

School Profile

Created Monday, October 28, 2013

Page 1

School Information

School Information District Name:	Thomaston-Upson School System
School Information School or Center Name:	Upson-Lee North Elementary School

Level of School

Elementary (K-5 or Primary, Elementary)

Principal

Principal Name:	Shad Seymour
Principal Position:	Principal
Principal Phone:	706-647-3632
Principal Email:	sseymour@upson.k12.ga.us

School contact information

(the persons with rights to work on the application)

School contact information Name:	Amy Miller
School contact information Position:	Assistant Principal
School contact information Phone:	706-647-3632
School contact information Email:	amiller@upson.k12.ga.us

Grades represented in the building

example pre-k to 6

4 to 5

Number of Teachers in School

52

FTE Enrollment

618

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: Kathy Matthews

Position/Title of Fiscal Agent's Contact Person: Director of Finance

Address: 205 Civic Center Drive

City: Thomaston Zip: 30286

Telephone: (706) 647-9319 Fax: (706) 646-4865

E-mail: kmatthews@upson.k12.ga.us

Marguerite V. Shook
Signature of Fiscal Agency Head (District Superintendent or Executive Director)

Dr. Marguerite V. Shook
Typed Name of Fiscal Agency Head (District Superintendent or Executive Director)

12/10/13
Date (required)

Preliminary Application Requirements

Created Thursday, November 14, 2013

Updated Tuesday, December 10, 2013

Page 1

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

SRCL General Information Packet-Cohort 3

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

-
- Yes
-

Click on the SRCL Rubric link below to assist you in the grant development process.

SRCL Scoring Rubric-Cohort 3

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

-
- Yes
-

Click on the Assessment Chart link below to assist you in the grant development process.

SRCL Required Assessments Chart

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

-
- Yes
-

Assessments

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

-
- I Agree
-

Unallowable Expenditures

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

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

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

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

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

Advertisements, Promotional or Marketing Items

Decorative Items

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

Land acquisition

Capital Improvements, Permanent Renovations

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

Dues to organizations, federations or societies for personal benefits

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

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

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

• I Agree

Grant Assurances

Created Tuesday, December 10, 2013

Page 1

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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

-
- Yes
-

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.

- 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.

III. Incorporation of Clauses

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



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

Kathy Matthews/Director of Finance

Typed Name of Fiscal Agency Head and Position Title

12/10/13

Date



Signature of Applicant's Authorized Agency Head (required)

Dr. Marguerite V. Shook, Superintendent

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

12/10/13

Date

N/A

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

N/A

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

Date (if applicable)

Thomaston-Upson School System

District Narrative

Brief History

Thomaston City and Upson County School Systems were consolidated into a single school district in 1990 by community vote. The new district, Thomaston-Upson School System, opened during the 1992-1993 school year. The system now serves 4,347 students and consists of one pre-kindergarten center, and schools at grades K-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Our system's size allows us to maintain a friendly, safe environment while offering an array of resources and opportunities to support teaching and learning.

System Demographics

We have a diverse student population as shown in the table below. Nearly 70% of our students participate in the federal free and reduced meals programs. All schools operate a School-wide Title I Program. Approximately 69% of our students receive compensatory services across grades K-12. The district employs 383 certified and 255 classified staff.

Student & Program Demographics	Percentage
White	59%
Black	35%
Hispanic	2%
Multi-Racial	4%
Asian-Pacific Islander	<1%
Am. Indian/Alaskan	<1%
Economically-Disadvantaged	68%
Early Intervention Program	18%
English Learners	<1%
Students with Disabilities	13%
Gifted	6%
CTAE	76%
Remedial Education	31%

Current Priorities-

Our current, system-wide priorities include:

- **Implementation of CCGPS** –All teachers and staff are expected to implement Common Core Georgia Performance Standards in Reading, ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies. Teaching teams collaborate in designing units and lesson plans around CCGPS and receive professional learning through district and RESA offerings.
- **Differentiation of Instruction** –Professional learning is on-going to ensure that teachers and staff master the principles of differentiation of instruction.

Thomaston-Upson School System

- **RTI revamp** –To provide stronger tiered interventions across all schools, the district has created an RTI Committee to lead the revamp of our pyramid of interventions and RTI process.
- **BYOT** –Students are encouraged to bring their own personal technology to school for use during selected segments of instruction. The Bring Your Own Technology initiative engages students in learning through use of technology.
- **Community Engagement** – The district office is assisting schools in involving the community, business, and parents by promoting the agenda of the Upson Education Alliance. The new Fine Arts Center is being used for public presentations of student work.

Strategic Planning

The district has a five-year strategic plan that was developed with all stakeholders' input. Our plan is undergirded by the vision and mission statements shown below.

Our Vision: *Thomaston-Upson Schools will be a model system of effective teaching and learning in preparing students who are personally, academically, and socially successful both in school and in life.*

Our Mission is *Excellence in education...every individual, every day.*

Our 2013-2014 district-wide school improvement goals include:

- Goal Area I: Increasing Achievement;
- Goal Area II: Promoting Stakeholder Involvement; and
- Goal Area III: Creating Organizational Effectiveness

Each school develops a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that links its initiatives to the district's three goal areas. During annual planning retreats with Central Office staff and invited stakeholders, including parents, school teams review and update their CIPs. The district's CIP is updated to reflect changes included in schools' CIPs. Additionally, schools incorporate strategies and interventions identified in their Title I Schoolwide Plans.

Current Management Structure

The district is governed by a seven member Board of Education that employs a Superintendent to lead and manage the education of its student. The Superintendent has assembled a Central Office Team that assists in managing educational programs, personnel, services, and practices. The Central Office Leadership Team consists of a Deputy Superintendent and Directors of Curriculum, Federal Programs, Pre-K, and Special Education. The District Leadership Team, all Principals, and Instructional Coaches form the Curriculum Advisory Board and meets monthly.

Past Instructional Initiatives

Thomaston-Upson School System

In the past, the district initiated the following programs to support instruction. All continue to be place.

- Cultural Diversity Training
- Differentiation
- Thinking Maps
- Student Longitudinal Data System.
- Love and Logic -discipline program.
- Data Director –System wide data warehouse; schools use it to access data and to scan benchmark data in order to create a student profile. Due to funding limitations, this data system will be dropped at the end of the 2013-1014 school year.
- Use of Technology to Support Instruction and Data Analysis-Most classrooms are equipped with Promethean ACTIVboard Collaborative Classroom systems that need updating.

Literacy Curriculum and Assessments Used District-wide

The table below highlights the major literacy curricula and assessments that are used in each grade level. The CCGPS framework is used in grades 1-12.

Thomaston-Upson’s District-wide Literacy Curriculums and Assessments Used

School/Center	Literacy Curriculum	Literacy Assessments
Pre-K Center	-High Scope -Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards	-Work Sampling System
ULSE (K-3)	-Guided Reading Levelled Instruction with Fountas & Pinnell and Scott Foresman leveled readers) -Fountas & Pinnell Phonics and Word Study Program -CCGPS State Frameworks and supporting literature -Scott Foresman Basal Reading Program -Lexia Software (for EIP students) -Wilson Reading System (Resource Students with	-Star Early Literacy -Star Reading -AR Test -GKIDS -CRCT (Reading & ELA) -CRCT-M -3 rd Grade Writing Test -ACCESS

Thomaston-Upson School System

School/Center	Literacy Curriculum	Literacy Assessments
	Disabilities) -Wilson Foundations (Students with Disabilities in Co-teach Classrooms)	-Lexia -GAA -OAS
ULNE (4-5)	-Open Court Reading Series -Lexia Software (for EIP students) -Wilson Reading System (Resource Students with Disabilities) -Wilson Foundations (Students with Disabilities in Co-teach Classrooms)	-Star Reading -AR Test -CRCT (Reading & ELA) -CRCT-M -5 th Grade Writing Test -ACCESS -Lexia -GAA -OAS
ULMS	-Holt Mifflin (supplement for literary works) -CCGPS -Classworks -System 44 and READ 180	-CRCT (Reading & ELA) -CRCT-M -Read 180 (struggling readers) -8 th Grade Writing Test -ACCESS -COACH workbooks for CRCT-like questions -GAA -OAS

Thomaston-Upson School System

School/Center	Literacy Curriculum	Literacy Assessments
ULHS	-Novels as a supplement along with CCGPS -Read 180	-EOCTs (Ninth Grade Literature and American Literature) -Read 180 (SWD & struggling readers) -ACCESS -GHSWT -End of Pathway Assessments (CTAE)

Need for Striving Reader Project

As of 2003, 20% of adults in Upson County are illiterate. Over 70% of our students are from impoverished backgrounds. In spite our teachers’ best efforts, we have increasingly more students who are not able to read by the end of third grade, thus carrying gaps into subsequent grades where the demands for reading are even higher.

In today’s economy, an employee’s independent knowledge and abilities will define them as necessary or expendable. “People who cannot write and communicate clearly will not be hired, and if already working, are unlikely to last long enough to be considered for promotion (The Why, p. 28).” Effective literacy instruction does not simply take place in a single classroom for a portion of the day. Instead, literacy instruction should be implemented and reinforced throughout all classes daily. It is important to make good reading skills a habit rather than a lesson (The Why, p. 32).

The district-wide literacy needs assessment conducted in conjunction with this grant application reveals that, while there is much to applaud in the literacy instruction underway in the system, there is far more that can be done. Teachers at every level, across all subjects, need extensive professional learning on how to provide evidence-based literacy instruction that is engaging and motivating for 21st century learners. There is also a need to better align literacy expectations, goals, and practices within schools and across schools to more effectively prevent and close literacy gaps. There is a glaring need to institute more appropriate tiered literacy instruction and revamp our RTI process system-wide. Our teachers are willing to take literacy to a gold standard level. The SRCL grant will assist our district in implementing a unified literacy plan, that incorporates evidence based practices and resources in every classroom, beginning with Pre-K.

Thomaston-Upson School System

District Management Plan and Key Personnel

In order to ensure effective coordination and implementation of SCRL grants across all center and school levels, our Curriculum Director will be designated to serve as the primary liaison between the schools, district office and GADOE. The table below provides an overview of the individuals, by position, who will be responsible for various aspects of the grants.

Management Plan and Key Personnel

Day to Day Grant Operations-Tasks	Person Responsible/Position	Responsibilities	Supervisor
System-wide Grant Coordination	Dr. Larry Derico, Curriculum Director and Instruction	Ensures implementation of approved grants; monitors literacy instruction at each school; troubleshoots problems that arise about the grant; compiles and submits grant reports and paperwork	Dr. Maggie Shook, Superintendent
Purchasing	Kathy Matthews Finance Director	Receive and process schools' literacy purchase orders, based on approved budgets; maintain up-to-date ledger on expenditure of all grant funds	Dr. Maggie Shook, Superintendent
Site-Level Coordination	-Mrs. Julie English, Director, Pre-K Center and Student	Serves as liaison to the Curriculum	District Leadership Team

Thomaston-Upson School System

Day to Day Grant Operations-Tasks	Person Responsible/Position	Responsibilities	Supervisor
	Services; Assessment Specialist -Dr. Sharon McLain, Principal, Primary School (K-3) -Mr. Shad Seymour, Principal, Elementary School (4-5) -Mrs. Ronda Gulley, Principal, Middle School (6-8) -Mr. Tracy Caldwell, Principal, High School (9-12; Learning Academy)	Director/Project Director on all matters pertaining to the grant; convenes School Literacy Team to discuss and evaluate grant implementation; supervises and monitors implementation of evidenced-based literacy instruction in classrooms.	
Professional Learning Coordination	Dr. Larry Derico, Director of Curriculum and Instruction; Jana Marks, Special Education Director; Betty Thurman; CTAE Director	Under Dr, Derico's guidance, PL Team will coordinate and schedule all PL relating to literacy grant and track PLUs for all instructional program staff.	
Technology Coordination	Dr. David Beeland, Director Federal Programs, Technology, & ESOL	District-wide director will oversee technology services and	Dr. Maggie Shook, Superintendent

Thomaston-Upson School System

Day to Day Grant Operations-Tasks	Person Responsible/Position	Responsibilities	Supervisor
		related professional development and purchases required in the grant.	
Assessment Coordination	Mrs. Julie English, Director, Pre-K Center and Student Services; Assessment Specialist	Works with schools to identify, purchase, and implement formative assessments approved in the grant; monitors implementation of assessment and testing schedule	Dr. Maggie Shook, Superintendent

Understanding of Grant Personnel Regarding Goals, Objectives and Implementation Plan

All individuals listed above have participated in planning and developing the grant from its inception. Working with the district and school-based literacy teams, the development of goals and objectives has been an on-going, collaborative process.

Methods for Involving Grant Recipients in Development of Budgets and Performance Plans

Each school’s literacy team will be used to develop a budget and a performance plan to support the implementation of their literacy plan. The district literacy team will provide technical support to the schools, including reviewing budgets and plans for horizontal and vertical connections.

On-going Meetings to be Held with Grant Recipients

The Curriculum Director will convene meetings of the district literacy team, which includes representatives of each school’s literacy team, at least monthly for progress and troubleshooting meetings. The Curriculum Director and Central Office Leadership Team will hold meetings with each literacy team at the school bi-monthly, or more frequently as needed.

Thomaston-Upson School System

Principals will convene their literacy teams for meetings monthly in conjunction with school improvement meetings.

Thomaston-Upson School System

Experience of the Applicant

Thomaston-Upson County has been awarded numerous federal and state grants that have led to a proven track record for successfully handling funding for projects and initiatives. As can be seen in the table below, we have had no audit findings in the last three years of funding.

