. (What 3B.2 p8) (How B p.36)
3. Research and select universal screening, progress monitoring, and curriculum-based assessments which will be used to determine instructional decisions regarding flexible 4-tier service options for
Response to Intervention (RTI). (What 3B.3 p8) (How B p.36)
4. Develop Intervention materials aligned with students’ needs and provide training for staff. (What 3B.2 p8)(How B p. 36)
5. Develop assessment measures that are regularly used to identify high achieving/advanced learners who would benefit from enrichment or advanced coursework. (What 3B.2 p8) (How B p.36)

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

**Best Practices to Implement**

1. Develop a protocol for ensuring that students identified by screenings routinely receive diagnostic assessment. (What 3C.1 p9) (How 3C p.37)
2. Where possible, identify diagnostic assessments that isolate the component skills needed for mastery of literacy standards. (What 3C.2 p9) (How 3C p.37)
3. Select interventions that include diagnostic assessments and multiple-entry points to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach. (What 3C.3 p9) (How 3C p.37)

D. Action: Use summative data to make programming decisions as well as to monitor individual student progress

**Current Best Practices to Continue**

1. Specific times for analysis of the previous year’s outcome assessments are identified in the school calendar to determine broad student needs and serve as a baseline for improvement. Those assessments are: (What 3D.2 p9)
   - End-of-Course Tests (EOCT) in grades 9-12 in math, social studies, science, and English language arts
   - Georgia Alternate Assessmen: (GAA) for students with disabilities
   - Georgia High School Writing Test (GHWT) given in fall of junior year

**Best Practices to Implement**

1. Devote time in teacher team meetings to review and analyze assessment results to identify needed program and instructional adjustments. (What 3D.2 p9) (How 3D. p37-38)
2. During teacher team meetings, focus discussions on changes that can be made to improve the instructional program for all students. (What 3D.2 p9) (How 3D p 38-39)
3. Disaggregate data to ensure the progress of subgroups. (What 3D.3 p9) (How D p38)

E. Action: Develop a clearly articulated strategy for using data to improve teaching and learning (See V. A.)

**Best Practices to Implement**
1. Develop and follow a protocol for making decisions to identify the instructional needs of students. (What 3E.1 p9) (How 3E p39)
2. Develop an adequate data storage and retrieval system that is understood and used by all appropriate staff members. (What 3E.2 p9) (How 3E p39)
3. Establish procedures and expectations for staff to review, analyze, and disseminate assessment results. (What 3E.3 p9) (How 3E p38-39)
4. Develop and regularly follow protocols for team meetings. (What 3E.4 p9) (How 3E p39)
Building Block 4. Best Practices in Literacy Instruction

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

“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.)” (Why pg 58) In keeping with the expectation of a rigorous curriculum and standards for all students, including English Language Learners, students with exceptional needs, and other at-risk populations, it is crucial that teachers access students’ prior knowledge and build upon students’ background experiences. By taking into consideration the individual needs and strengths of all students, teachers build a foundation for the implementation of appropriate strategies that lead to academic success. (Why p41).

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Differentiating instruction (What 4.A.6 p10)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Research and select a core program that will provide continuity based on a carefully articulated scope and sequence of skills that is integrated into a rich curriculum of literary and informational texts (What 4.A.1 p9; How 4.A p40)
   - Provide training to all pertinent staff in the use of the core program. (How 4.A p40)
2. Examine student data regularly to identify areas of instruction with greatest needs (e.g., phonological awareness, word identification, fluency, vocabulary, word study, comprehension, motivation and engagement). (What 4.A.2 p9; How 4.A p40)
3. Administration conducts classroom observations (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA) using an assessment tool to gauge current practice in literacy instruction. (What 4.A.3 p10)
4. Allocate which aspects of literacy instruction students are to receive in each subject area. (What 4.A.5 p10; How 4.A p40)
5. Plan and provide professional learning on differentiated instructional options for literacy assignments (How 4.A p41)
6. Plan and provide the following professional learning within each subject area:
   a. Using of data to inform instructional decisions and explicit teaching
   b. Selecting of appropriate text and strategy for instruction
   c. Telling students specific strategies to be learned and why
   d. Modeling of how strategy is used
   e. Providing guidance and independent practice with feedback
   f. Discussing when and where strategies are to be applied (What 4.A.6 p10; How 4.A p40)
B. Action: Ensure that students receive effective writing instruction across the curriculum

"Technological advances, changing workplace demands, and cultural shifts make writing more important than ever, especially because the way we write often predicts academic and/or job success. Creates opportunities, maintains relationships, and enhances critical thinking. (NCTE, 2008, p.1) Because students enter the classroom with such diverse needs, one single approach is no longer effective (NCTE, 2008, p. 1). According to NCTE, "Instructional practices, writing genres, and assessments should be holistic, authentic, and varied," (NCTE, 2008, p. 2)" (Why p44). "Students’ reading comprehension is improved by having them increase how often they produce their own texts" (Graham & Hebert, 2010, p. 5)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Create a plan for instruction in writing that is consistent with CCGPS and is articulated vertically and horizontally. (What 4.B.1 p10; How 4.C p42)
2. Develop a coordinated plan for writing instruction across all subject areas that includes:
   a. Explicit instruction
   b. Guided practice
3. Develop or identify the programs, protocol, and/or materials necessary to implement the plan at each level. (How 4.C p42)
5. In every class at least one day a week, teachers will provide instruction in and opportunities for one of the following: (What 4.B.4 p10)
   - Developing an argument citing relevant and reliable textual evidence
   - Writing coherent informational or explanatory texts
   - Writing narratives to develop real or imaginary experiences to explore content area topics
6. Create a plan that describes how technology will be used for production, publishing, and communication across the curriculum (What 4.B.5 p10; How 4.C p42)

C. Extended time is provided for literacy instruction.

"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.)" (Why pg 58)

Best Practices to Implement

1. In any grade in which instruction is departmentalized students will receive two to four hours of literacy instruction across language arts and in content area classes. (What 4.C.2 p10)
2. Leverage instructional time for literacy by instruction in disciplinary literacy in all content areas.
D. Action: Teachers work to develop and maintain interest and engagement as students’ progress through school.