Experience of District and Schools in Successfully Handling Funding for Projects and Initiatives, Including Audit Results for 3 Years

FY11	Title of Projects/ Initiatives	Funded Amount	Is there an audit?	Audit results For 3 years
LEA –Thomaston-Upson County School District	-Title I -Title VI-B -Title II-A - High School Student Re-engagement Grant (GEAR)- Federal	\$1,637,498.00 \$130,991.00 \$312,183.00 \$430,247.00	Yes	There have been no federal award findings or questioned cost
Schools/Center				
UL Prekindergarten Center	-GA Pre-K Program	\$445,719.00	Yes	
ULSE (K-3)	-Title I (regular) -Title I (Focus School)	\$515,679.00	Yes	
ULNE (4-5)	-Title I	\$269,937.00	Yes	
ULMS (6-8)	-Title I	\$416,807.00	Yes	
ULHS (9-12)	-Title I (regular) -Title I (Focus School Grant)	\$101,471.00 \$79,483.00	Yes	

Thomaston-Upson School System

FY12	Title of Projects/ Initiatives	Funded Amount	Is there an audit?	Audit results For 3 years
LEA –Thomaston-Upson County School District	-Title I	\$1,726,265.00	No	N/A
	-Title VI-B	\$107,286.00		
	-Title II-A	\$283,901.00		
	- High School Student Re-engagement Grant (GEAR)- Federal	\$723,263.00		
Schools/Center				
UL Prekindergarten Center	-GA Pre-K Program	\$533,003.00	No	N/A
ULSE (K-3)	-Title I (regular) -Title I (Focus School)	\$468,657.00	No	N/A
ULNE (4-5)	-Title I	\$264,560.00	No	N/A
ULMS (6-8)	-Title I	\$382,750.00	No	N/A
ULHS (9-12)	-Title I (regular) -Title I (Focus School Grant)	\$246,222.00 \$74,471.00	No	N/A

FY13	Title of Projects/ Initiatives	Funded Amount	Is there an audit?	Audit results For 3 years
LEA –Thomaston-Upson County School District	-Title I	\$1,695,102.00	No	N/A
	-Title VI-B	\$92,413.00		
	-Title II-A	\$293,007.00		
	- High School Student Re-engagement Grant (GEAR)- Federal	\$639,401.75		

Thomaston-Upson School System

Schools/Center				
UL Prekindergarten Center	-GA Pre-K Program	\$426,089.00	No	N/A
ULSE (K-3)	-Title I (regular)	\$461,000.00	No	N/A
	-Title I (Focus School)	\$55,200.00		
ULNE (4-5)	-Title I	\$273,480.00	No	N/A
ULMS (6-8)	-Title I	\$367,292.00	No	N/A
ULHS (9-12)	-Title I (regular)	\$247,722.00	No	N/A
	-Title I (Focus School Grant)	\$50,800.00		

Description of LEA’s Capacity to Coordinate Resources and Control for Spending in the Past

Our effective and efficient coordination of the above annual grant awards has allowed us to remain within all budget allocations. A 2011 federal budget audit did not result in any findings or questions about resource management. There have been no audits since 2011. Our Director of Finance tracks all school budget expenditures and provides monthly updates on remaining funds. Purchase orders using federal, state, or local funds must be accompanied by a justification statement that can be tracked to approved budget categories.

Description of Sustainability of Past Initiatives Implemented by the LEA

Thomaston-Upson School System was the first in the nation to equip all classrooms with Promethean’s ACTIVboard Collaborative Classroom systems using Title I and the local SPLOST fund to sustain technology upgrades.

Description of Initiatives the LEA Implemented Internally with No Outside Funding Support

Some of the past initiatives that the district has implemented internally with no outside funding support include: purchase of technology for classrooms, Data Director, STAR Reader, STAR Early Literacy, STAR Math, Accelerated Reader Program, Oddeyseyware, Study Island, Lexia, Go My Access, Fast Math, Brainpop. All of these were covered by local SPLOST funding over nine years.

ULNE School Narrative

Upson-Lee North Elementary School (ULNE), a fourth and fifth grade school, is home to 617 students with an ethnicity as follows: 368 White, 201 Black, 15 Hispanic, and 30 other ethnic groups. Over the last three years, our enrollment has been decreasing by an average of 55 students per year. Approximately 50% of the student body is enrolled in compensatory programs: Special Education 15%, 504 .04%, EL (English Learners) .01%, and EIP (Early Intervention Program) 34.9%. Gifted students comprise 9% of the student body. Special education is our fastest growing program. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the student body qualifies for free or reduced cost meals. The staff consists of 58 certified teachers and support personnel and 9 paraprofessionals. The pupil/teacher ratio is 17:1. The specific number of staff by positions is shown in the table below.

ULNE Positions and Numbers

Position(s)	Number
Gifted	1
Special Education	8
EL (part time)	1
EIP	3
ELA/Reading	9
Mathematics	9
Science	9
Social Studies	9
P.E.	2
Instructional Technology Coach (part time)	1
Instructional Coach for Curriculum (part time)	1
Media	1
Paraprofessionals	9
Psychologist	1
Counselor	1
Social Worker	1
Administrators	2

Prior to the elimination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) through the Georgia federal ESEA Waivers in 2012, ULNE had made AYP as specified in the *No Child Left Behind* federal statute for nine consecutive years. The school has been recognized as a Title I Distinguished School. Under Georgia’s new designations for Title I Schools, Upson-Lee North Elementary was named one of the state’s Reward Schools for High Progress in academic gains in the last three years.

Past Instructional Initiatives

- Ruby Payne, *Understanding Poverty*
- Ron Clarke, *The Excellent 11*
- Implementation of GPS
- *My Access! Writing*
- School-wide math RtI
- Cultural Diversity (system initiative)
- Differentiation (system initiative)
- *Thinking Maps* (system initiative)
- *Love and Logic* (system initiative)
- *Fast for Word* (Tier III intervention. Lost due to funding.)
- *Mindset Training*

Current Instructional Initiatives

- Extended Learning Time (enrichment, acceleration, intervention)
- Least Restrictive Environment and Collaborative Teaching
- Differentiation
- Implementation of CCGPS
- *Study Island*
- *Lexia Learning*
- Tier 2 and Tier 3: Response to Intervention
- *Renaissance Learning: Accelerated Reader and Accelerated Math* (including *STAR Assessments*)
- *Thinking Maps: Write From the Beginning and Beyond*

Administrative and Teacher Leadership Team

The school leadership team holds meetings once a month to facilitate the development of the Continuous Improvement Plan and monitor, assess, and amend the plan as needed. The monthly meetings consist of items addressing the three system-wide goals set by Superintendent Dr. Maggie Shook: Goal Area I: Increasing Achievement; Goal Area II: Promoting Stakeholder Involvement; and Goal Area III: Creating Organizational Effectiveness. Data Analysis (academic and discipline) and logistical information are the primary topics of discussion.

The composition of the team is as follows:

Team Member	Position
--------------------	-----------------

Shad Seymour	Principal
Amy Miller	Assistant Principal
Ann Larson	Instructional Coach for Curriculum (Part Time)
Jaime Joiner	Instructional Coach for Technology (Part Time)
Shameika Worthy	School Counselor
Christy Johnson	Library Media Specialist
Daniel Sparrow	School Psychologist
Jenna Dunaway	Special Education Lead Teacher
Kenneth Vaughn	Grade 5 English-Language Arts-Gifted Certified
Angela Floyd	Grade 5 Science/Social Studies-Gifted Certified
Vernechia Derico	Grade 5 Science/Social Studies-Gifted Certified
Powell Hosey	Grade 4 English-Language Arts/Social Studies
Patti Weed	Grade 4 English-Language Arts/Social Studies
Traci Harrison	Grade 5 Mathematics-Gifted Certified
Heather Rawls	Grade 4 Mathematics/Science-Gifted Certified
Heather Lonecke	Grade 4 Mathematics/Science
Wendy McWaters	Early Intervention Program-Math Specialist
Dr. David Beeland	Director of Technology & Federal Programs (TUCS)

Professional Learning Needs

- In order to become a 21st century school and allow students to become members of a 21st century society, teachers need to understand how to integrate technology into instruction.
- Though some professional learning has been provided regarding *STAR* Assessments, *Data Director* (benchmarking program), and *SLDS*, further training on analysis of assessment data to improve instruction is needed.
- In order to improve instruction at Tier I, professional learning in regards to best practices in reading/writing instruction, implementing literature circles, guided reading, and cross-curriculum writing is needed.
- Administrators and team leaders will be trained to use Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist to gauge teachers' delivery of literacy instruction.

- In order to provide appropriate reading interventions for Tier II-IV students, professional development is needed regarding research-based literacy instruction.
- In order to increase the amount of collaborative learning across the curriculum, professional learning on flexible grouping and cooperative learning groups is needed.
- For teachers to understand the importance of using the Lexile Framework for Reading in order to match readers with books, articles, and other leveled reading resources, professional development is needed.
- The ULNE Leadership team needs professional development regarding ways to implement, monitor, and follow through with new initiatives.

Need for Striving Readers' Project

The staff at ULNE holds high expectations for all students and lives by our mission statement, "Understanding, Learning, Nurturing...Every day." It is crucial to ensure that all of our students receive the highest standard of literacy instruction to begin their lives in society. With society and technology rapidly evolving, students must steadily increase their ability to read, write, and solve problems at more complex levels. Our students are our future. Therefore, we must motivate, engage, and provide them effective literacy instruction at an early age in order for them to complete high school ready to pursue multiple college and career options.

Our current screener data indicates that 37-46% of our students are reading one or more grades below level. CRCT Lexile data is concurrent with our screener data, showing 32-37% of students in grade 4 and 5 did not meet the CCRPI Lexile targets. The average Lexile level for fourth grade SWD is 657 (below Grade 4 750 target). The average fifth grade SWD Lexile level was 731 (below Grade 5 850 target). Our Grade 5 Georgia Writing Assessment data shows significant achievement gaps for SWD, Blacks, and males. A Striving Readers' grant will assist our school in systematically implementing evidence-based strategies to address school-wide literacy gaps that we have identified in our comprehensive literacy plan.

ULNE Literacy Plan

Note: This plan has been prepared based on our needs assessment, review of formative and summative data, and evidence presented in *Georgia Literacy Plan: The Why* document.

Building Block 1. Engaged Leadership

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

“Leadership is cited no less than 30 times as being a key piece in any aspect of literacy performance” (The Why, p.157). In order for a school to be effective in increasing student literacy, it is paramount that all administrators fully understand how to teach reading and writing (The Why, p. 155). Administrators must become exemplars in regards to their knowledge of effective literacy instruction and supporting the instructional needs of teachers and students. Participation in ongoing professional development and a continuous review of student data are required in increasing achievement across the curriculum.

In order to continue our commitment to learn about and support evidence-based literacy instruction, the ULNE Leadership will continue to support the following procedures and initiatives:

1. Require teacher AND administrator participation in CCGPS Webinars/RESA training (The How, p. 20; The Why, p. 166).
2. Provide quarterly ELA planning (The How, p. 20).
3. Require after school content meetings (twice monthly) (The How, p. 20).
4. Provide a 90-minute ELA block (The What, p. 10).
5. Continue ELT Rotation ($\frac{2}{3}$ literacy focus).
6. Utilize our two members of DOE ELA Revision Team as internal experts.
7. Seek cross-curricular guidance from our three certified *Write From the Beginning and Beyond* (WFTBB) trainers.
8. Continue to enlist teachers for professional development through Griffin RESA (ELA Consortium, Best Practices in ELA) (The How, p. 20).
9. Utilize our nine gifted certified teachers’ training in differentiation to provide peer-to-peer support.
10. Continue to utilize an incentive based school-wide AR program.
11. Continue to provide EIP Reading Instruction (*Lexia*) during the school day.
12. Continue to use *Wordly Wise* as a supplementary tool to improve vocabulary development.
13. Use part-time Instructional Coach/Reading Specialist as a guide during unit/lesson development.
14. Continue to screen all students quarterly in order to identify at-risk learners (The Why, p. 98).

To improve our commitment to learn about and support evidence-based literacy instruction, the ULNE Leadership will implement the following procedural or instructional changes:

1. Ensure that all lessons in ALL contents include the key components in improving student literacy (advanced word study, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and motivation) (The Why, p. 26-27.)
2. Implement literacy circles and guided reading instruction.
3. Require part-time Instructional Coach for Curriculum/Reading Specialist to work directly with teachers and students, modeling best practices in instruction.
4. Increase knowledge and use of data-driven decision-making (CRCT, Universal Screeners (STAR)).
5. Utilize formative assessment and provide immediate feedback to students AND teachers.
6. Implement effective practices in literacy instruction for ALL content area teachers.
7. Utilize Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist.
8. Use student and system technology to increase literacy (The Why, p. 56).
9. Increase student motivation and success using the *Accelerated Reader* Program (The Why, p. 54).
10. Implement a Reading Endorsement initiative school wide to ensure the sustainability of literacy best practices.

B. Action: Organize a Literacy Leadership Team

The ULNE Literacy Team was established October 17, 2013. The team consists of members from all instructional and support areas (Special Education, Media/Library, Administration, Instructional Coach for Curriculum, Early Intervention Specialist, and all content areas).

In order to develop a fully functioning Literacy Team, the ULNE Leadership will continue to support the following procedures and initiatives:

1. Communicate literacy plan to school council and all parents (The How, p. 21).
2. Identify at-risk readers (universal screeners, common assessments, progress monitoring) (The Why, p.98) (The How, p. 21).
3. Revise the ULNE School Improvement Plan based on literacy research and student data; monitor achievement of objectives at monthly meetings (The How, p. 21).
4. Realign personnel as needed to maximize literacy goals (The How, p. 21).
5. Provide five full professional days for Literacy Team and regular monthly meetings (The How, p. 22).
6. Analyze the impact of student assessment, attendance, and discipline data on achievement (The How, p. 22; The Why, p. 96).

ULNE Leadership will implement the following procedural or instructional changes:

1. Add additional, non-personnel stakeholders to ULNE Literacy Team.
2. Use the Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist to regularly assess literacy instruction in all content areas (The How, p. 21).
3. Define literacy priorities and allocate needed resources to sustain them over time (The How, p. 21).
4. Increase communication with parents regarding students' reading and writing abilities (The Why, p. 36).
5. Provide opportunities for the ULNE Literacy Team to visit other schools with effective, well-established literacy plans and successful gains in student achievement (The How, p. 21).

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

Ensuring effective use of instructional time and providing protected time for uninterrupted literacy instruction and collaborative planning are critical pieces in an effective literacy plan. Although content area teachers recognize that effective instruction in Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics reinforces literacy standards, especially those addressing reading and writing informational text, the burden of instruction and assessment has primarily been placed upon language arts teachers. ULNE teachers need more professional development and resources to truly understand the importance of collaborative planning and cross-curricular literacy instruction.

In order to maximize the use of time and personnel through scheduling and collaborative planning, ULNE Leadership will CONTINUE to support the following procedures and initiatives:

1. Provide a 90 minute ELA block (The How, p. 22)
2. Provide ELT Rotation (2/3 Literacy Focus) (The How, p. 23)
3. Increase collaborative planning to adjust units (weekly/monthly) (The How, p. 22)
4. Ensure that the majority of students with disabilities are served under a cooperative teaching model, as appropriate.
5. Analyze formative assessment results (*STAR/AR*) (The How, p. 23)
6. Continue to provide reading intervention (EIP) within the daily academic schedule (during resource time) (The Why, p. 139-140; The How, p. 23)

ULNE's sample schedule is shown below. Currently, 90 minutes of instruction is specifically designated for CCGPS English-Language Arts instruction. Currently, ULNE is trying to revise Math, Science, and Social Studies units to include specific instruction regarding comprehension, vocabulary, and writing.