“Though it is listed as one of nine recommendations for improving instruction for adolescents, the Georgia Literacy Team has taken the stance that this is an area that requires unique focus. 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. 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) (Why p51)

**Current Best Practices to Continue**

1. Provide students with opportunities to self-select reading material and topics for research (What 4.D.1 p11)
2. Take steps to provide students with an understanding of the relevance of academic assignments to their lives (What 4.D.2 p11)

**Best Practices to Implement**

1. Increase access to texts that students consider engaging (What 4.D.3 p11)
2. Increase opportunities for collaborating with peers in the learning process (What 4.D.4 p11)
3. Scaffold students’ background knowledge and competency in navigating literary and informational texts to ensure their confidence and self-efficacy (What 4.D.5 p11)
4. Leverage the creative use of technology within the learning process to promote engagement and relevance (What 4.D.6 p11)
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.)

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). The effectiveness of interventions requires an analysis of previously conducted research that supports the design of the intervention and a review of current research.

Three components of these bills mandate the use of research- and evidence-based interventions:
1. Requirement for the use of scientifically based instructional/intervention practices
2. Evaluation and documentation of how a student responds to intervention
3. Emphasis on the use of data for decision making at each step (Brown-Chidesy & Steege, 2005) (Why p124)

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. Continue to track the percentage of students currently served by grade levels K-12 in each tier to determine the efficacy of instruction in each tier. (What 5.A.1. p11)
   - Articulate goals/objectives at building and system level based on identified grade-level and building needs, as well as system needs. (How 5.A. p43)
2. Continue to incorporate the protocols for identifying students and matching them to the appropriate interventions already in place. (What 5.A.2. p11)
3. Continue to monitor, frequently, interventions, in order to ensure that they occur regularly and with fidelity. (What 5.A.3. p11)
4. Develop protocols for identifying students and matching them to the appropriate intervention(s). (How 5.A. p43) The Response to Intervention (RTI) is a protocol of academic and behavioral interventions designed to provide early, effective assistance for ALL underperforming students. Research-based interventions are implemented, and frequent progress monitoring is conducted to assess student response and progress. When students do not make progress, increasingly more intense interventions are introduced. (Why p 125)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Analyze frequently the results of formative assessments in order to ensure that students are progressing and/or adjusting to the instruction in order to match their needs. (What 5.A.4. p11)
   - Implementation of RTI requires a school-wide common understanding of the Common Core
   - Georgia Performance Standards (GPS), assessment practices, and instructional pedagogy.
   - Data-driven decision making must be available at the classroom level. (Why p125)
Current Best Practices to Continue

1. If fewer than 80% of students are successful in any area:
   - Teachers participate in ongoing professional learning on the following:
   - School-wide understanding of assessment data and anticipated levels of student mastery during the school year (What 5.B.3.d. p12) Tier 1 interventions include seating arrangements, fluid and flexible grouping, lesson pacing, collaborative work, demonstrations of learning, differentiation of instruction, and student feedback. Responding to student performance is a critical element of all classroom learning environments. The teacher’s ability to identify areas of focus, scaffold the learning for the individual to reach the expectation, and support the solidification of new learning behaviors is vital to student success. For more information: http://www.rinetwork.org/learn/research/response-to-intervention-research-is-the-sum-of-the-parts-as-great-as-the-whole. (Why p126)

Best Practices to Implement

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

1. Examine student data to determine the instructional areas of greatest need (e.g., decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, written expression). (What 5.B.1. p11) Universal screenings to target groups in need of specific instructional support. (Why p132)
   - Use student data to determine the current percentage of successful students in the areas of literacy (i.e., reading and writing) (How 5.B. p43)

2. Implement and assess the current practices in literacy instruction in each subject area using an approved checklist (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, GA or some equivalent instrument) and a review of teachers’ lesson plans. (What 5.B.2. p11) Implementation of the CCGPS by 2014 in a standards-based classroom. (Why p132) 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. (Why p133)

3. Use system-developed classroom-based formative assessments to monitor consistent grade-level implementation of curriculum and to gauge students’ progress toward mastery of CCGPS at each grade level. (How 5.B. p44) Progress monitoring of learning through multiple formative assessments. (Why p132) Schools should identify common formative assessments and a common protocol for analyzing and recording student progress. (Why p133)

4. Provide teachers with ongoing opportunities for professional learning on the following:
   - Direct, explicit instructional strategies that build students’ word identification, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills. (What 5.B.3. p11) (How 5.B. p44)
   - Differentiation of instruction including fluid, flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, and demonstration of learning. (Why p132)
   - Team teaching and inclusion of students with special learning needs (EL, SWD, gifted) in the general education setting (What 5.B.3. p12)

5. Ensure effectiveness of interventions by: 1) Building sufficient blocks of time into the daily
Current Best Practices to Continue

1. In addition to everything that occurs at T1 and T2, data teams (expanded to include ESOL teacher, SLP, etc.) meet to: (What 5.D.1.a.e. p12)
   - Discuss students in T3 who fail to respond to intervention.
   - Ensure that interventionists have maintained fidelity to intervention protocol prior to referral to SST.
Best Practices to Implement

1. In addition to everything that occurs at T1 and T2, data teams (expanded to include school psych, ESOL teacher, SLP, etc.) meet to:
   - Receive professional learning on Student Support Team processes and procedures as outlined in the GaDOE manual and guidance. (What 5.D.1.b. p12)
   - Receive professional learning on SST processes and procedures as outlined in the GaDOE manual and guidance. (How 5.D. p46)

3. The data team will confirm the fidelity of implementation of the interventions through frequent contact and observation during instruction. Additional Tier 2 interventions may be required if little or no progress is documented. (Why p134) The Georgia Department of Education encourages systems and schools to use these protocols to provide a common framework for choosing evidence-based interventions:
   - Evidence-Based Decision-Making Cycle: Shows the process that teams can utilize to integrate the use of data and research into the decision-making cycle.
   - Types of Research Methods: Provides an overview of the types of research methods used in research on interventions and compares the level of rigor in determining “what works.”
   - Critical Reading Protocol for Studies and Interventions: Provides a framework (in conjunction with the Types of Research Methods tool) for assessing the quality and rigor of a research study on an intervention.
   - Intervention Review Protocol: Provides a framework (in conjunction with the Types of Research Methods and Critical Reading Protocol tools) for the review of all available information on an intervention, including research studies, to support decisions about the selection of interventions. (Why p129)

4. Teachers consistently provide research-validated interventions designed to meet individual student’s needs. (How 5.D. p46) Data-driven decision making must be available at the classroom level. (Why p125)

5. T3 SST/data teams will meet at least once a month to discuss student progress based on daily interventions that include a minimum of four data points. (What 5.D.2. p12) (How 5.D. p46)


7. T3 SST/data teams will follow the established protocol to determine the specific reason when an EL fails to make progress (i.e., language difficulty or difference vs. disorder). (What 5.D.4. p12) (How 5.D. p46) 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. (Why p134)

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.

Professional learning in intervention strategies must be aligned with the needs of the students and the goals of the school’s leadership team. Interventions may include supplemental materials that embed
literacy skills in all content areas. Supplemental materials may be used to increase students’
opportunities for academic success. Materials that engage students in learning are viable intervention
tools that increase the numbers of Georgia students who successfully perform in all content areas.
(Why p124) Applying best practices strategies will impact all students. For ELL students in
early grades, these strategies supplemented with more extensive recommendations will enhance
the intervention efforts. 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). (Why p132)

Current Best Practices to Continue

1. School schedules will continue to be developed to ensure least restrictive environment (LRE).
(What 5.E.1. p12)
2. Building and system administrators are familiar with funding formulas affecting students in special
programming. (What 5.E.2. p13)
3. Continue to retain the most highly qualified and experienced teacher to support the delivery of
instruction for students with the most significant needs (i.e., best Geometry teacher teams with best
special education teacher for team-taught instruction). (What 5.E.3. p13)

Best Practices to Implement

1. Special education, ESOL, and gifted teachers participate in professional learning communities to
ensure strict alignment with delivery of CCGPS, even in separate settings (What 5.E.4. p13)
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Needs Assessment, Concerns, and Root Cause Analysis

a) Description of the Needs Assessment Process

A literacy assessment was determined for use at both the district and school level. All teachers county-wide were assessed using a county survey. This assessment determined district needs and helped to set goals for literacy at that level. The school used the Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment via departments to determine school needs, goals, and objectives.

b) The types and styles of surveys.

A Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment was administered at the department level in the school. The survey indicated that all subjects lack reading and writing skills. In social science or science classes, students are not showing literacy proficiency.

Universally, teachers agree for the need for a scientifically evidence-based core to improve reading.

Concerns from the needs assessment were noted in math and science. EOCT data for math and science content areas identified significant gaps in the following populations:

- SWD/Non-SWD Math - 49.3
- SWD/Non-SWD Science - 50.7
- ED/Non-ED Math - 22.9
- ED/Non-ED Science - 18.8
- White/Non-White Math - 17.8
- White/Non-White Science - 12.2

Additionally, at grade levels 9 and 11, a high percentage of students are enrolled in
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remedial programs/courses: 25% for 9th grade and 19.9% for 11th grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
<th>What We Have Done</th>
<th>What We Have Not Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Active Literacy Team            | • Lack of understanding in best practices of school-wide literacy or interdisciplinary literacy practices.  
• Active Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)  
• Highly qualified new hires  
• LLT uses data to create/adjust school improvement plan  
• School commitment to STEM  
• Administer surveys to staff, students and parents  
• Assess data on attendance, discipline and assessment | • Regular literacy observations  
• Professional Learning for LLT in literacy  
• Improve our technology used for literacy  
• Looked at data regarding literacy  
• Better use time and personnel in school scheduling and planning |
| Literacy Across the Curriculum  | • Need for professional learning – reading endorsement, reading theory, reading and writing across the curriculum  
(What 1.E.1. p 6) (How 1.A. p 20) | • Developed a STEM focus  
• Common Planning | • Provide professional learning  
• Adopt a research-based common procedure for teaching academic vocabulary and writing  
• Common planning should address a consistent literary focus  
• Align goals for literacy across the curriculum |
| Community Involvement in Literacy | • Lack of communication using face to face, virtual, and e-communication (i.e. social media, blogs, wikis, email) | • Social media is used to distribute information  
• Local media promotes school related events  
• School council meets bi-monthly | • Create an advisory board including community members to support and promote literacy  
• Broaden our use of social media and print media |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
<th>What We Have Done</th>
<th>What We Have Not Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p 32-33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>We do not have a school-wide universal screening and progress monitoring instrument.</td>
<td>Implemented for special needs students</td>
<td>CTAE create and implement a program to read in the community and local hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>We do not have a clearly articulated school-wide protocol for formative assessment and progress monitoring</td>
<td>benchmarks and common mid-terms are being implemented now</td>
<td>Train ECE students in reading strategies to read aloud to elementary aged students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessments for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>Lack of understanding of appropriate interventions</td>
<td>SST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>Limited funds for interventions</td>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>Collegial observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interventions</td>
<td>Lack of understanding of adolescent literacy needs</td>
<td>Tutoring available before and after school daily</td>
<td>Continue to educate and implement RTI process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What 3.A. p 11)(How 4.C. p 42-43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit recovery available</td>
<td>Differentiate between tier 1,2,3 interventions and teach accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remediation for testing (GHSGT and high stakes testing)</td>
<td>Expand SST to include school social worker, psychologist, ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern</td>
<td>Root Cause</td>
<td>What We Have Done</td>
<td>What We Have Not Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of teacher training in diagnosis of student needs and designing interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>and counselors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide adequate/additional time for literacy instruction (What 4.A.2,3. p 10) | • Balancing graduation requirements and repeating courses with time for reading intervention  
• Limited personnel trained in literacy deficits  
• Lack of student motivation to participate outside the school day |                                                         | No time in current daily schedule                  |
| Professional learning for literacy and interventions (What 1.A.1-6. p 5)(How 1.C. p 22) | • Initial professional learning is not sustained to support initiatives.  
• Difficult to find credentialed instructors  
• Limited time to implement professional learning. | • Ongoing CCGPS training  
• Common planning time  
• Extensive new teacher orientation and training | • Train new teachers in literacy  
• Implement training programs for literacy (all teachers)  
• Promote teacher “buy in” for any implemented literacy program and training. |
Analysis of Student Teacher Data

End of Course Test (EOCT) Data – Students with Disabilities (SWD) vs. Non-SWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>SWD DNM No.</th>
<th>SWD DNM %</th>
<th>Non-SWD DNM No.</th>
<th>Non-SWD DNM %</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>-49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>-45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>-50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>-31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart is an indicator of the difference between Students with Disabilities (SWD) and other students on the End of Course (EOCT). It demonstrates the need for a literacy program. This chart shows that SWD are almost twice as likely to fail as those not receiving special needs support. The chart is indicative of the focus in literacy across the curriculum and STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) courses.

End of Course Test (EOCT) Data – Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>African American DNM %</th>
<th>Hispanic DNM %</th>
<th>Average Non-White %</th>
<th>White DNM %</th>
<th>Gap vs. Non White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>+0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>-14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart from disaggregated data by ethnicity on the End of Course Test (EOCT) shows a gap between students who are non-white and whites. Non-whites are more likely to not meet standards versus their counterparts in subgroups.