4th Grade	Instructional Segment	5th Grade	Instructional Segment
------------------	------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

7:30-7:55	Homeroom	7:30-7:55	Homeroom
7:55-8:45	Reading	7:55-8:40	Reading
8:45-9:35	ELA	8:40-9:25	ELA
9:35-10:20	Social Studies	9:25-10:10	Math
10:20-11:05	Resource/EIP Reading (Tier II & III)	10:10-11:00	Math
11:05-11:50	ELT/EIP Math (Tier II & III)	11:00-11:50	ELT/EIP Math (Tier II & III)
12:20-1:05	Math	12:20-1:05	Resource/EIP Reading (Tier II & III)
1:05-1:50	Math	1:05-1:50	Science
1:50-2:35	Science	1:50-2:35	Social Studies

In order to IMPROVE our use of time and personnel through scheduling and collaborative planning, ULNE Leadership will implement the following procedural or instructional changes:

1. Ensure that ELA and content teachers examine student work and assessment data and adapt instruction (The How, p. 22).
2. Increase differentiation of content, process, product, and learning within our instructional units and in our delivery models.
3. Provide time for cross-curricular planning (especially ELA and Social Studies) in order to improve students' abilities to read and write informational text (The How, p. 23).
4. Provide professional development and grade-wide strategies for increasing the use of formative assessment of reading/writing skills and strategies.

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

As mentioned in Building Block 1: C, the primary burden of literacy instruction at ULNE has been placed on language arts teachers. There are some foundational pieces of cross-curricular literacy instruction in place (scheduling and planning opportunities); however, additional professional development, funding for unit realignment, and additional resources are needed.

In order to create a school culture in which improving student literacy is a school-wide, interdisciplinary initiative, the ULNE Leadership will continue to support the following procedures and initiatives:

1. Analyze screener and summative (benchmarks & CRCT) data regularly (The How, p. 24)
2. Participate in CCGPS webinars & staff development (The How, p. 20)
3. Identify target students and track their academic progress using STAR, common assessments, daily class work, and standardized testing. (The How, p. 24)

In order to improve the school culture and our approach to improving student literacy, ULNE Leadership will implement the following procedural or instructional changes:

1. Evaluate current instructional practices addressing literacy across the curriculum using the Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist (The How, p. 24)
2. Work as part of interdisciplinary teams, thus ensuring that all content area teachers have access to an ELA content specialist to assist in building reading and writing skills into all content areas.
3. Adjust all instructional units from all content areas in order to incorporate reading and writing activities into all daily lessons.
4. Provide professional development in order to improve literacy instruction, thus improving student literacy in all academic areas.
5. Implement a Reading Endorsement initiative school wide to ensure sustainability of best practices in literacy instruction.

E. Action: Optimize literacy instruction across all content areas

According to *Georgia's Literacy Plan: The "Why"*, the most effective K-5 schools provided an average of 60 minutes of guided, ability grouped reading instruction (p. 58). Providing reading instruction AT students' reading ability levels allows the opportunity for success and the educator to build proficiency. At ULNE, the majority of the reading instruction in Tier I is provided through whole group instruction using a standard, grade level text. Although ULNE has provided professional development on improving student writing (*WFTBB*), we are not fully implementing a cross-curricular approach to writing, nor are we providing enough opportunities for students to write extensively (The Why, p. 43). Despite, a moderate amount of professional learning, the ULNE writing scores dropped significantly in 2013. Only 69% of fifth grade students passed the Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment. Only 19% of SWD and 52% of Black students met or exceeded grade level writing standards..

In order to optimize literacy instruction, therefore increasing student proficiency, ULNE Leadership will continue to support the following procedures and initiatives:

1. Continue to use *Wordly Wise* used as a supplementary vocabulary instruction tool (The How, p. 26).
2. Continue efforts to link Social Studies content and ELA (The How, p. 26).
3. Continue to integrate writing into all five content areas (The How, p. 26).

4. Use the K-12 English Language teacher to decrease the gap in student achievement for EL students (The How, p. 26).
5. Continue ULNE literacy-based programs such as Family Reading Night, Constitution Day, Veterans Day Program, VIP Student Readers, RESA Literacy Contest, and UL Movie Academy Awards (The How, p. 26).

In order to improve literacy instruction, ULNE Leadership will implement the following procedural and instructional changes:

1. Participate in professional learning in the following areas (The What, p. 6):
 - a. Incorporating the use of literary texts in content areas
 - b. Using informational text in ELA classes
 - c. Incorporating writing instruction (narrative, argument, and informational) in all subject areas
 - d. Implementing and applying Lexile levels in the classroom
 - e. Selecting text complexity that is appropriate to grade levels as required by CCGPS
 - f. Selecting text complexity that is adjusted to the needs of individual students
 - g. Instructing students in the following:
 - i. Conducting short research projects that use several sources
 - ii. Identifying and navigating the text structures most common to a particular content area (e.g., social studies, cause and effect; science, problem/solution)
 - iii. Supporting opinions with reasons and information
 - iv. Determining author bias or point of view
2. Work as part of interdisciplinary teams, thus ensuring that all content area teachers have access to an ELA content specialist to assist in building reading and writing skills into all content areas.
3. Improve our understanding of how EL students learn and increase English Language proficiency.
4. Encourage teachers to identify common themes, where possible, across subject areas in order to increase engagement and relevance (The How, p. 26).
5. Expand meaningful opportunities for students to write, speak, and listen (e.g., contests, debates, speeches, wikis, blogs, staff monitored *You-Tube* videos, and drama) (The How, p. 26).
6. Celebrate and publish student-writing products (The How, p. 26).
7. Provide more resources to align with students' Lexile levels in all content areas.
8. Purchase a universal screener to identify student Lexile levels.

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.

In today's economy, an employee's independent knowledge and abilities will define them as necessary or expendable. "People who cannot write and communicate clearly will not be hired, and if already working, are unlikely to last long enough to be considered for promotion" (The Why, p. 28).

In order to continue use of our community to support schools and teachers in the development of college-and-career-ready students as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards, ULNE Leadership will continue to:

1. Refer students for Park Lane Place (After School Tutoring) (The How, p. 28).
2. Consult with Thomaston-Upson Parent Involvement Coordinator (DeAnn Hopkins).
3. Consult with Special Education Parent Mentor (Taimie Hoffman).
4. Continue to provide AR/STAR Growth Awards (The How, p. 28).
5. Support the FERST Foundation student book ownership program (The How, p. 28).
6. Coordinate activities with Hightower Memorial Library.
7. Coordinate with the Lincoln Park After School Tutoring Program.
8. Continue to use students as V.I.P Guest Readers for Family Reading Night (The How, p. 28).
9. Continue Career Day.
10. Continue with classroom, school, and community essay contests.

In order to improve our use of the community to support schools and teachers in the development of college-and-career-ready students as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards, ULNE Leadership will implement the following procedural/policy changes:

1. Build a network of learning supports within the Upson Education Alliance (The How, p. 28)
2. Acquire more resources to provide after school tutoring and support our community after school programs (The How, p. 28)
3. Ask past students, who have been particularly successful, to speak to students and the community at large as to the potential for schools to change lives (The How, p. 28).
4. Establish a mentoring system, from within and outside of the school, for every student who needs additional support (The How, p. 28).
5. Proactively focus on broad issues that may prevent students from learning (The How, p. 28).

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.)

Providing students with the skills to become proficient, literate learners is the responsibility of all school personnel (The Why, p. 54). Direct instruction regarding reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills and strategies must exist in all subject areas (The Why, p. 26). In order for cross-disciplinary instruction to occur, collaborative teams must be created.

Department teams at ULNE meet after school to discuss instructional sequence, assessments, and strategies for student achievement. These teams meet a minimum of twice a month. However, many teams meet weekly to facilitate unity in the implementation of best practices for the classroom. Teachers work as part of interdisciplinary teams, thus ensuring that all content area teachers have access to an ELA content specialist to assist in building reading and writing skills into all content areas (The Why, p. 31).

At Upson-Lee North Elementary, two collaborative teams have been created to discuss literacy and instruction, the ULNE School Improvement Team and the ULNE Literacy Team. In order to improve the effectiveness of these two teams, ULNE will continue to:

1. Schedule time for teams to meet for regular collaboration and examination of student/data work (The How, p. 29). Require minutes and evidence of these meetings to be submitted to administration.
2. Set specific, measurable student achievement goals that align with grade-level expectations shared by teachers in all subjects (The How, p. 29).
3. Create awareness of the need to identify achievement gaps (The How, p. 29).
4. Present data analysis from summative assessments (administrators).
5. Use STAR Reading data to identify students who are not meeting grade-level expectations.
6. Reinforce whole literacy practices in all content areas.
7. Provide interdisciplinary teams a collaborative planning period (50 minutes) each week and record minutes and sign-in sheets.
8. Implement common in-unit and end-of-unit assessments and monitor student progress as a grade level.
9. Participate in grade-level or school-wide essay contests to promote writing.

In order to increase our consistent literacy focus across the curriculum, ULNE collaborative teams will implement the following changes:

1. Provide more professional development opportunities to enhance lessons and activities presented from current resources.
2. Provide professional development to understand new resources, technology equipment, and student hand-held devices.
3. Create an ongoing professional learning network for literacy (The Why, p. 142).
4. Require interdisciplinary units that provide specific instruction on reading and writing strategies and assist students in making connections among the subject areas.

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

Effective literacy instruction does not simply take place in a single classroom for a portion of the day. Instead, literacy instruction should be implemented and reinforced throughout all classes daily. It is important to make good reading skills a habit rather than a lesson (The Why, p. 32).

In order to support our teachers in providing literacy instruction across the curriculum, ULNE will continue to:

1. Hold monthly faculty meetings on the last Monday of every month.
2. Provide reinforcement training for all teachers regarding *Thinking Maps: Write from the Beginning and Beyond (WFTBB)*.
3. Identify concepts and skills that students need to meet expectations in CCGPS (The How, p.30).
4. Use research-based strategies and appropriate resources to support student learning of the CCGPS (The How, p.30).
5. Identify/strengthen skills or knowledge in future lessons for students to reach standards proficiency (The How, p. 30).
6. Provide opportunities for reading varied genres to improve fluency, confidence, and understanding (The How, p. 30).
7. Expand opportunities for students to write, speak, and listen using both face-to-face and online options for listening, viewing, and communicating through social media (The How, p. 30).
8. Study the text structures most frequently used in texts of each content area (The How, p. 31).
9. Teach and have students practice writing as a process (pre-write, draft, revise, edit, and publish online and on hardcopy) (The How, p. 3).
10. Host family nights that engage parents in activities that demonstrate the importance of literacy proficiency (Family Reading Night). Other PTO programs held throughout the year reinforce literacy skills such as reading for information, listening, and speaking skills (The How, p. 31).
11. Plan a literacy celebration for the entire school (Book Character Day/Parade). Book fairs held three times a year (The How, p. 31).

In order to support our teachers in providing literacy instruction across the curriculum, ULNE will implement the following changes:

1. Investigate core programs that can provide continuity and a carefully articulated scope and sequence of skills that integrated into a rich curriculum of literary and informational texts.
2. 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 (The How, p. 30).

3. Use school-wide, commonly adopted writing rubrics that align with the CCGPS and/or *WFTBB* to set clear expectations and goals for performance (The How, p. 31).
4. Infuse all types of literacy into all content areas throughout the day (e.g., print, non-print, online, blogs, wikis, social media) (The How, p. 31).
5. Require purposeful reading and writing in the content areas, with required conventions, sending the message that conventional spelling, punctuation, and grammar serve the purpose of facilitating communication.
6. Provide literacy training for non-ELA teachers regarding strategies and the importance of literacy across the curriculum (Staff Needs Survey).
7. Continue training for the universal implementation of writing in the ELA classroom and across the curriculum.
8. Expand opportunities for students to write, speak, and listen using both face-to-face and online options for listening, viewing, and communicating through social media (The How, p. 30).
9. Provide content teachers with more resources such as *Weekly Readers*, *Georgia Social Studies or Science Weekly*, up-to-date textbook resources, class sets of biographies and interdisciplinary novels, materials for hands-on projects and experiments, and content-related or high student-interest classroom libraries.
10. Implement Reading Endorsement initiative school wide to ensure sustainability of best practices in literacy instruction.
11. Provide more literacy and media resources for all content areas.
12. Update textbooks or resources, especially Social Studies and English Language Arts.
13. Level nonfiction and fiction texts with appropriate Lexile levels.

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

A partnership between schools and out-of-school agencies or community after-school programs creates an alliance that fosters relevance in instruction (The Why, p. 51). Working together as a team to motivate learners and promote common literacy goals has a direct impact on increasing literacy achievement.

In our efforts to collaborate with supporting out-of-school agencies and organizations within the community, ULNE will continue to:

1. Partner with FERST Foundation to provide books to economically disadvantaged children.
2. Provide opportunities for students to get involved in service projects in the school and community through 4-H and other organizations.
3. Collaborate with local businesses to provide supplies and resources to students who cannot obtain them at the beginning of the year.

4. Utilize the district and school website to communicate with stakeholders.

In order to improve our collaboration with supporting out-of-school agencies and organizations within the community, ULNE will implement the following changes:

1. Investigate various models of coordinating “wrap-around” services (The How, p. 3; The What, p.7).
2. Utilize our system Parent Involvement Coordinator to communicate with local tutors, after-school programs, summer literacy programs, and community leaders.
3. Seek the appointment of a staff member to the Upson Education Alliance.
4. Establish a comprehensive system of learning supports to enhance motivation and capability of the critical mass of stakeholders (The How, p. 33).
5. Improve our use of technology to increase stakeholder engagement, i.e., blogs, Twitter, electronic newsletters, School Reach (The What, p. 8).
6. Educate our stakeholders regarding our current literacy instructional practices, literacy support programs, literacy acceleration programs, resources, texts, and needs.

Building Block 3. Ongoing formative and summative assessments

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

The Georgia Literacy Plan recognizes the significance of identifying the literacy needs of students, the instructional approaches needed to achieve literacy, and the assessment components necessary to advance student growth and success (The Why, p. 95). Early indicators and observations of reading levels allow teachers to plan and devise specific instruction for at-risk students, as well as increase reading comprehension levels for the average and above learner. As a grades 4-5 elementary school, it is difficult correcting poor reading habits and below grade-level reading skills after grade three. Screening students early and providing intensive reading intervention based on specific deficits is far more effective (The Why, p. 101).

Screening data in August 2013 indicates that 50% of grade 4 and 44.7% of grade 5 students are one or more grades below grade level. Using April 2013 CRCT Reading Lexile data, 32% of grade 4 students and 37% of grade 5 student did not meet the Lexile targets set by the Georgia Department of Education.