End of Course Test (EOCT) Data – Economically Disadvantaged (ED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ED Total</th>
<th>ED DNM %</th>
<th>Non-ED Total</th>
<th>Non-ED DNM %</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>-22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>898</th>
<th>483</th>
<th>33.2%</th>
<th>415</th>
<th>14.4%</th>
<th>-18.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart is indicative of the problem facing WHS. The status of wealth shows a significant difference between those who are Economically Disadvantaged (ED) over their counterparts. Of particular notice is the statistic of math and science courses. As literacy and focus in the STEM courses are of importance in this study, students are more than likely to fail those tests twice as much as those who are not ED.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

Overall, WHS students score at or above state average on EOCTs in the content areas of Math II, American Literature, United States History, and Biology. However, as we focus on STEM, the gaps noted in math and science between Non-ED and ED; Non-SWD and SWD; and White and Non-White. Students with disabilities are almost twice as likely to fail as those who do not have exceptionalities. Our Hispanic and African-American students are less likely to meet standards in EOCT courses than the white majority of the student population. Economically Disadvantaged students are twice as likely to fail in the disciplines of math and science as their Non-ED classmates.

**WHS Enrollment Data-Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total in Grade</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Hawaiian Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Not Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHS Student Retention Data Disaggregated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total in Grade</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Hawaiian Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students being retained in 9th grade are of particular note from this chart. Students in 9th grade are three times as likely to be retained as their upperclassman counterparts. This indicates a need for literacy in the 9th Grade Academy to help those students who are being retained and being placed in Remedial Education Programs (REP).

WHS Students in Remedial Education Programs (REP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of Students in REP</th>
<th>Percentage of Students in REP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>16.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table indicates, a high percentage of students are in Remedial Education Programs (REP). Many of these students are experiencing frustration with literacy. With a school-wide REP rate of 16.40%, it may not seem like a large number, but the focus is on the 9th grade with one in four students in remediation for a course.
WHS Personnel SY2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Level</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Yr Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yr Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Yr Specialist's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Yr Doctoral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience At WHS</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Yrs.</td>
<td>8.6 Yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart indicates that of the 112 teachers at WHS, 66% hold advanced degrees above the bachelor’s level. The second indicator is a total of years experience at WHS.

WHS Faculty and Staff Attrition Data

Attrition rate is defined as the number of staff members who leave the profession or transfer to another system from the beginning of the school year to the beginning of the next school year, excluding retirement. Considering the high attrition rate of administrators since WHS was founded in 1997, the attrition rate for teachers has remained low with an average of 9.2%. This shows a deep commitment by a strong core of staff that remains each year at WHS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attrition Rate of Teachers</th>
<th>Attrition Rate of Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Teacher Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>11 / 110</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>11 / 117</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>9.5 / 114</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>11/108</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>7/109</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goals and Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Assessment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop comprehensive plan for children birth to 4</td>
<td>PALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPVT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate literacy comprehension strategies and skill</td>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction in content areas</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation at core levels</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher understanding of selection and implementation</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of interventions aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data notebooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase student and teacher access to multiple modes of text</td>
<td>Student and teacher use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via technological sources</td>
<td>technological resources to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enhance 21\textsuperscript{st} century skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase rigor across the curriculum and improve students’</td>
<td>EOCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to think independently and critically</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT/PSAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASVAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher understanding of the language of poverty using</td>
<td>PLC sign-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLCs</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase stakeholder understanding of and involvement in the</td>
<td>Brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance, benefits, and relevance of literacy across the content</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas</td>
<td>Website information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course enrollments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-pathway completions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Professional Learning Communities*

Teachers are continuously involved in professional learning communities to develop their instructional skills. WHS presently participates in the following professional learning initiatives: common core literacy including CTAE, Gifted and AP certification, LDS, STEM, Math workshop model, differentiation, technology seminars, vertical alignment, curriculum councils, and CCRPI analysis. Staff development will continue to focus on literacy as previously stated on the Professional Development Chart (Chart 1.1). More professional development will be added to address the fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and writing across the curriculum. Professional development will also focus on differentiation of instruction including fluid, flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, demonstration of learning, team teaching and inclusion of students with special learning needs (ED, SWD, gifted) in the general education setting. PLCs will focus on SRI, Universal Design for Learning, STEM, Reading Endorsements, and disciplinary literacy strategies.
Project Plan, Procedures, Goals, Objectives and Support

WHS has prioritized items needing to be addressed in our Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment. (UDL) Universal Design for Learning principles, writing, and technology are implicit throughout all goals; measurements to be made by EOCT, GAA, and GHWT (9-12). Grant funds it, but GOALS to be funded via other sources. (How 3.D. p 38)

Goal 1  Develop a comprehensive plan for children from birth to age 4. (as part of county birth-5 grant)

Need: Implement necessary assessments and diagnostics

WHS has Pre-K, ECE, and FACS classes. “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). (Why p 41) Success of interventions will be measured using formative/summative assessments: PPVT, PALS.

Objectives, using PALS & PPVT:

1. Train teachers in evidence-based literacy practices.
2. Instruction in vocabulary, oral language, and comprehension.
3. Partner with FACS and ECE classes to teach parenting skills, including read-alouds and expanding oral development

Goal 2  Integrate literacy comprehension strategies and skill instruction in content areas.

Need: Literacy across the curriculum

Accommodate and integrate CCGPS literacy with STEM instruction using science reading lessons for text, incorporating problem solving, building vocabulary, writing, and speaking through STEM activities. Extensive training is needed on Lexiles to support
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content standards. Results will be seen using formative and summative assessments (EOCT/SRI). “Reading Next states literacy instruction for adolescents should extend beyond a single language arts period and be integrated in subject area coursework…anywhere from two to four hours, should occur in language arts and content-area classes” (Biancorosa & Snow, 2006, p. 20.) (Why pg 58)

Objectives:
1. Experiences reading instruction in content texts, minimum of 2 hours daily across curriculum.
2. Literacy strategies that support core/content reading.
3. Provide classrooms and media center with multiple modes of non-fiction, standards based text.
5. Framework for vocabulary across curricula.
6. SRI training for use and assessment.
7. Empower students to become innovators and technologically-proficient problem solvers.
8. Reading endorsement opportunities across disciplines.