One of our biggest challenges in RtI at ULNE is that our primary reading intervention program, *Lexia*, is the same program used at the primary school, Upson-Lee South Elementary (ULSE). When the budget for technology, support staff, and interventions was greater, *Fast for Word* was used at ULSE and ULNE as a Tier III intervention, ensuring that the intervention was changed to a more specific, intensive intervention at Tier III. To achieve Building Block 3A’s expectations the use of effective screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools will be implemented to identify achievement levels of below, as well as, advanced students.

In order to maintain our infrastructure for ongoing formative and summative assessments to determine the need for and the intensity of interventions, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, ULNE will continue to:

1. Review and analyze *STAR Reading* results to correlate instructional material with various student comprehension levels.
2. Provide detailed feedback of *Accelerated Reader* data to students and allow them to graph their own progress (The How, p. 34).
3. Implement common assessments (The How, p. 34). Common Assessments are by grade level and content area and written into the units/lesson plans. The assessments themselves specify an area in which additional instruction is needed, not how to instruct (The Why, p. 98). More professional development and planning are needed to train teachers to disaggregate data from common assessments and adapt instruction.
4. Use progress reports/report cards, sent home quarterly, to inform parents. Parents are then able to provide feedback to their child allowing for positive academic restructuring. ULNE teachers contact the parents of all students that are failing an academic subject and request a conference.
5. Incorporate purposeful writing in all five subjects that teachers will commonly assess.
6. Conduct annual benchmarks at the midpoint of the school year. These assessments are currently administered in hard copy format, but scanned and disaggregated using *Data Director*. Due to budgets constraints, *Data Director* will no longer be available after 2013-2014. ULNE is not currently equipped with the necessary technology to administer these assessments online.
7. Analyze summative data obtained from CRCT and other standardized assessments.

Though ULNE has the foundational infrastructure for screening and monitoring students, a more in-depth, diagnostic assessment is needed to identify exact deficits and identify appropriate text levels or Lexiles. Two primary deficits in our Response to Intervention (RtI) program are a lack of intervention materials or software and adequate professional development to effectively implement appropriate interventions. According to our longitudinal RtI data, many of our students have been served through the Early Intervention Program (EIP) or RtI for over a year; thus indicating that adequate interventions to return students to Tier I have not been effectively provided.

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

The building blocks for ongoing formative and summative assessments are in place to define the need for and the intensity of interventions and to evaluate the success of instruction (The What, p. 8).

To achieve the expectations of Building Block 3B, ULNE will:

1. Utilize universal screening, progress monitoring, and curriculum-based assessments to assist with instructional decisions (The What, p. 8) in the areas of:
 - a. Flexible 4-Tier service options for Response to Intervention (RtI)
 - b. Special Education
 - c. Challenge (Gifted)
 - d. Extended Learning Time (ELT)
2. Continue to use STAR Reading as a universal screener and progress-monitoring tool.
3. Implement a testing and analysis calendar at the beginning of each year to provide a baseline for each student and at the end of each grading period (The How, p. 36). This provides immediate feedback for the students, teachers, and administrators.
4. Conduct benchmark testing at midpoint of school year, in January. Instructional feedback is provided within 24 hours and uploaded into *Data Director*. Test items align with CCGPS as preparatory for the CRCT.
5. Analyze summative assessment data using the Georgia Longitudinal Database System (SLDS).
6. Purchase a data storage system (The What, p. 8) that will retain Tier II and Tier III progress monitoring, intervention, formative/summative data, and documentation of meeting dates and notes.

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

Currently, ULNE uses the *STAR Reading* as a universal screener and progress-monitoring tool. The *STAR Reading Diagnostic Report* provides a percentile rank, Instructional Reading Level (IRL), Grade Equivalency (GE), Estimated Oral Reading Fluency (ORF), and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). It does not identify a specific comprehension or vocabulary target area, recommend a specific intervention strategy, or provide an appropriate Lexile level. Students placed in Tier II or Tier III are screened with a more in-depth assessment through the *Lexia Program*. This screener will recommend programs within Lexia and monitor progress. Unfortunately, with limited staff and resources Lexia has become our “one-size-fits-all” intervention tool (The What, p.9).

1. Limited populations of students actually receive interventions based on our diagnostic assessment (*Lexia*). With only one Reading Early Intervention Program (EIP) teacher, we do not have adequate number of faculty, technology, and funding in place to address the needs of all students that meet the requirements.
2. *STAR Reading* and Lexia are used for progress monitoring in the intervention process. *STAR Reading* assesses comprehension aligned with the CCGPS.
3. *Lexia* is another software program utilized with those students who have been identified as needing diagnostic assessments to assist in the intervention process, or students who are being served in special education. *Lexia* assists students in acquiring foundational reading skills. *Lexia* is an individual program with many

different levels that meet the needs of each student. *Lexia* is a highly accredited, research-based intervention program; however, due to budget constraints, *Lexia* is primarily used as both a Tier II and Tier III reading intervention.

4. Students' incremental gains towards reaching literacy goals will be acknowledged and celebrated (The How, p. 37).

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

According to ULNE summative data, 32-37% of our students are not reading at a grade appropriate Lexile level. Student performance within the Information and Media Literacy domain of the Grade 4 and 5 Reading CRCT is significantly below the performance level with the Literacy Comprehension domain. The lack of proficiency in comprehending informational text is directly linked to performance on the Grades 4 and 5 Science and Social Studies CRCT, which is on a three-year decline. With the implementation of CCGPS, all content area teachers are charged with incorporating direct instruction of comprehension and vocabulary skills and strategies; however, the instructional units and lessons currently place most of the responsibility for literacy instruction on the language arts teachers. The current practices for reviewing summative data include:

1. Specific time is designated for all faculty to review and dissect previous year's CRCT data and other outcome assessments for establishing a baseline for individualizing instruction (The What, p. 9 & The How, p. 38). Those assessments include, but are not limited to: CRCT, *STAR Reading*, Cumulative ELA/Reading grades.
2. During content area meetings, time is dedicated to reviewing and analyzing assessments to identify needed programs and instructional adjustments (The What, p. 9). These adjustments can then be implemented during Extended Learning Time (ELT), Early Intervention Program (EIP), Special Education, English Learner (EL), or Challenge (Gifted) classes.
3. Professional Development is routinely scheduled to offer learning opportunities to faculty in order to ensure progress of all subgroups and their various learning modalities.
4. Individual student progress for at-risk students is monitored through EIP at Tier II and Tier III. Intervention teams discuss summative data, progress-monitoring data, and work samples at each RtI meeting (The How, p. 38).

In order to improve our use of summative data to make programming decisions, ULNE will implement the following changes:

1. Require teachers to disaggregate their CRCT data at the end of the year and at the beginning of the next year. Teachers will compare their class progress with the DOE CRCT performance targets set for each subgroup (The What, p. 9).

2. Require teachers to monitor growth on summative as well as formative assessments.
3. Require collaborative teacher teams to document changes in instructional units or lessons based on summative and formative data.

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

In order to improve teaching and learning, data must be readily accessible to school faculty in order to drive successful decision making throughout the school year. All faculty and staff should have the ability to sort and dissect in a timely manner for data analysis and collaborative decision-making to be implemented (The Why, p.96).

At ULNE, a plethora of data is available for monitoring students and subgroup proficiency; however, specific protocols for data-driven decision-making, procedures and expectations for disaggregating and applying the data, and protocols for team meetings to discuss formative and summative data are not clearly established.

1. ULNE collects student data using the following sources:
 - a. State Longitudinal Data System (CRCT, CRCT-M data)
 - b. Informal assessments
 - c. Common, content assessments
 - d. Mid-year benchmarks (disaggregated and scored with *Data Director*)
 - e. Teacher Observations
 - f. *STAR Reading* Scores
 - g. Flexible Tier Process (Response to Intervention - RtI)

ULNE will:

- Clearly establish a protocol for making decisions to identify the instructional needs of students (The How, p. 39).
- Develop procedures and expectations for staff to review and analyze assessment results (The How, p. 39).
- Establish protocols for collaborative team meetings, such as those found on <http://www.lasw.org/methods.html> (The What, p. 9).

Building Block 4. Best Practices in Literacy Instruction

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

ULNE plans to develop a core program that will provide continuity of scope and sequence that is integrated into a rich curriculum of literary and informational texts (The What, p. 40). In order to make literacy gains in all academic areas, ULNE will continue to provide direct, explicit instruction for all students in the following ways:

1. Training for all teachers has been provided and will continue to be provided in *Thinking Maps: Write from the Beginning and Beyond (WFTBB)*.
2. *Wordly Wise* will be utilized in both 4th and 5th grades as a supplementary tool to build vocabulary skills. With this program, teachers provide explicit vocabulary instruction.
3. Use research-based strategies and appropriate resources to support student learning of the CCGPS.
4. Special education teachers and EIP teachers use Lexia to teach explicit literacy instruction.
5. Students are provided with a protected segment for extended learning time. During this segment, teachers of various content areas provide direct, explicit instruction in the areas of literacy.
6. Students with disabilities will receive specialized instruction from special education teachers in the area of literacy with Lexia, teaching of phonological awareness, providing opportunities for fluency in reading, and teaching the effectiveness of word prediction software when writing.
7. Co-teaching pairs will share effective differentiated lessons and differentiation strategies in teacher team meetings (The How, p. 40).

ULNE plans to provide instruction that is explicit, individualized, and responsive to the particular needs of learners with much more than quality programs and quantities of reading materials. Teachers will ensure that students engage in critical thinking, inquiry-based studies, and learn independently based on the CCGPS.

Results from the literacy survey supports that even though teachers use resources provided by the State of Georgia to implement these standards in literacy and core subjects, the literacy team recognizes teachers are in need of professional learning on strategies to provide direct, explicit instruction to students with various levels of ability. Professional development opportunities will allow teachers to learn how to use assessments to drive their direct instruction practices. “The ‘how to instruct’ must be embedded in sound professional learning opportunities and training. In the Georgia Literacy Plan, ongoing professional learning expectations center around the marriage of effective instructional strategies based on assessments and the alignment of instruction currently to the Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS by 2014)” (The Why, p. 98).

Concerning literacy instruction, the amount of assistance varies with the student’s ability to accomplish a task and is observed through an interactive process between student and teacher. Professional learning and bi-monthly content meetings will be conducted to aid the teacher in assessing and analyzing data from student’s present ability and responds with just enough support to help the student accomplish the task. Students will spend at least 50% of their time fully engaged in literary and informational reading and writing texts that resonate with them. When providing professional development, funding has limited the amount of trainings offered. Future professional development will offer direct, explicit instructional strategies to build students’ vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills within each subject area (The How, p. 40). ULNE has identified a need for professional development in the following areas:

1. Implementing daily components of literacy instruction and strategies to scaffold instruction.
2. Assessing and analyzing data to inform instructional decisions (The What, p. 10).
3. Implementing best practices in reading instruction using literary and informational texts.
4. Co-teaching strategies for literacy.
5. Differentiating literacy instruction. “More specifically, the CIERA researchers, Taylor, et al., found that the most effective elementary schools provided an average of 60 minutes a day of small, ability-grouped instruction. That was instruction that provided differentiation at the students’ achievement level and therefore presumes additional time for grade-level instruction as well” (The Why, p.58).

Effective implementation of professional development includes the goal of training administrators and teachers. Administrators need assistance with using assessment tools to gauge current practices in literacy instruction. Teachers need training to implement differentiated instruction, technology, and collaborating with peers and students. Administrators and staff members will implement the Georgia Literary Instruction Observation Checklist, along with other observation instruments, to ensure instruction is appropriately gauged (The How, p. 40).

B. Teachers work to develop and maintain interest and engagement as students progress through school.

Students’ perceptions about their reading and writing abilities carry over and impact their achievement in all subject areas. Therefore, effective literacy instruction must account for how to address the issues of self-efficacy, motivation, and engagement (The Why, p. 52). Research suggests specific strategies for facilitating literacy engagement. “(1) Help students discover the purpose and benefits of reading. (2) Create opportunities for students to see themselves as successful readers. (3) Give students reading choices. (4) Give students the opportunity to learn by collaborating with their peers” (The Why, p. 54). Currently, teachers are using the following tools and methods to develop and maintain interest and engagement as students’ progress through school:

1. Interactive flipcharts
2. Bring Your Own Technology (The Why, p. 53)
3. Providing student computers
4. Most classrooms are equipped with ActivVotes or ActivExpressions
5. Accelerated Reader Incentives
6. Relating instruction to prior knowledge (The Why, p. 41)
7. Classroom environments are supportive and pleasant (The Why, p. 31)
8. Peer reviews (The Why, p. 59)

Consistent with page 41 of the “How” document, teachers take steps to provide students with an understanding of the relevance of their academic assignments. In the Implementing Stage of the

“How” document, teachers and staff members plan to ensure that incentive programs are voluntary and are not required, not tied to grades, incentives are minimal and are connected to reading, and are used with students who are unmotivated to read rather than with those who are already excited about reading (p. 41). To ensure an increase in conceptual learning and reading engagement, teachers plan to make literacy experiences more relevant to students’ interests, everyday life, or important current events and build in certain instructional conditions, such as student goal setting, self-directed learning, and collaborative learning.

In reading through the research included in the *The Why* document, it is evident that ULNE teachers need more professional development and additional resources in order to maintain interest and engagement as students’ progress through school. Additional texts in a variety of genres and formats are needed to increase student interest and engagement (i.e., Nonfiction-scientific, political advertisement, technical, biographical; Fiction- novels, short stories, plays, scripts; Non-print art, cartoons, etc.) (p. 49).

ULNE plans to provide a positive learning environment that promotes students’ autonomy in learning. Page 54 of *The Why* document outlines recommendations to promote student motivation:

1. To understand the purpose and benefit of reading
2. To see themselves as successful readers
3. To have reading choices
4. Opportunities for peer collaboration

Based on our student literacy needs assessment results, 23.67% of our students disagree or are not sure that they are a good reader. 26.97% disagree or are not sure that they are proud of their current *Accelerated Reader* book level. Based on this data, the ULNE Literacy Team will focus on improving student interest and engagement in the following areas:

1. All teachers currently implement incentive programs through the use of *Accelerated Reader* program that are “voluntary and not required, not tied to grades, offer minimal incentives and are connected to reading, and are used with students who are unmotivated to read rather than with those who are already excited about reading” (The Why, p.41). Through the use of the *STAR/Accelerated Reader* program, students receive “motivation and self-directed learning, which includes building motivation to read and learn and providing students with instruction and supports needed for independent learning tasks they will face after graduation” (The Why, p. 66). Teachers need professional development to understand how to motivate students, effectively analyze data, monitor students who participate in the program, and strategies to provide best practices to execute the program. Teachers also need more text materials to implement into the program to develop and maintain students’ interest in reading.
2. For planning, teachers attempt to “leverage the creative use of technology” (The How, p. 41) when developing innovative lessons for all students. The literacy demands placed on students in the current global economy are greater than ever

because of technological developments; therefore, students need to be prepared to meet these demands (The Why, p.26). Due to lack of funding, teachers do not have access to a wide range of technological tools to utilize in lessons. We are a BYOT school, but due to the condition of our local economy, many students are not able nor have technology to bring to school.

3. The Library Media Specialist (LMS) is the classroom teacher's partner in promoting reading and teaching literacy skills (The Why, p. 58). The classroom teacher and LMS can collaborate to increase student-reading levels and promote student engagement. The ULNE LMS and teachers co-teach lessons to further students' understanding and awareness of the importance of literacy. Due to time constraints, few lessons are taught. ULNE plans to promote literacy within the community via collaborating with the local library and hosting family reading nights as a way for both students and parents to have positive interactions with reading.

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

For Literacy instruction to be most effective, content area reading instruction needs to be embedded in the content being presented and taught by subject area educators. Instruction should be aligned with CCGPS (The Why, P. 58).

1. ULNE teachers have been trained in *Thinking Maps: Write from the Beginning and Beyond*. In all subjects, teachers have developed unit plans to integrate writing in all subject areas; however, due to lack of funding, updated materials have not been issued to the school in any subject. In the past, ULNE used *My Access*, but due to funding, this program was eliminated.
2. ULNE plans to develop procedures to increase writing across all subject areas. In order for this to be successful, professional learning and updated materials are required. Teachers will also be trained to utilize technology in writing lessons for allowing students to conduct research and perform the writing process. Teachers will be given opportunities to share effective differentiated lessons and differentiation strategies in teacher team meetings (The How, p. 40).
"Specifically, content-area teachers at all grade levels must include reading comprehension and processing subject-specific texts in all areas: mathematics, science, social studies, Career Technical and Agricultural Education (CTAE), world languages, English Language Arts (ELA), fine arts, physical education, and health" (The Why, p.26).
3. Currently, every classroom has an interactive board to enhance the effectiveness of writing instruction. Teachers use the boards to model the writing process, from planning to publishing.

4. Teachers are working towards increasing the amount of open-ended questions on assessments and classroom assignments to develop the students' awareness of writing in all subject areas.
5. Teachers will use various types of media to research the writing process and conduct research projects that will have incorporated elements of writing. Purposes of assignments will vary and be geared to a variety of audiences. Peers will be used to review others' writings, and criticism will be focused with rubrics.
6. To enhance understanding across content areas, students at ULNE will be asked to make connections to what they read by writing intensively for a variety of purposes (The Why, p. 66).
7. ULNE students will:
 - a. Write routinely and extensively.
 - b. Interpret and analyze what they are reading in various genres.
 - c. Apply grammatical concepts throughout their writing samples.
 - d. Collaborate with peers to improve writing (The Why, p. 46).
8. Teachers at ULNE will be trained to formatively assess writing and provide immediate feedback (The Why, p. 43). Teachers will create a rubric for writing across the curriculum.
9. Purchase additional technology, such as handheld student devices or tablets, to allow students to create and produce their writing throughout all subject areas.

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.)

Schools are charged with ensuring that students are provided with adequate skills to be productive, successful members of society. When it becomes evident that students have gaps in reading achievement, specific interventions are applied to close those gaps. ULNE has a well-established Response to Intervention (RtI) plan; however, we have limited resources and have not provided adequate professional development on best practices in improving reading instruction, especially specific strategies for the most commonly at-risk students, EL learners, students of color, and economically disadvantaged students (Why, p. 65).

ULNE uses the *Renaissance Learning STAR Assessment* in reading and math as a catalyst to drive decision-making for the RtI process. Every student at ULNE is monitored through these programs. The *STAR Assessments* are administered five times a year. Once the data is collected, the data analysis team (consisting of the assistant principal, the media specialist, the three EIP teachers, and the school counselor) meets to analyze the data. The results, along with grades and CRCT scores, are used to determine intervention groups.

The current percentage of students identified for Tier II or Tier III reading interventions at ULNE is far below DOE recommendation of 16%. The EIP/RtI team is currently reviewing the most up-to-date screener and midterm data to move needed students up or down the Pyramid of Interventions. Although 49% of the students in grades 4-5 are served in reading EIP, only 10%

have been placed in Tier II or Tier III. Our data/RtI team is very proficient at identifying the students that need interventions, and the *STAR Reading Diagnostic Report* works well to identify a target area. However, with limited resources and professional development, *Lexia* is the only intervention available for Tier II or Tier III reading.

ULNE will:

- Provide professional development on best practices in improving reading instruction for all learners, especially EL, economically disadvantaged, and blacks.
- Develop a plan to enhance reading resources available at Tiers II and III (The How, ppp. 43-44).

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

ULNE has completely transitioned to CCGPS as the basis for the instructional curriculum and assessments. Currently, content teams meet regularly (a minimum of twice a month) to develop and revise common core lessons. Common assessments have been developed as a method for determining mastery of the skills and concepts students are expected to know.

Tier I instruction involves differentiation in a standards-based classroom. Students receive Extended Learning Time as needed.

As mentioned in Building Block 4: A-B, additional resources and professional development are needed to ensure that effective instruction is occurring in all classrooms. Additional professional development is also needed to address the needs of English Learners (EL), students with disabilities, and gifted students. ULNE will incorporate the use of the *Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist* to monitor Tier I instruction (The What, p. 11). *STAR Reading Assessment* is used as both a screener and a progress-monitoring tool.

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

At Tier II, students are provided small group interventions through EIP based on their screener data. These students are progress monitored every two weeks using an online *STAR Reading Assessment*. The RtI team, which includes the students' classroom teachers, meets every four weeks to discuss progress. Teachers must present classroom work and recent student data during Tier II meetings.

1. Diagnostic *STAR Reading Assessments* are given every other week.
2. *Lexia* is a software program used in Tier II and Tier III to assist students in acquiring foundational reading skills.
3. Meetings are held monthly to monitor the progress of students. Teachers and intervention specialists meet to keep documentation about strengths and weaknesses regarding interventions (The How, p. 45).
4. The use of practical interventions will be ensured by the following:

- a. Extended Learning Time (ELT) will be used to meet the needs of all students, and teachers will provide interventions or acceleration based on students' needs.
- b. *Lexia* progress monitoring charts will be used to chart intervention efficiency.

According to our formative assessment data, almost 50% of our students are reading one or more grades below grade level; however, with only one teacher serving both grades 4-5 EIP students, very few students have an EIP reading slot or are currently placed in Tier II or Tier III. In order for teachers to provide adequate literacy instruction and the interventions necessary to meet the needs of all students, professional learning regarding Tier II research-based reading interventions is necessary to ensure that high-risk, non-EIP students are provided interventions by a classroom teacher during Extended Learning Time (ELT) –The How, pp. 45-46. Additional resources and training are needed to return students to Tier I and improve their reading achievement.

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

After at least eight weeks of Tier II interventions, if significant progress is not noted, students are referred for Tier III. At Tier III, students are provided individualized interventions and weekly progress monitoring. Parents are invited to attend RtI meetings every four weeks at Tier III. Teachers must present classroom work and recent student data during Tier III meetings.

After at least four weeks of Tier III interventions, students may be returned to Tier II, allowed to continue interventions at Tier III, or referred for evaluation for specialized instruction (Tier IV).

1. Diagnostic *STAR Reading Assessments* are given weekly in Tier III to monitor student progress.
2. Due to budget constraints, *Lexia* is also used as an intervention in Tier III of the RTI Process. The intensity level or time on one specific skill level is increased in Tier III *Lexia*. Students work on specific levels within foundational reading skills to improve their basic abilities to read various texts. It is easy to monitor, and the program aids in providing feedback for students on an individual basis.
3. Progress meetings are held monthly with parents, teachers, and the school counselor to keep information and all parties up to date about improvements, needs, and academic/behavioral performance (The What, p. 12).

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

Interventions at Tier IV are specifically designed to meet the learning needs of the individual. These interventions are based on the CCGPS/GPS and the individual learning and/or behavioral needs of the individual (The Why, p.126). Tier 4 provides a layer of interventions that may be provided in the general education classroom setting or in a separate setting; however, Tier IV

does not represent a location for services. When the IEP team decides the services for a student with disabilities SWD), highly qualified staff members provide access to CCGPS in all academic areas (The How, p. 47). Ensuring this instruction takes place is a crucial element.

1. School schedules are developed to ensure least restrictive environment (LRE) (The How, p.45; The What, p.12).
 - a. ULNE schedules SWDs based on their needs and services in their Individualized Education Plan (IEP). During instructional segments where students need to be in an inclusive setting, co-teaching is offered to ensure the LRE. ULNE has highly qualified teachers and experienced teachers who support the delivery of instruction for students with the most significant needs (The How, p. 45). In order for co-teaching to be effective, we plan to offer professional development to general education and special education teachers who teach in inclusive settings.
2. Building and system administrators are familiar with funding formulas affecting students in special programming (The What, p.13).
 - a. Administrators and teachers horizontally and vertically collaborate to ensure students in special education are appropriately placed. Mr. Seymour, the principal of ULNE, and Mrs. Miller, the assistant principal of ULNE, build the schedule for the entire student body. Ms. Julia Murphy, registrar, follows current FTE practices so that funding can be maximized. Special Education teachers complete FTE cycles twice during the school year to maximize funding.
3. In order to sustain the implementation of Tier IV, teachers analyze student data regularly (The How, p. 47). Every 3 years, SWDs are reevaluated. If student data supports the exit of Tier 4, the eligibility team makes the final determination.
4. All students with an IEP at ULNE are assigned a case manager to facilitate communication between students, teachers, and parents.
5. Case managers, or co-teachers, provide other teachers with necessary information regarding accommodations and modifications for the curriculum within the IEP. IEP meetings are held annually to discuss any revisions needed. Progress monitoring charts are communicated with parents and teachers on a regular basis. (The Why, p.134). Progress monitoring occurs with greater frequency with students who need additional support, including gifted education and special education.
6. According to the “Why” document, for many students with disabilities, literacy begins with speech-language pathology services (p.135). “Collaboration between the SLP and the regular education teacher is an integral part of the success for special needs and ‘at-risk’ students with language weaknesses” (The Why, p. 136). When language services are integrated into the educational setting, research indicates that significant gains are made in literacy skills for elementary school children. Currently, ULNE has 43 students receiving speech and language

services, 11 are being served for speech only. 32 students are being served for speech (secondary) disability and a primary disability.

7. A system of checks and balances ensures fidelity of implementation and progress of student subgroups at a rate commensurate with typical peers indicative of closing the present gap in performance (The How, p. 47).
8. As our EL population increases, professional development and resources need to be provided to improve the literacy instruction of these students. Collaborative planning between our system EL teacher and classroom teachers must exist outside of the yearly EL TPC.

Progress monitoring from *STAR*, *Lexia*, and CCGPS is used to analyze the progress of students with special needs compared to their typical peers. Professional development is needed in this area to aid teachers in understanding the results of data and interventions that will help a student progress in the general education curriculum.

Building Block 6. Improved Instruction through Professional Learning

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

The Thomaston-Upson County School District communicates with partner colleges and universities at a district level to discuss specific expectations or needs the school system may have for students graduating from those institutions (The Why, p. 150).

In addition to the communication at the district level, ULNE strives to keep lines of communication open between teachers and leaders from neighboring institutions and teachers and leaders at the school (The Why, p. 151). At ULNE, pre-service teachers participate in practicum and internship experiences within the school on a consistent basis. Administrators and teachers make an effort to discuss performance with pre-service teachers, supervising teachers, college observers, and college professors regularly (The How, p. 48).

ULNE also provides new teachers with additional support through a mentor-mentee program. New teachers are assigned a teacher to partner with who assists them by providing strategies for the challenges they face. The new teachers meet with the mentor monthly (or more if necessary) to set goals for a successful teaching experience. This program helps to ease the transition from being a pre-service to in-service educator (The How, p. 48).

Educational Leaders at ULNE also serve as mentors for in-service professionals who are advancing their education. Administrators' conference with professors and teachers to ensure an internship which best provides for the purposes of the school, the individual, and the university goals.

In order to improve the pre-service experience and provide student teachers with the skills to assist our school and district to meet specific literacy goals, ULNE will implement the following changes:

1. Improve effective cross-curricular, literacy instructional methods used by supervising teachers.
2. Provide learning institutions with specific information regarding ULNE literacy goals and initiatives (The How, p. 48).

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

Long-term and ongoing professional development regarding effective literacy practices is key in improving literacy achievement (The Why, p. 67). Based on our summative assessment data, our faculty is very successful in providing students with enough reading skills to pass the Reading CRCT; however, our diagnostic data indicates a wide gap between our text levels and actual reading proficiency. In order to close this gap, professional learning regarding effective instructional and assessment practices are needed (The Why, p. 98).

In order to improve instruction through professional learning, ULNE will continue to:

1. Schedule and protect time during the school day for teachers to collaboratively analyze data, share expertise, study the standards, plan lessons, examine student work, and reflect practice (The How, 48).
2. Build in unit writing days throughout the school year for all subjects. Specific content teachers, along with the instructional coach, meet to discuss unit building, ideas, student work, and teachers dissect the standards to ensure material is covered at an exceeding level.
3. Utilize the instructional coach to provide site-based support and model lessons (The How, p. 49). (Currently, the instructional coach is part-time and provides support two days a week. This year, her role is to aid teachers on unit writing days, participate on the literacy team, and provide strategies to offer differentiation in lessons.)
4. Require grade level content teachers to meet twice a month to plan instruction, self-reflect, and implement best practices.
5. Participate in CCGPS training, Department of Education webinars, and Griffin RESA professional development opportunities throughout the school year. All teachers will be encouraged to share information learned at professional learning sessions through redelivery (The How, p. 49).

In order to improve student literacy through professional learning, ULNE will implement the following changes:

1. Provide training in administering and interpreting results of assessments in terms of literacy (The How, p. 49). Currently, ULNE uses STAR reading to assess students' progress in the area of literacy. In order for teachers to maximize the use of this program and fully understand the results, professional learning will be

offered during protected times of the school day. “Effective professional learning is linked to higher student achievement” (The Why, p.49).