Goal 3  **Differentiation at the Core Level**

Need: - *Implement necessary interventions*

*-Literacy across the curriculum*

Success begins with differentiation within complex texts so students become college and career ready. STEM allows opportunities to develop literacy skills through topics of interest to solidify STEM content. All classes have a literacy section encouraging literacy to show understanding of what is read and is vital to the learning process of all subjects. “A successful interaction with any text depends on the student’s ability to access, use, and evaluate content material based on background and vocabulary knowledge, word study strategies, fluency, motivation and now even familiarity with the media used to deliver the content.” (Why pg 49)
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Objectives:
1. Professional learning on literacy strategies across the content areas
2. Improve student Lexiles so students advance at or above the grade level set by the SRI.

Goal 4 Increase teacher understanding of selection and implementation of interventions aligned to student needs.

Need: Professional learning for literacy and interventions

WHS needs support choosing interventions for students needing support. Teachers need understanding in comprehension and writing proficiency to identify deficiencies and create interventions across the curriculum. Students with reading issues may utilize topic based, high interest materials. “Supplemental materials may be used to increase students’ opportunities for academic success. Materials viable as intervention tools that increase the numbers of Georgia students who successfully perform in all content areas.” (Why pg 124)

Objectives:
1. Provide training on gold standard reading interventions aligned to the Georgia tiers.
2. Use data to diagnose student needs, place students in the correct tier of intervention, implement and monitor interventions, and assess results

Goal 5 Increase student and teacher access to multiple modes of text via technological sources.

Need: Community involvement via face-to-face, virtual, and e-communication

WHS is the oldest high school and has unreliable technology. Technology is incorporated in reading although many students do not have access to technology. Accessibility is a challenge with only two computer labs for 1700+ students. “To be effective in the 21st century, citizens and workers must be able to exhibit a wide range of functional and
critical thinking skills, such as information literacy; media literacy; and information, communications, and technology literacy.” (Why p 56) “Rather than viewing technology as a distraction, educators must learn to rethink instruction in order 2008) to leverage their students’ fascination with technology rather than to see it as a distraction only.” (Why pg 58)

Objectives:

1. Expand hardware, software, and professional development and training, and increase rigor to attain excellence in literacy for the 21st century.
2. Address the need for student access to 21st Century technology in order to enhance learning outside the traditional classroom.
3. Increase student 21st century skills and technological literacy by providing students with opportunities to use the technical tools of the STEM industry.

Goal 6 Increase rigor across the curriculum and improve students’ ability to think independently and critically.

Need: Literacy and best practices to support literary/STEM

Methods and expectations must change to meet new curriculum requirements.

“Beginning in kindergarten, the CCGPS begins moving students up the first step toward the goal of graduating from high school ready for college or a career.” (Why pg 86-87)

Objectives:

1. Train teachers to meet the demands of the CCGPS, address higher-level questions, create more rigorous lessons, and produce independent thinkers.
2. Increase Georgia’s capacity to provide high-quality K-12 STEM professional learning opportunities.
3. Train teachers to implement UDL strategies so students and teachers understand the what, why, and how of learning.

Goal 7 Increase teacher understanding of the language of poverty using

Need: -Active Literacy Team
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-Literacy across the curriculum

-Professional learning for literacy and interventions

Approximately (48.7%) of WHS students are ED. We must show these students the importance and relevance of literacy.

Objective:

Use professional learning communities to conduct book studies on understanding the elements of poverty and strategies to reach ED students at WHS.

Goal 8 Increase stakeholder understanding of and involvement in the importance benefits, and relevance of literacy across the content areas.

Need: Community involvement in literacy

The emphasis on STEM comes as leaders recognize that U.S. schools are not producing graduates with skills needed to lead the world in innovation, and jobs requiring these skills will grow at twice the rate as other jobs in the next decade. We must integrate these priorities for the new standards allowing teachers to spend more time on these skills.

“The role of leadership in developing literacy in the nation, state, district, school and classroom cannot be overstated. It is a key piece in virtually every literacy initiative undertaken at any level in education.” (Why pg 156)

Objectives:

1. Guide community understanding of STEM education while building a viable STEM program to prepare students for work and life in the 21st century.
2. Nurture partnerships that allow schools and the businesses to join efforts to improve students’ STEM-career opportunities.
3. Increase the number of students pursuing careers in STEM-related fields and/or post-secondary STEM related education/training.

5
Sample Tiered Instructional Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Literacy or Math Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4 (supported instruction per IEP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Support</td>
<td>Math Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elective choices: PE, Fine Arts, Core Electives, CTAE
Assessment/Data Analysis Plan

Currently there are state mandated assessments administered throughout the school year. The table below lists the Assessment Type, Who’s Responsible, When Administered and How Analyzed. The GHSGT is listed in the table; however, this assessment is being eliminated. Incoming ninth graders are no longer required to take this assessment as part of their graduation requirement.

WHS’ summative, high-stakes tests must be “complemented by a coordinated system of assessment that are ongoing and of smaller scale to direct instructional decision making. This system should include: universal screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic assessment” (“The Why,” p. 99). The following table illustrates our assessment schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Who’s Responsible</th>
<th>When Administered</th>
<th>How Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal screening</td>
<td>Trained program teachers</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td>Use program recommendations and flow chart in “The Why” p. 103 that is embedded below this table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic assessment</td>
<td>Trained program teachers</td>
<td>August-September</td>
<td>Use program recommendations to identify areas for intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress monitoring</td>
<td>Core academic teachers</td>
<td>Course benchmarks</td>
<td>Collaboratively in data teams: Scale score; item analysis; disaggregated by course three times per year; classroom, gender, course mid-term ethnicity, SWD, and exam ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As recommended by</td>
<td>Data provided in program reports; program monthly collaborative data teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOCT</td>
<td>Principal, school test coordinator</td>
<td>December 2012, May 2013, mid-month during school year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia LDS exports; disaggregated by All, ethnicity, SWD, ED, Gender, Gifted; data and preliminary analysis disseminated to departments and content teachers; data teams continue analysis for areas of concern; root cause analysis; identify instructional implications of data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSGT</td>
<td>Principal, school test coordinator</td>
<td>Retests in June, September and November 2012 and July 2013; main administration in March 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia LDS exports; disaggregated by All, ethnicity, SWD, ED, Gender, Gifted; data and preliminary analysis disseminated to departments and content teachers; data teams continue analysis for areas of concern; root cause analysis; identify instructional implications of data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSWT</td>
<td>Principal, school test coordinator</td>
<td>Main administration October 2012; retests in February and July 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia LDS exports; disaggregated by All, ethnicity, SWD, ED,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SRCL assessment plan will include the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). This is a research-based, computer adaptive reading assessment program that assesses students’ reading levels, tracks students’ reading growth over time, and helps guide instruction according to students’ needs. It measures reading comprehension on the Lexile Framework for Reading. The SRI will be administered for every student. This assessment is detailed in a previous table (Universal screening, Diagnostic assessment, Progress monitoring).
Current assessment protocol will remain in effect with the exception of the GHSGT as it is no longer a requirement for incoming ninth grade classes. The EOCT and the GHSWT will remain in place as they are state mandated. As the table stated the PARCC is a forth-coming assessment.