2. Increase professional development opportunities for non-homeroom personnel (paraprofessionals, support staff, substitute teachers, and pre-service teachers working at the school) (The How, p.49).
3. Conduct walkthroughs using pre-selected assessment tools tied to professional learning (i.e., *Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist*) (The How, p. 49).
4. Use data obtained through TKES observations to identify and support individual teachers with follow-up coaching, conferencing, and mentoring (The How, p. 49).

Needs Assessment, Concerns, and Root Cause Analysis

Description of Needs Assessment Process

Upson Lee North Elementary administered the Georgia Literacy Needs Assessment on-line to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of our literacy program. The survey was emailed to all ULNE content teachers and ancillary teachers, including special education, gifted, media specialist, EL teacher, and paraprofessionals (62 staff members). Student and parent literacy surveys were also developed and administered. Students were allowed to participate in the survey during their computer lab segment and accessed the survey through the link on the school website. Parents were notified of the needs assessment survey by the principal via School Reach and had the opportunity to participate through a link posted on the district website. The survey window for all surveys was two weeks, during which time reminders were sent to the three stakeholder groups. Following is a summary of the results of each survey.

Staff Survey

Approximately 36% of ULNE’s 68 staff responded to the survey. Respondents represented grades 4 and 5 and each core subject, including ELA, Reading, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Teachers of specialized programs responded with their subject area peers. The Literacy Team conducted an analysis of aggregated responses to the survey and identified items that had the highest percentage of combined *Emergent* and *Not Addressed* responses in each of the six Building Blocks. The Table below presents the selected *Emergent and Not Addressed items* as concerns, shows where the concerns originated, when known, and pinpoints root causes.

*Note: The steps that ULNE has taken or proposes to take to address the concerns are addressed in the Literacy Plan in the corresponding Building Block and sub-section

Building Block	Concern*	Where Concern Originated	Root Causes of Concerns
Building Block 1: Engaged Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative planning does not occur across content areas (59%) [The What, p. 6]. • The community at large engages in limited collaboration with ULNE to help develop college and career ready students (59%) [The What, pp. 7-8] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 4-5, especially Science & Social Studies Teachers • Grades 4-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative planning time is provided for teachers on the same teams. However, Science and Social Studies Teachers do not have similar time for planning built into their schedules. • There are numerous community based learning support programs, but there

			has not been a structured mechanism to tap into them until recently with the creation of the Upson Education Alliance.
Building Block 2: Continuity of Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative teams are not ensuring a consistent focus across the curriculum (55%) [The What, p. 7]. • ULNE is collaborating with few out of school agencies and organizations to support literacy within the community (55%) [The What, p. 8]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-5, Reading/ ELA and Math 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams are meeting, but may not be productive because they do not have clearly defined roles and meeting protocols in place. • ULNE does collaborate with the public library system and uses community volunteers as VIP Readers. However, it has not developed a major community outreach campaign to support literacy.
Building Block 3: On-going Formative and Summative Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ULNE staff is not using summative data effectively to make program decisions and improve teaching and learning (23%) [The What, p. 9] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-5, all subjects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time is allotted for collaborative team meetings to discuss and analyze data, but teachers are not applying their findings to adjust instruction.. They may also need PL on how to utilize data to make program decisions.
Building Block 4: Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some students are not receiving effective writing instruction (36%) [The What, p. 10]. • Some students are not receiving direct, explicit reading instruction (32%) [The What, p. 10]. • Students do not appear interested and engaged in literacy as the progress through the grades (23%) [The What, p. 11]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5th • EIP, Special Ed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers in all content areas need to participate in PL on best practices in writing instruction. • ELA teachers have carried the burden for all literacy instruction. Teachers in all content areas need to participate in PL on best practices in reading instruction. • ULNE does not have some of the tools and technology that would

			make their literacy instruction more engaging.
Building Block 5: Tiered Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students targeted for needs-based interventions in Tier 2 do not always receive the literacy support they need (23%) [The What, p. 12]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Lexia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ULNE does not have enough Tier 2 programs that are not also being used in other tiers, like Lexia, which is used in Tiers 2-4. Teachers need PL on tiered instruction at all levels.
Building Block 6: Improved Instruction through Professional Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New teachers are not being prepared for all aspects of literacy instruction (40%) [The What, p. 13]. Teachers at ULNE are not receiving on-going professional development in all aspects of literacy instruction, especially disciplinary literacy in the content areas (36%) [The What, p. 13]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preservice programs may not understand that teachers need to come into schools knowing how to effectively teach literacy within content areas. New teachers are expecting staff to orient them to the literacy practices being implemented at ULNE. Due to a reduction in state and district PL funds, ULNE staff has not had opportunities to participate in specialized literacy training.

Parent Survey Results

Only 16 parents responded to the online literacy survey. Items on the parent survey asked them their perceptions about whether their child is receiving extended time for literacy instruction, direct reading instruction, and effective writing instruction in all classes. Other items examined whether the child’s interest and engagement in literacy continues as he or she progresses through school; whether the teacher is trained to teach reading and writing; and whether the parent knows if the child is reading at grade level. The literacy team combined the total percentage of *Disagree, Strongly Disagree, or I Don’t Know* responses to identify potential areas of need. Using this criteria two items were noted. Nearly 60% of respondents indicated that they don’t know whether their child receives extended time for literacy. Forty two percent (42%) stated that they disagree or strongly disagree that their child is receiving effective writing instruction in all classes. The first item suggests that parents are in need of more information about the literacy instruction that their children are receiving. Parents’ concern about their child’s writing is shared by school staff.

Student Survey

Nearly 400 students responded to the six item survey. They were asked to rate their reading and writing skills, their AR book level, and their enjoyment of reading and writing activities.

Overall, ULNE students expressed high confidence in their reading and writing abilities, which is contradictory to our formative and summative assessment data. 42.24% of our students either disagree or are not sure that they are receiving extra help in reading or writing. 50% of our students are in EIP or special education. All students receive extended literacy instruction through ELT. The most glaring data indicates that 37.15% of our students do not feel that they are good writers. This matches our declining Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment data.

ULNE Analysis and Identification of Student/Teacher Data

CRCTs

Over three years, ULNE has maintained an above 90% pass rate for Reading and RLA. Math scores have increased to an average of 93% for grades 4 and 5. Scores have declined in Social Studies (85%) and Science (83%). Grade 5 students perform at a higher rate than Grade 4 students, especially in Reading, ELA, and Math. In 2013, over 20% of our students received CRCT accommodations through IEPs or 504 plans. Although the pass rates for our students remain high on CRCTs, formative assessment data shows almost 50% of our students are reading one or more levels below grade.

Table 1: Grade 4 CRCT Pass Rates

Grade 4 CRCT	2011	2012	2013
Reading	92	91	90.88
ELA	90	92	91.84
Math	89	84	89.36
Social Studies	86	80	84.12
Science	87	84	83.78

Table 2: Grade 5 CRCT Pass Rates

Grade 5 CRCT	2011	2012	2013
Reading	96	97.5	97.8
English-Language Arts	95	96	96.68
Math	93	93	95.6
Social Studies	81	88	86.26
Science	83	87	82.22

CRCT-M

CRCT-M pass percentages have increased in all subjects, especially Reading. Gains are attributed to the collaborative teaching (co-teaching) model, in which most of our SWDs are served.

Table 3: CRCT-M Pass Rates

Grade 4 CRCT-M	2011	2012	2013
Reading	40	88	92

ELA	33	63	94
Math	0	76	81

Table 4: CRCT-M Pass Rates

Grade 5 CRCT-M	2011	2012	2013
Reading	33	25	100
ELA	0	50	66.67
Math	0	50	66.67

CRCT & CRCT-M Reading Domains

Performance within the Information and Media Literacy Domain has decreased ten percentage points for Grade 4 and one percentage point for Grade 5 (Tables 5-8). School-wide implementation of *Wordly Wise* as a supplement for vocabulary instruction has positively affected Grade 4-5 vocabulary scores on CRCT and CRCT-M.

Table 5: Grade 4 CRCT Reading Domain Percentages

Grade 4 Reading CRCT Domains	2011	2012	2013
Literary Comprehension (42%)	79	80	80
Information & Media Literacy (38%)	78	66	68
Skills & Vocabulary Acquisition (20%)	78	82	84

Table 6: Grade 4 CRCT-M Reading Domain Percentages

Grade 4 Reading CRCT-M Domains	2011	2012	2013
Literary Comprehension (42%)	44	29	49
Information & Media Literacy (38%)	47	35	50
Skills & Vocabulary Acquisition (20%)	22	25	59

Table 7: Grade 5 CRCT Reading Domain Percentages

Grade 5 Reading CRCT Domains	2011	2012	2013
Literary Comprehension (40%)	71	70	71
Information & Media Literacy (40%)	65	69	68
Skills & Vocabulary Acquisition (20%)	83	82	85

Table 8: Grade 5 CRCT-M Reading Domain Percentages

Grade 5 Reading CRCT-M Domains	2011	2012	2013
Literary Comprehension (40%)	44	29	49
Information & Media Literacy (40%)	47	35	50
Skills & Vocabulary Acquisition (20%)	22	25	59

Lexile Levels

On average, our students’ Lexile levels are within CCRPI targets (Table 9). However, , 32% of 2013 fourth graders and 37% of fifth graders did not meet the targets (Table 10).

Table 9 Average Lexile Levels

AVG LEXILE	2011	2012	2013
4th (750 Target)	809	804	810
5th (850 Target)	889	897	898

Table 10: Percentage of Students Below Lexile Cut Score

CCRPI Target	2011	2012	2013
4th (750 Target)	33% Below	34% Below	32% Below
5th (850 Target)	39% Below	20% Below	37% Below

CRCT Subgroup & Gender

Fourth grade cohort data indicates drops in reading achievement for all subgroups in Grade 4, with wider gaps between ALL, SWD and Black. In Grade 5 cohort data indicates gains in all subjects and subgroups except Science. Performance levels for SWD on the Grade 4 Reading CRCT have dropped significantly since 2011. Gains were made by SWD in Grade 5 in 2012. A different student cohort performed poorer on the 2013 assessment. Insignificant changes occurred in the economically disadvantaged and white subgroups. Females outperformed males in reading and ELA.

Table 11: Grade 4 CRCT Subgroup Data

GRADE 4 READING	2011	2012	2013
ALL	92.24	90.99	90.88
SWD	90.48	66.67	69.57

ED	90.66	88.05	89.5
B	88.6	84.21	83.52
W	93.88	95	94.94

Table 12: Grade 5 CRCT Subgroup Data

GRADE 5 READING	2011	2012	2013
ALL	90.93	92.66	92.17
SWD	50	76.19	69.57
ED	88.26	90.04	90.84
B	89.26	85.59	86.09
W	91.98	96.32	95.5

Table 13: CRCT Achievement by Gender

Grade 4-5	2011 Reading	2011 ELA	2012 Reading	2012 ELA	2013 Reading	2013 ELA
Females	95	94	93	95	93	96
Males	89	91	92	93	89	94

ULNE Screener

The *STAR Reading* Assessment is given five times per year to ensure that gains are made in each student’s Instructional Reading Level (IRL) and Grade Equivalency (GE). At the beginning of this school year, 50% of Grade 4 and 44.7% of Grade 5 students were reading below grade level (Table 14). Students have made gains from August to October; however, an average of 41% is still not reading on grade level.

Table 14: STAR Reading Assessment 2013-2014 Data

	August 2013	October 2013
4th	50% Below 4.0	45.9% Below 4.0
5th	44.7% Below 5.0	36.5% Below 5.0

Grade 5 Writing Assessment

Proficiency on Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment dropped 11 percentage points in 2013 (Table 15). ULNE students consistently fair better in Narrative Writing genre (Table 16). The lowest writing scores were in the persuasive genre. Poor performance in the informational genre may link to lack of monitoring of writing across the curriculum. The application of conventions, especially in persuasive writing, was our lowest domain. Achievement gaps for SWD and Black subgroups significantly increased.

Table 15: Grade 5 Writing Assessment Pass Rates by Subgroup and Gender

GRADE 5 WRITING	2011	2012	2013
All	76	76	67
SWD	35	31	19
B	73	70	52
W	79	80	76
Females	85	83	74
Males	66	70	61

Table 16: Grade 5 Writing Performance

Year	Persuasive			Informational			Narrative		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
Ideas (40%)	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.7	3	3	3
Organization (20%)	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	3	3
Style (20%)	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9
Conventions (20%)	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.8

Attendance

The percentage of students absent for more than 10 days has increased from 15.4% in 2011 to 18.4% in 2013. Subgroups with the greatest absences include SWDs (27%) and Whites (23%).

Teacher Experience and Retention Rate

The majority of ULNE’s 43 teachers have between 11 and 30 years of experience and the Master’s degree or higher (Table 17). Specific numbers of teachers by programs and subjects are shown in the School Profile section. The retention rate for teachers at ULNE is high, with only five teachers leaving, primarily for retirement, over the last three years. Two teaching positions were lost through attrition and several added in special education.

Table 17. Teacher Experience 2013-2014

Years of Experience/Degree	Number of Teachers
0-5	4
6-10	7
11-15	4
16-20	6
21-25	5
26-30	4
Over 30	2
Bachelor’s Degree	12
Master’s Degree	14
Educational Specialist Degree	7
EdD or PhD	2

Goals and Objectives Based on Formative and Summative Assessments

Specific goals and objectives relating to improving reading, writing, and science/social studies literary information are discussed in the Project Plan section.

Professional Learning

Our staff participates in on-going, grade level PL relating to student needs derived from analyses of achievement and other data. Examples of PL topics include: Thinking Maps: *Write from the Beginning and Beyond*, Differentiation of Instruction, and Use of Data (See Professional Learning Strategies Section).

ULNE Project Plan-Procedures, Goals, Objectives, and Support

Goals and objectives based on formative and assessment data:

Goal 1: Using research-based interventions and software for Response to Intervention (RtI), ULNE will reduce the percentage of students identified as At-Risk/Targeted (Failing Reading, Below Grade Level STAR G.E, Bottom 20% CRCT Reading) by 10% by 2019.