Georgia is a member of the PARCC consortia, which is to design Common Core assessments and guidelines for their administration and scoring ("The Why," p. 119). When implemented, several assessment processes at WHS will change. Currently, most standardized assessments are administered by pencil-and-paper or multiple choice tests. PARCC will change this. At our level, the assessments will only be administered online ("The Why," p. 119). Currently technology does not support online assessment of all students; more computers will be required.

Test formats will change to “combination of constructed-response items, performance tasks, and computer-enhanced, computer-scored items” ("The Why," p. 119). Assessment will be administered in summative, “Through-Course” design four
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times a year. As we implement our literacy and assessment plan, we will equip our students to succeed on whatever assessment they are given.

Use of data from each formative and summative assessment will make sure our teachers identify students’ strengths and weaknesses, diagnose disciplinary literacy skills that are lacking, set goals based on the GPS/CCGPS, match instruction to learning, evaluate the effectiveness of instruction or interventions, and monitor student progress ("The Why," p. 96). Support is needed in implementing an assessment plan to learn how to use existing data, identify new tools and strategies for diagnosing skill deficits and progress monitoring, use their classroom practices as progress monitoring tools, and analyze results from a variety of resources to set students’ literacy goals and identify the most effective instructional strategies ("The Why," p. 96).

The key to assessment is how the resulting data are used to improve teaching and learning. WHS has accepted NCEE recommendations for the use of data:

*Classroom-level recommendations*

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

*Administrative recommendations*

1. Establish a clear vision for school-wide data use
2. Provide supports that foster a data-driven culture within the school
3. Develop and maintain a district-wide data system ("The Why," p. 120-121)

Every teacher should learn (a) what data are available; (b) how to analyze data in collaborative data teams using all available technologies (Excel, LDS, student information system (SIS)); (c) how to interpret results; and (d) how to design interventions to support struggling learners to guarantee our students’ disciplinary
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literacy. WHS is beginning to use data to develop instructional strategies and determine materials. PLCs will utilize the Data Analysis Module developed by architects.

Professional learning implementation training will be needed to effectively utilize the SRI program. Scholastic implementation consultants, who are former educators that have used this program, would be the preferred choice for trainers. The media specialist, who will serve as literacy coordinator, and two additional teachers will be trained in SRI assessment. Trainers will redeliver to advisors - who will administer the assessment three times per year to all students. The SRI assessment will be administered monthly to students at-risk. Face-to-Face and online training, customized to secondary level, would be beneficial in meeting needs of staff and addressing our goals.

In addition to the “How Analyzed” section, our data is presented to parents and stakeholders through our School Improvement and Parent Involvement Plans accessed through our BCSS website. Parents can access their child’s individual score data through Parent Portal which is a web-based link to the BCSS SIS. Parents also receive hard copy score reports of their child’s assessments through the mail and/or sent home with student.

In addition to the “How Analyzed” section, the Scholastic Achievement Manager component of SRI will manage the data and reports. This is the data backbone for all Lexile-based Scholastic reading programs. SRI, in addition to automatically scoring and analyzing student performance data, will provide staff with 21 reports and letters that support the universal screening, instructional placement, progress monitoring, and reporting needs. Since SRI provides an accurate measure of reading ability and text difficulty on a single vertical scale, staff can set rigorous goals as recommended by the CCGPS.
Resources, Strategies and Materials (Existing and Proposed) Including Technology to Support the Literacy Plan

While American education is accustomed to the term, accountability, attention now falls on educators to seek measures to implement knowledge for the ever-demanding information age. This presents educators with great challenges beginning with students as early as Pre-K and continuing through twelfth grade who must be challenged to develop skills and abilities needed for the 21st century workforce. No longer can the 3R's, Reading, wRiting, and aRithmetic stand alone but must be teamed with more comprehensive skills like listening, communicating, viewing, researching, interpreting, and knowledge.

Resources needed to implement the literacy plan including student engagement

Engage students in reading at all ability levels using multiple resources (Books, periodicals, online text, e-text, primary sources, photographs, maps, charts, and music in varied formats).

- Provide all students (Pre-K through 12th) with engaging reading materials and resources to motivate and increase fluency and comprehension skills using a variety of media sources.
- Literacy resources for all students, to include novels, leveled reading materials – both print and digital.
- Provide 21st century technology resources to students and teachers for literacy activities.
- Professional development for teachers to bridge literacy efforts throughout the curriculum.
Activities that support literacy intervention programs

- Reading and Writing across the curriculum using print, online text, and e-text materials.
- Implement intervention programs for phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary.
- Provide and implement instructional technology, embedded assessment, and instructional strategy connections.

Shared resources

- Online database materials (including GALILEO and NBCLearn) are accessible from home and school computers.
- Two computer labs (24 computers each) available to all teachers.

Library resources or a description of the library as equipped

- LMC has 23,000 book titles, database of E-books, 1300 VCR tapes, 75 DVDs, 20 computers with student and teacher printers.
  - 7500 Novels make up one-third of the collection.
- LMC has two presentation areas with LCDs.
- Variety of TV/VCR/DVD players that travel, overhead projectors, LCD projectors for checkout, recorders and microphones.
- 5 response pad sets.

Activities that support classroom practices

- Research presentations pre-empting student research assignments
  - Presentations and guideline packets for various methods of research citation
  - same information can be found on the LMC website
- Introduce and oversee online database (e-books) and GALILEO research procedures and search hints.

- Lookup stations for student search for books and materials by title, author, subject (available online through LMC website).

**Additional strategies need to support student success**

- Additional and more online materials and resources to cover the entire curriculum in both fiction and non-fiction genres to increase reading across the curriculum.

- Reading and resource materials in print as well as electronic format for ease of reading for students with different technological access.

- A tool for measuring and improving a student's reading levels.

- Reading service that helps English language learners read and improve more effectively.

- Reader assessment engine that enables student reading ability to be reported as a Lexile measure to support differentiated instruction.

- Literacy program in vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and writing for students.

- Programs to provide practice reading nonfiction text and include extension activities designed to address vocabulary, reading comprehension, a relevant math problem, and written output.