<p>Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide PL on research-based reading interventions. ● Provide PL on differentiation. ● Provide leveled texts and instructional resources on or near student level. ● Incorporate software and instructional resources applicable to our Tier II, III, and IV needs. ● Provide handheld devices/tablets to increase engagement and motivation. ● Incorporate a diagnostic assessment to identify deficits following screenings.
<p>Evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist results (EIP & SWD classrooms) ● RtI reports from software and progress monitoring data ● Screener results ● Lexile scores ● academic averages in all core subjects ● sign-in sheets from collaborative planning, data analysis sheets, and professional development classes
<p>Instructional Schedule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sample schedule in Building Block 1: which provides for literacy and tiered instruction.
<p>Teachers and staff addressing student needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrators ● School Improvement Team ● ULNE Literacy Team ● Data Analysis Team ● RtI/Student Support Team ● Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies Team ● classroom teachers ● EIP teachers (currently 2 math; 1 reading) ● SWD teachers (currently 1 self-contained, 1 speech, 6 cooperative teams) ● Instructional Coaches for Curriculum and Technology ● Media Specialist ● EL Teacher

Current Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CCGPS & GPS instruction and unit revision ● Tier II-IV instruction using <i>Lexia Learning</i> software ● Quarterly RtI/SST Data meetings ● At-Risk Intervention Conferences (parents/guardians) ● EIP/RtI Placement letters
Funding Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current practices are funded through QBE, SPLOST, Title I, Title II, Title VI Will supplement with literacy grant.
Sample Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C
Research-based practices from the “What” and “Why” document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional development on strategies to improve reading instruction, especially for targeted students (The Why, p. 65). ● Utilize the Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist in all EIP, cooperative teaching, and SWD resource reading instruction classrooms. ● Ensure that interventions are monitored for fidelity and validity. ● Continue providing interventions during the academic day. ● Implement a diagnostic assessment to more accurately determine target areas.

Goal 2: Using a research-based Reading incentive program and improved classroom instruction on comprehension/vocabulary skills/strategies, ULNE will increase the Instructional Reading Level (IRL) the percentage of ALL students by 10% by 2019.

Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide PL to improve reading instruction at Tier I. ● Increase texts and resources to support cross-curricular reading instruction. ● Use technology to increase student motivation and engagement. ● Require interdisciplinary collaborative planning, both vertical and within the grade level. ● Provide resources to improve overall comprehension and fluency levels. ● See Building Block 1: C-E ● See Building Block 2: A-B ● See Building Block 4: A, C ● See Building Block 5: B
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increased IRL on universal screeners and diagnostic assessments. ● Increased student Lexile levels on CRCT Reading. ● Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist data. ● Increased proficiency on <i>Study Island</i> objectives and assessments.
Instructional Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C.

Teachers and staff addressing student needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See list in Goal 1.
Current Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Accelerated Reader</i> program is used to set reading goals for students and provide rewards for reaching goals. • <i>STAR Reading Assessments</i> are given five times a year to progress monitor IRL and CCGPS (ELA). • Extended texts and short texts of various genres are used to expose students to challenging and developmentally appropriate literature. • <i>Study Island</i> used to reinforce CCGPS.
Funding Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current practices are funded through QBE, SPLOST, Title I, Title II, Title VI. • Will supplement with literacy grant.
Sample Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C.
Research-based practices from the “What” and “Why” document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide professional development in literacy instruction. • Increase use of handheld technology (student or ULNE) to increase motivation and engagement. • Provide additional, scaffolded independent reading time during the instructional day. • Differentiate literacy and content-based instruction.

Goal 3: In order to improve student achievement on the Science and Social Studies CRCT, ULNE will increase student achievement of Information and Media Literacy within the Reading CRCT by 15% by 2019.

Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create interdisciplinary research-based literacy units • Provide opportunities for students to interact with informational texts in Science and Social Studies. • Integrate more research activities and lessons that support use of Information and Media Literacy to obtain sources. • Provide opportunities for technology projects that require research and investigation.
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased proficiency CRCT Results/Reading Domain Analysis • Increased proficiency on Science and Social Studies CRCT. • Increased proficiency in CCGPS relating to informational text on <i>STAR Reading Assessment</i>.
Instructional Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C
Teachers and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See list in Goal 1

staff addressing student needs	
Current Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Moderate use of leveled readers from <i>Harcourt Science</i> textbook series. ● Cumulative and research projects are required in Science and Social Studies. ● Media center orientation on informational and nonfiction resources ● Refer to Building Block 1: C-E.
Funding Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current practices are funded through QBE, SPLOST, Title I, Title II, Title VI. ● Supplement with literacy grant funds.
Sample Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C.
Research-based practices from the “What” and “Why” document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide PL regarding best practices in literacy instruction to all content and support staff. ● Increase technology resources and PL (21st Century Classrooms). ● Provide leveled texts that support content-based standards. ● Make all learning opportunities relevant and meaningful. ● Require interdisciplinary collaborative planning

Goal 4: ULNE will increase the overall student achievement on the Grade 5 Writing Assessment and/or CRCT ELA Writing Assessments by 15% by 2019.

Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve implementation of WFTBB. ● Create an interdisciplinary writing rubric. ● Provide more opportunities for students to write everyday in all classrooms. ● Investigate and implement interventions for writing. ● Balance assessments to include open-ended questions and essays. Collaborate on persuasive and informational writing instruction and assignments. ● See Building Block 4: B.
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grade 5 Writing Assessment Results/Data Analysis
Instructional Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C.
Teachers and staff addressing student needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See list in Goal 1
Current Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implementing <i>Thinking Maps: Write from the Beginning and</i>

	<p><i>Beyond.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PL on narrative writing and expository writing. ● Mock Grade 4 Writing Assessment Daily writing in ELA block ● Random writing assignment in Science, Social Studies, and Math ● Research projects/essays in Science and Social Studies.
Funding Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current practices are funded through QBE, SPLOST, Title I, Title II, Title VI ● Will use literacy grant to supplement.
Sample Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sample schedule in Building Block 1: C.
Research-based practices from the “What” and “Why” document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase writing opportunities, especially for less advanced writers, that are meaningful and relevant to content. ● Provide PL to all staff on writing instruction and assessment. ● Create an interdisciplinary writing rubric. ● Provide student self-assessment writing rubrics. ● Increase writing technology and publishing opportunities. ● Refer to Building Block 4: B.

Tiered Instruction

Our RTI model is discussed fully in Building Block 5: B-E of the Literacy Plan.

ULNE Assessments/Data Analysis Plan

ULNE uses ongoing formative and summative assessments to guide instructional practices, interventions, and unit plans. In order for students to improve and excel in academic areas, data is analyzed to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses. Benchmark assessments are developed and common assessments are given in content-specific areas to help teachers and leaders make informed decisions regarding adjustable, instructional practices. The state-mandated CRCT is also administered once a school year. Teachers participate in several CRCT/CRCT-M/Georgia Grade 5 Writing data analysis meetings a year and utilize the data to making instructional and scheduling decisions. Though summative data is very important, it is not the primary data used to monitor student achievement, teacher effectiveness, or current instructional practices.

A: ULNE Current Assessment Protocol

Assessment	Purpose	Skills	Time of Administration	Frequency
<i>STAR Reading Assessment (Grades 4-5)</i>	Universal Screener, Progress Monitoring	Comprehension, Vocabulary, Estimated Oral Reading Fluency, Instructional Reading Level	August, October, December, February, May	school wide-5 times per year (biweekly for Tier II; weekly for Tier III)
<i>STAR Math Assessment (Grades 4-5)</i>	Universal Screener, Progress Monitoring	Computation Fluency, National Math Standards, CCGPS	August, October, December, February, May	school wide-5 times per year (biweekly for Tier II; weekly for Tier III)
<i>Renaissance Accelerated Reader (Grades 4-5)</i>	Progress Monitoring of Independent Reading Comprehension	Comprehension, Vocabulary	September-April	As needed
Yearly Benchmark Assessments (OAS) (Grades 4-5)	Mastery of Grade Level Standards; Unit Revisions	CCGPS (all content areas)	Standardized	once per year
Common Assessments	Mastery of Grade Level	Reading, ELA, Math, Social	Ongoing	Ongoing

(within and end-of-unit) (Grades 4-5)	Standards	Studies, Science		
Lexia Learning (Grades 4-5)	Tier II, III, IV (Identifying Target Areas and Progress Monitoring)	Phonics, Phonemics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension	Small group, individual	pre and post test (ongoing progress monitoring)
CRCT CRCT-M (Grades 4-5)	Mastery of Grade Level Standards; Unit Revision	All content areas	standardized	April
Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment	Assessing Prompt Writing Ability & ELA Standards; Unit Revision	Ideas, Organization, Style, Conventions	standardized	March
Grade 4 Mock Writing Assessment	Assessing Prompt Writing Ability & ELA Standards; Unit Revision (not fully implemented)	Ideas, Organization, Style, Conventions	standardized	March

B. Comparison of Current Assessment Protocol with SRCL Assessment Plan

The SRCL and ULNE assessment protocols are comparable. ULNE will not have to discontinue any current assessments. ULNE will need to add a diagnostic screener in order to more efficiently identify specific literacy deficits following screening.

C. Implementation of SRI and/or Additional Assessments into the Current Assessment Schedule

Throughout the current and upcoming school years, ULNE will continue to administer current assessments to measure and analyze student performance in the area of literacy. Since ULNE teachers use the current assessments listed above to drive literacy instruction, monitor growth in literacy skills, and identify some weaknesses in comprehension in order to provide interventions, the current assessment schedule will remain the same unless state mandated tests are revised or discontinued. The SRI and a diagnostic test will be incorporated into ULNE’s master assessment schedule and disseminated to faculty and staff as customary. Our testing coordinator will work with teachers to ensure that they administer all assessments according to schedule. She will also

be responsible for tracking the availability of adequate numbers of copies of assessment tools and student recording forms.

D. Discontinuation of Current Assessments.

Since assessments align with the assessment procedures of the SRLC, the team does not foresee any discontinuation of scheduled assessments (See B above).

E. Professional Learning Needs for Teachers to Implement New Assessments

In order to effectively implement SRI in conjunction with our current assessments, teachers and staff will need ongoing professional learning on all elements of the SRI tool. Specifically, our teachers and staff will need PL on how to use results of the SRI to assist with: differentiating instruction, making meaningful interventions, forecasting individual growth toward standardized assessments, and demonstrating accountability.

F. Dissemination of Data to Parents and Other Stakeholders

Student assessment data is shared with parents and stakeholders in various ways. After the school leadership team analyzes the results of data, leaders of the team present the information to the following stakeholders:

- PTO
- School Council
- Partners in Education (PIE)
- Curriculum Advisory Council
- District Leadership Team
- Parents (2 formal conferences; Tier III meetings; At-Risk conferences)
- Principal's Newsletter
- System Website
- GADOE CCRPI Report

ULNE will continue to use these methods of sharing data with parents and stakeholders.

G. Analysis of Data to Determine Instructional Strategies and Need for Materials

To make informed instructional decisions, educators should not use single assessments to make determinations; however, they should use multiple sources to gain insight for instruction. For this reason, ULNE will use SRI in conjunction with current assessment practices. Analysis of data by teachers at the departmental and grade levels will aid them in evaluating current instructional practices and resources, unit revisions, progress monitoring, ensuring students set and attain specific instructional goals, accelerating advanced learners, identifying at-risk learners, and developing interventions for struggling students.

H. Assessment Performance- “Who” and “How”

Highly qualified certified teachers administer state, district, and school-level assessments at ULNE. During the state-mandated CRCT/CRCT-M and Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment, all teachers have proctors to assist with testing to ensure validity and fidelity. We anticipate that the SRI will be administered by our ELA, EL, EIP, Gifted, and Special Education teachers.

Thomaston-Upson County Schools-Upson-Lee North Elementary

These teachers, along with the school's testing coordinator (assistant principal) and the teachers listed above, will manage the assessment schedule and training on the administration of the tests. The Principal, system administrators, and the testing coordinator will monitor the administration of SCRL tests.

**ULNE Resources, Strategies, and Materials (Existing and Proposed)
Including Technology to Support the Literacy Plan**

A. Resources Needed to Implement SRCL

Resources	Link to Supporting Literacy	Funding Alignment
SRI (Scholastic Reading Inventory)	This research-based, computer adaptive reading assessment will aid teachers in measuring <i>Lexile</i> levels and administering assessments to drive instructional practices. Teachers can use results to forecast student achievement and align student goals with state tests. Supports the process of RtI.	SRCL Grant
Software (capability to connect student devices to ActivBoards)	With the capability to connect student devices to the interactive board, peer review, think-pair-share, etc. can provide student engagement.	SRCL Grant Title I
Software (research-based interventions for Tier II, III, and IV)	Lexia is currently used as RtI and SWD software K-5. Additional software will ensure that interventions are changed when they are determined to be ineffective.	SRCL Grant Title I & VI-B
Assistive technology devices for students with special needs and EL students	Assistive technology such as word processors can engage and empower SWDs with tools to make academic progress. EL students can benefit from hand-held scanning translators that offer immediate word-by-word translation and vocabulary support.	SRCL Grant Title I & VI-B SPLOST (not after 2013-2014)
Printers, ink cartridges, and paper	Classroom teachers, SWD, EIP/RtI, etc. need access to immediate print resources that support literacy.	SRCL Grant Title I & VI-B SPLOST (not after 2013-2014)
Updated texts to integrate science and social studies into reading curriculum/novel sets aligned with CCGPS/informational texts/ non-fiction	Resources are needed in all content areas to supplement and provide instruction aligned with the CCGPS.	SRCL Title I PTO Principal's Activity Account

weekly readers		
Leveled Readers	In order to provide instructional at or slightly above individual students' reading level, additional leveled readers are needed in each classroom, especially in EIP, SWD, and EL.	SRCL Grant Title I, II, VI-B
Informational Text resources	Classroom sets of media resources such as newspapers, magazines, newsletters, etc. will greatly increase informational text proficiency and increase student motivation.	SRCL Grant Title I PTO
Professional Learning	Administration, teachers, and support staff need training in areas described in the Professional Learning section of the application and literacy plan.	SRCL Grant Title VI
Instructional Technology (handheld devices or tablets) to enable students to read QR codes, create presentations and research topics	Teachers will be allowed to "check out" devices to foster a 21st century learning environment. Since speaking skills are a crucial element of CCGPS, students can use media to create videos, presentations, etc.	SRCL Grant Title I SPLOST (not after 2013-2014)
Instructional Technology (laptops)	Mobile labs will allow teachers to incorporate more research, writing, and publishing opportunities.	SRCL Grant Title I SPLOST (not after 2013-2014)

B. Activities that Support Literacy Intervention

- Early Intervention Program (EIP)
- RtI models for Tiers II and III
- *Lexia Learning* software
- *Accelerated Reading* and *STAR Reading* Assessments
- Inclusive and resource settings for SWDs
- Extended Learning Time
- School-wide vocabulary instruction
- Comprehension and vocabulary instruction at Tier I
- Differentiated and specialized instruction

C. Shared Resources at ULNE

- Poster printer

- Novels
- Two outdated limited computer labs
- Two part-time instructional coaches (curriculum and technology)
- One centralized copy machine
- *Data Director* scanner
- Software- *Study Island, Brain Pop, Renaissance Learning, Orchard, 7 sets of ActivVotes*