- A program for the core reading/language arts program designed for high school students who have not mastered essential reading, writing and language skills and are typically reading two or more years below grade level.

- A more personalized learning platform that employs the research and technology of the Lexile Framework to differentiate students' reading and writing practice.
• Programs that rely on screening, placement and progress-monitoring features.

• A computer-adaptive assessment that provides a Lexile measure and an immediate and positive feedback for students engaged in assessments.

*Current classroom resources for each classroom in the school*

• Computer/printer for each teacher.

• Some Mounted LCDs with WIN TV.

• One iPod classroom.

• Some Smartboards or interactive boards.

*Alignment plan for SRCL and other funding as provided by the school district*

• Purchase for and train teachers to use assessment and feedback methodology which is essential to improving student learning outcomes.

• Provide the avenues for training and teaching the five components of reading – phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension –

• Invest more in our professional energy to cultivate vital reading and writing skills within our students.

• Enhance and increase materials for non-fiction literacy which reflects our urgent need to strengthen explicit instruction of reading and writing information texts which focuses on nonfiction literacy that aligns to the reading, writing, and content area learning skills articulated in the new Common Core State Standards, making students become stronger “comprehenders” and composers of non-fiction because school readiness and success through grade 12 is pivotal to the success in all students in their academic pursuits.

• Provision of technical assistance, i.e., professional development to include
coaching and mentoring, regional conferences, on-site workshops) and web-based resources (such as a dedicated website, webinars, and networks).

- Develop a plan for the effective use of technology.
- Provide students with interactive texts and resources to help strengthen their acquisition of the five components of reading and couple it with systematic and explicit instruction; this will give students greater access to and practice of non-fiction literacy strengthening our capacity to evaluate and communicate student growth over time, our 21st century students need the 21st century learning tools of technology.
- Implement the goal through onsite coaching, professional development webinars, and bi-annual data collection using a reliable source for research, data, and analysis.
- Purchase, provide and implement strategies to eliminate gaps and increase achievement for all students.
- Implement instructional strategies in classrooms and schools – focusing on all students as well as the economically disadvantaged students thus providing instruction and scientifically based strategies for improving literacy, valuable feedback and data on program effectiveness for data-based decision-making.

*Demonstrate how technology purchases will support RTI, student engagement, instructional practices, writing, reading comprehension, etc.*

- New literacies will include digital and media technologies to better prepare students to understand and adjust to the literacy demands which are critical to current and future expectations for pleasure and work.
- New literacies include innovative text formats (multiple media or hybrid texts).
• Implement the effective use of search engines to locate information; evaluation of Internet sources; communication using e-mail, texts, and chats; and the use of word processing programs.

• The Internet has caused educators to confront issues related to new technologies; technologies are being adopted rapidly and simultaneously to meet the need of the ever expanding workforce technology, therefore the need for expanded and up-to-date technologies is vital to the success of all of our students.

• Provide training for the implementation of technologically based strategies in all classes as well as the integration of reading and writing in print or digital text.

If the SRLC grant is awarded to WHS, the school literacy team will ensure that all funding is fully aligned to our school and system literacy goals. District administrators will allocate funding equitably to ensure alignment and provide budgetary guidance for federal, state, and system funds. Additionally, discretionary local school funds will continue to be provided to support classroom instruction and student literacy. We believe that all proposed resources and materials, especially those that support greater technology integration, RTI interventions, and our school’s STEM focus, are warranted by our school’s demonstrated literacy needs. We are only in the beginning stages of full implementation of a universal design for learning that (a) instills best practices for disciplinary literacy in every classroom, (b) embeds a school-wide writing focus, (c) provides a systematic process for identifying students’ needs and (d) follows Georgia’s RTI model to ensure every students’ literacy learning.
**Professional Learning Strategies Identified on the Basis of Documented Needs**

Total # of Teachers = 112

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Professional Development</th>
<th># Staff Participated</th>
<th>Percentage of Staff Participated</th>
<th>Professional Development Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Literacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerschool</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Certification</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Maps</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL Training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Workshop</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAE Literacy Workshop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Planning</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Workshops</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From GLPNA survey, 72% of staff indicated that pre-service education does not include coursework in all aspects of literacy in the content areas. New teachers are not being prepared for all aspects of literacy instruction, so staff development is necessary in this aspect. Fifty-seven of staff surveyed indicated that professional learning had not begun formally and 43% stated that ELA teacher training was only “emergent” for ELA instructors on the use of the core literacy program.

Classroom observations, lesson plans, and collaborative meetings will be the main measurement for the effectiveness of staff development. Additionally, feedback will be given at the end of training to measure teacher perception of that training and trainer, and whether the skill learned may be applied to their classroom. Administrators and department heads would be responsible for monitoring the teacher implementation of literacy strategies. Scheduled common collaborative planning time will give course
specific subject area teachers time to commonly plan literacy strategies. Lead subject
teachers will record minutes and agendas from planning meetings.

Disaggregated data from the administrative team will be dispersed among those
teachers in EOCT courses. If fewer than 80% of their students meet or exceed the
standards on the test, this will show the ongoing need for professional development. Four
overall main strategies for the literacy program that will be addressed include fluency,
vocabulary development, comprehension, and writing across the curriculum. Staff
development will continue to focus on literacy as previously stated on the Professional
Development Chart (Chart 1.1). More professional development will be added to address
the fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and writing across the curriculum.
Professional development will also focus on differentiation of instruction including fluid,
flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, demonstration of learning, team teaching
and inclusion of students with special learning needs (ED, SWD, gifted) in the general
education setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Professional Learning Plan</th>
<th>Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>evidence-based literacy practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>vocabulary, oral language, and comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>read alouds and expanding oral development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>2 hours reading instruction per day across curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>Literacy strategies that support core/content reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>CCGPS Training</td>
<td>non-fiction text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Technology Training</td>
<td>Access to 21st century technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>Framework for teaching vocabulary across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Professional Learning Plan</td>
<td>Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>SRI Training</td>
<td>monitor comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>STEM &amp; Universal Design for Learning Training</td>
<td>innovators and technologically proficient problem solvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Reading Endorsement Training</td>
<td>Reading Endorsements across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy Training</td>
<td>literacy strategies across the content areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SRI Training</td>
<td>Improve student Lexile levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Reading Intervention Training</td>
<td>interventions in reading aligned to the Georgia tiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>SRI Training</td>
<td>data to diagnose student needs, place students in the correct tier of intervention, implement and progress monitor interventions, and determine next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Technology Training</td>
<td>enhance the curriculum, engage students, and increase rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Technology Training</td>
<td>Ensure that all students have access to the appropriate technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>STEM Training</td>
<td>Increase student 21st century skills and technological literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>CCGPS &amp; Universal Design for Learning Training</td>
<td>meet the demands of the CCGPS, ask higher-level questions, create more rigorous lessons, and produce independent thinkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>STEM Training</td>
<td>provide high quality K-12 STEM professional learning opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Universal Design for Learning Training</td>
<td>implement UDL strategies so students and teachers understand the what, why, and how of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>conduct book studies on understanding the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greatest measurement of the effectiveness of the staff development will be measured through student achievement. The benchmark measurement will be an increase in EOCT scores of three percent per year.
Sustainability

Literacy is the responsibility of every stakeholder in WHS community. By learning literacy strategies and incorporating technology, as well as a STEM focus, we will increase literacy and student engagement. Initial assessments indicated needs in systemic literacy plan across all disciplines, universal screenings and diagnostics, intervention strategies and resources, professional learning, community involvement, and STEM initiative.

Data-based decision making will become priority. Data-driven formative and summative assessment will ensure teachers identify students’ strengths and weaknesses, diagnose disciplinary literacy skills that are lacking, set goals based on the GPS/CCGPS, match instruction to learning, evaluate the effectiveness of instruction or interventions, and monitor student progress. Literacy RTI coordinators will monitor implementation and resultant data. BCSS will develop a systemic formative assessment calendar based on local, state, and program guidelines. Each initiative and program requires professional learning; details of continuous professional learning for all school staff is clear in our literacy plan and SLRC application that is based on school data. Professional learning opportunities for teachers will expand to include attendance and presentations at conferences and training for new staff.

Involvement of all stakeholders will be encouraged as WHS strivews to enhance community partnerships. Annually, the Bartow Education Foundation funds innovative instructional resources. Business partners include Publix, Vulcan, Comcast, Chamber of Commerce, Bartow Community Foundation, and other local businesses. A community advisory council for literacy will be established. Business partners will be included in the STEM project
and will partner as work sites for students. Data analysis indicated significant gaps for students who meet standards and those who do not in the specific subgroups:

- SWD are twice as likely to fail as non-SWD;
- Hispanic and African-American students are less likely to meet standards than white students;
- ED students are twice as likely to fail in math/science.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Other funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 21st Century technologies</td>
<td>• 21st Century Technology</td>
<td>Local/State funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-Texts</td>
<td>• Authentic literacy texts</td>
<td>Perkins grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Digital media</td>
<td>• STEM resources</td>
<td>SPLOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Print materials</td>
<td>• Universal screening</td>
<td>IDEA (SWD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tier 1 resources</td>
<td>• Progress monitoring</td>
<td>Remedial funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tier 2/3 resources</td>
<td>• Intervention resources</td>
<td>Title I/II/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional learning</td>
<td>• Training aligned to</td>
<td>Teacher grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community/parent literacy</td>
<td>literacy plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops</td>
<td>• Literacy initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benchmark development</td>
<td>across all disciplines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading/writing programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure upgrades at each school will be supported by BCSS and will be ready to support the technology grant requests as new materials are implemented.

The school’s literacy plan will be a living document that provides school improvement goals, objectives, and strategies for ensuring our students’ literacy needs are met.
commitment to students’ literacy growth will be a continuous cycle of improvement based on quality data analysis.

Success begins with differentiation within complex texts so students become college and career ready. STEM allows opportunities to develop literacy skills through topics of interest to solidify interdisciplinary content. All subject areas will have a literacy focus to show understanding of what is read. If SRLC grant is awarded, however, the greatest gain will be in building teacher capacity in leading literacy learning. Teachers will be aware of achievement gaps and learned what it takes to close those gaps in our subgroups. Teacher leaders will understand the use of data for instructional implications and guide data teams to ensure literacy learning for WHS students. Leaders will collaborate with parents and community members to continue engagement of all stakeholders in support of student literacy.
Budget Summary

The SRLC grant funds allow Woodland High School to budget programs and initiatives that we need to improve the literacy skills in the content areas, develop professional learning for our teachers that equips them to serve the needs of students, and ensure that WHS students are prepared with the content area literacy skills and strategies they need for College and Career Readiness. If the Striving Readers Grant is awarded, the funds will allow us to purchase technology, programs, and initiatives to assess all students and to support those who struggle in literacy learning. Budget items that need funding include the following:

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

- 21st Century Technology
- STEM resources
- Benchmark and mid-term development and implementation for progress monitoring in each course
- Computerized software to support identified targeted interventions for students’ literacy needs
- Writing and Reading programs for literacy across the disciplines
- High-interest, diverse texts with a STEM focus and supporting the CCGPS to be used across the curriculum
- Textbooks that must have e-text capability
- E-books that support CCGPS with a focus on literary and, especially, informational and authentic literacy texts
- Literacy initiatives for community and PreK

RTI Support

- Intervention programs for explicit Tier 2 and 3 intervention program
- Progress monitoring protocol and program to evaluate

Professional Learning provided in the following areas

- Universal Design Learning training
- STEM resources
- Best practices in literacy learning, vocabulary development, and disciplinary literacy
- Technology implementation for student engagement
- Reading endorsements
- Data analysis to inform instruction
- Training on the elements of poverty and strategies to reach ED students
- Training for ECE interns in PreK lab
- Effective use of purchased Internet-based programs or software with ongoing vendor support
- Workshops for parents and community stakeholders
The Striving Readers grant can fund these items that Woodland High School could not otherwise afford and make it possible for us to strengthen and enrich our students’ abilities “to access, use, and produce multiple forms of media information, and knowledge in all content areas at all grade levels” (The Why, p. 31). Thus, we will equip our students to meet Georgia’s goal for all students to “become self-sustaining, lifelong learners and contributors to their communities” (The Why, p. 31). If we can do that, our students – and our community – will better prepare their children with literacy strategies. Students will arrive in PreK better prepared and our community will be all the better for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Technology</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM resources</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-books library and e-texts</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td># students TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Reading Inventory</td>
<td># students TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Learning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRI training</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI training</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading endorsement across curriculum areas</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary literacy strategies</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective vocabulary development strategies</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for use of classroom technologies</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on how to analyze data and use it to inform instruction</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM resources</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Institutes and workshops</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for ECE students in PreK internship</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community initiatives and workshops</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDL training</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on the elements of poverty and strategies to reach ED students</td>
<td>TBD by CO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>