D. Library Resources and/or Equipment

- 6,527 fiction chapter books
- 5934 easy picture books
- 5,965 non-fiction books
- 581 non-circulating reference books
- 2 Student computer workstations
- 10 outdated digital cameras
- 11 outdated video cameras
- 1 Poster Printer
- 1 Laminator
- 2 circulation computers
- 1 ActivBoard hooked up to a Dell Laptop
- 1 Network LaserJet color printer
- DVD Players, limited periodicals, professional learning resources, guided reader sets, instructional DVD's and Videos
- 27,219 materials in the Media Center.
 - 45 % fiction books
 - 24% non-fiction books
 - 2.5% periodicals
 - 5% instructional DVD's and videos
 - 10.5% professional materials
 - 6% equipment
 - 4% book sets, and
 - 3% kits and manipulatives
- Average circulation- 4,557 per month.
- Average age of the collection is 1996.
- 29.87 books per child
- Media Specialist & Media Paraprofessional

E. Activities that Support Classroom Practices

- Professional learning- *Thinking Maps*, technology classes, data analysis (locating, not applying)
- Benchmark testing
- Differentiated Instruction (limited professional development)
- Extended Learning Time
- *WFTTB*
- Cooperative teaching -SWD

- *Accelerated Reader*
- Progress monitoring (*STAR*)
- Formative and summative assessments
- Literacy Days (writing and poetry recitation competitions)
- Early Intervention Program
- Quarterly unit revision days (not interdisciplinary)
- *Study Island*
- *Lexia Learning*
- *Brain Pop*

F. Additional Strategies Needed to Support Student Success

- Increased professional development (best practices in literacy instruction, writing across the curriculum, interdisciplinary planning, RtI interventions)
- Strategies aligned with CCGPS
- Differentiated and Specialized Instructional strategies
- Integrating technology into lessons (need the technology too)
- Data-driven instruction

G. List of Classroom Resources

- Interactive boards and projectors in every classroom
- Document cameras
- Class sets of textbooks (most recent adoption of new textbooks = 6 years ago/Science)
- Open Court Reading series (purchased during QCCs)
- World of Language textbook (does not match CCGPS)
- Harcourt Math textbooks (2007)
- Harcourt Science textbooks (2008)
- McGraw-Hill Social Studies textbooks (1999-QCC aligned)
- Teacher computers in every classroom (outdated; slow)
- 2-4 student computers (outdated; slow)
- Software- *PowerSchool/PowerTeacher, SLDS, Data Director, Study Island, Brain Pop, Orchard, Lexia Learning* (Tier II, III, IV), *Renaissance Learning (Accelerated Reader, Accelerated Math (EIP), STAR Reading, STAR Math)*

H. Alignment Plan for SRCL and Other Funding

At ULNE, the SRCL Grant funding will be used in addition to Title 1, school budget, special education funds, and QBE. ULNE allocates and prioritizes funds for instructional needs; however, due to significant budget cuts, ULNE's ability to deliver high-quality education with necessary resources has decreased. SRCL grant funds will significantly assist ULNE with providing the much needed professional learning opportunities, instructional resources and tools, and literacy programs to promote academic success.

I. Technology Purchases that Support RtI, Student Engagement, Instructional Practices, Writing, etc.

Computer based software programs that focus on increasing literacy skills, providing tiered levels of instruction, differentiation, and helping students meet personal academic goals, as well as goals related to the CCGPS, would greatly assist ULNE in meeting individual student needs.

Writing and typing skills will be essential to student success on future assessments and in a competitive economy. In analyzing student responses on the needs assessment, it is evident that our students demonstrate poor typing skills, weak sentence structure, and inventive spelling.

Our school should be preparing students with the skills they need to survive in a complex, highly technology-based economy. ULNE lags behind on integrating technology into classroom learning or providing computer-based assessments. Our school and system have implemented a BYOT initiative), but we have low student participation and lack many of the wireless resources to create WIFI classrooms in all parts of our building. ULNE's goals for implementing technology include:

- Increasing the depth of understanding and rigor of assignments
- Increasing Project-based and collaborative learning
- Providing media for self-expression and speaking skills, collaboration, and personal productivity.

ULNE Professional Learning Strategies Identified on the Basis of Documented Needs

The following chart indicates professional learning that took place in the 2012-2013 school year.

A-B. Professional Learning in School Year 2012-2013

PL Activity	% of Staff in Attendance
Special Education Meetings	100%
<i>Love and Logic</i>	100%
<i>Thinking Maps: Write from the Beginning and Beyond Train the Trainer</i>	20% (2 ELA teachers)
<i>Thinking Maps: Write from the Beginning and Beyond</i>	100%
CCGPS Implementation and Unit Development	100% (classroom teachers)
Implementing Guided Math	10% (1 teacher)
Math Collaborative Training (Griffin RESA)	40%
ELA Consortium	40%
BYOT Field trip to Forsyth County	45%

C. Ongoing/Current Professional Learning for the Academic School Year of 2013-2014:

The following chart lists opportunities for staff members to participate in ongoing, off-campus, and on-site professional development.

PL Activity	% of Staff in Attendance
Special Education Meetings	100%
ActivBoard Training	100%
Grade Book Training	98%
RtI Team	No formal prof dev in 2013
GTEP Training	100%
Lab Disc Training Part II	98%
SLDS Training	98%

Georgia Technology Conference	.03% (2 teachers; 1 tech specialist)
TKES Orientation	100% (4 teachers; 2 administrators)
TKES Pre-Evaluation Conference	100% (4 teachers; 2 administrators)
STAR reporting	90%
iMovie- Part I	98%
PBIS	95%
iMovie- Part II	94%

D. Programmatic Professional Learning Needs

The results of literacy needs assessment surveys indicated that PL needs to be provided in these areas:

- Explicit comprehension and vocabulary across subjects
- Writing instruction and assessment across subjects
- Collaborative interdisciplinary planning
- Data-driven decision making at the classroom/individual level
- Implementing research-based interventions to aid students in Tier II, III, and Tier IV.
- Analyzing Lexile levels to match books to reader levels
- Providing differentiated instruction
- Increasing student motivation and engagement
- Implementing and applying SRI

E & G. Process Used to Rate Professional Development as Adequate or Effective (Tied to Goals & Objectives)

ULNE staff *Needs Assessment, Concerns, and Root Cause Analysis* results indicate that PL is needed to engage teams of teachers in literacy instruction that meets the goals and objectives addressed below. Effectiveness of PL will be measured by how well the opportunities met the stated goals and objectives set forth to be accomplished. The following goals reflect the needs of staff as described in the ULNE Literacy and Project Plans:

Goal 1: ULNE will continue to develop proficiency in technological areas that support instruction via the internet, workshops, and ongoing technological updates to enhance student learning.

Goal 2: ULNE will learn strategies and understand data analysis practices to improve literacy instruction in order to incorporate them into daily instructional practices.

Goal 3: ULNE will provide professional development that will inform all teachers on the best practices in literacy instruction.

Goal 4: ULNE will increase students’ motivation and engagement towards literacy by capitalizing on students’ existing needs and helping students to set achievable goals (specifically EL, RtI, SWD).

Goal 5: ULNE will increase student achievement in writing by providing professional development and collaborative planning opportunities across the curriculum.

Targeted Professional Learning Plan

Aligned with Goal	Objective	PL Activities	Person(s) Responsible	Evaluation/ Evidence
1	Improve implementation and effectiveness of BYOT.	PD on improving participation and use of student owned hand-held devices or tablets.	Instructional Coach for Technology Administrators Exemplar Teachers	Parent/student surveys Lesson/Unit Plans Increased student achievement
1	Integrate powerful 21st Century literacy strategies that make teaching and learning fun and engaging for all students.	PD on 21st Century classrooms.	Instructional Coach for Technology Administrators Exemplar Teachers	Parent/student surveys Lesson/Unit Plans Increased student achievement
1	Increase technology resources.	PD on utilizing current and proposed technology equipment.	Instructional Coach for Technology Administrators Exemplar Teachers	Parent/student surveys Lesson/Unit Plans Increased student achievement Inventories
1	Provide handheld devices/tablets and assistive technology to support student engagement.	PD on utilizing current and proposed technology equipment.	Instructional Coach for Technology Administrators Exemplar Teachers	Parent/student surveys Lesson/Unit Plans Increased student achievement Inventories

				Progress Monitoring charts
2	Use data to provide appropriate literacy instruction for reading levels.	PD-Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans
3	Explore practical literacy skills and instructional methods that improve student achievement.	PD-Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans
3	Increase differentiation in all classrooms, especially gifted and SWD subgroups.	PD-Differentiation	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans SWD Progress Monitoring
3	Demonstrate application of Lexile levels to ELA, content units, and individual growth plans.	PD-Appling Lexiles	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans Lexile data
	Provide opportunities for all teachers to obtain a reading endorsement.	PD-Reading Endorsement	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators	PSC Reading Endorsements

			Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	
4	Increase student self-efficacy skills in reading.	PD-Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Student Surveys Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans
4	Increase student engagement in academic speaking.	PD-Best Practices; Student Engagement & Motivation	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans
4	Increase knowledge of research-based reading interventions.	PD-Best Practices in Literacy Instruction & Reading Interventions	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans Reduced # in RtI
4	Provide leveled texts and instructional resources on or near student level.	PD-Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) Unit/Lesson Plans
4	Incorporate software and instructional resources applicable	PD-Software training RtI	Instructional Coach for Curriculum	Increased student achievement

	to Tier II, III, and IV needs.	Interventions	Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	(CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) RtI and IEP plans
4	Incorporate diagnostic assessment to identify deficits following screenings.	PD-Software training RtI Interventions	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT, STAR, Lexia, academic averages) RtI and IEP plans
4	Utilize observation checklist to monitor implementation of best practices in literacy instruction.	PD- Using Georgia Literacy Observation Checklist (How, Why, What)	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators Exemplar Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement Checklist data Unit/Lesson Plans
5	Improve implementation of <i>WFTBB</i> .	PD- <i>WFTBB</i> or additional	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators <i>WFTBB</i> Trained Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT ELA and/or Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment)
5	Collaborate on persuasive and informational writing instruction and assignments	PD- <i>WFTBB</i> or additional	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators <i>WFTBB</i> Trained Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT ELA and/or Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment)
5	Investigate and implement interventions for writing.	PD-Writing Interventions	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators <i>WFTBB</i> Trained	Increased student achievement (CRCT ELA and/or Georgia

			Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Grade 5 Writing Assessment
5	Increase writing instruction and assessment across subjects.	PD- <i>WFTBB</i> or additional	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators <i>WFTBB</i> Trained Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT ELA and/or Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment)
5	Train teachers to target essential academic writing skills that help students become independent writers.	PD- <i>WFTBB</i> or additional	Instructional Coach for Curriculum Administrators <i>WFTBB</i> Trained Teachers PD Consultant/ Trainer	Increased student achievement (CRCT ELA and/or Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment)

ULNE Sustainability Plan

Extending Assessment Protocols and Print Material beyond the Grant Assessment data, both formative and summative, will continue to drive instruction and inform decisions. Our Title I Budget, QBE funds, and the Principal's Activity account (ice cream, dances, Fun Friday, yearbook, etc.) will be used to replenish assessment protocols and provide needed teacher created and purchased print materials. Assessment protocols will continue to be administered as part of our master assessment schedule.

Developing Community Partnerships

ULNE will increase our partnerships and involvement with The FERST Foundation, Education Alliance, Civic Center After School Tutoring, Lincoln Park After School Program, and other day cares that provide tutoring.

ULNE will showcase evidence of students' learning success on the school or class websites and through blogs, e.g., writing assignments, improved test scores, awards or recognitions in order for the community to realize the importance of sustaining the literacy plan goals and objectives.

We will investigate fundraisers that support our literacy initiatives. The system's parent involvement coordinator will be utilized to keep parents informed when questions arise.

Extending Professional Development Beyond Grant & for New Staff

Sustaining professional development will involve a variety of peer collaboration and support. The PL that our staff will receive over the five year period will be used to shape us into a professional learning community. The primary way that we intend to extend PL is through getting all ULNE teachers to complete a reading endorsement. This will enable us to identify teacher leaders who can facilitate PL on a variety of topics with all staff. It will also ensure that we have a high degree of sustainability in implementation of our assessment protocol, evidence based practices, etc. When new teachers and other personnel enter our school, ULNE plans to share literacy data effectively and efficiently and ensure that they receive vital PL from previous years. In order to retrieve previous PL opportunities with ease, ULNE plans to videotape important sessions. We will use GaDOE online PL options to continue to train all staff, especially new ones.

Sustaining Technology

With sufficient technology and professional development on technology, we believe that our teachers and staff will be able to revolutionize their instructional practices in literacy. In order to make progress in the area of technological advances, ULNE must have a plan to sustain devices. Currently, a SPLOST is providing our system technology needs. SPLOST funding ends in 2013. In order to continue our goal of improving instruction through technology, ULNE secure funds from Title I and VI-B budgets, QBE funds, PTO, and grant writing initiatives. We will use these funding sources to update aging technology and to maintain site licenses for key software and assessments purchased through SRCL grant funds. As we purchase more classroom technology over the five years of the grant, we will be able to help our teachers and students build proficiency in using technology and fully implement our BYOT initiative. This will, in turn, generate more support from all stakeholders.

Expanding Lessons Learned from SRCL

Documented, authentic discussions will take place during peer collaboration and school improvement meetings pertaining to supporting and improving literacy instruction across content areas. SRCL goals and objectives will be tied to our School Improvement Plan, which guides decision making in increasing student achievement, increasing stakeholder involvement, and creating organizational effectiveness. We will participate in SCRL cohort meetings and share what we are learning, while learning from others who are implementing the grant. As opportunity permits, we will make presentations to peer schools in the region during RESA/GLRS conferences and meetings.

ULNE Budget Summary

Providing professional development and resources that support literacy is a critical need for reaching ULNE's goal of creating a gold standard literacy program. ULNE is already a Georgia Reward School. We believe that receiving a SRCL grant will help propel us to one day being named a Blue Ribbon School. Our preliminary working budget is shown below and is not exhaustive.

Item	Description/Use	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost
<i>Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)</i>	Universal Screener for Reading Lexile Assessment Program	625 licenses	\$8000.00
Professional Learning for <i>SRI</i>	Teacher training	3 days	\$7500.00
Portable Tablet Labs	60 tablets with mobile cart for taking to classroom/ Teachers need technology to implement hands-on literacy instruction and flexible groups.	2 sets	\$30,000.00 (\$500/ea.)
Portable Laptop Labs	30 laptops with mobile cart for taking to classroom: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assist with Grade level Unit planning ● Assist with student access to computer based programs for instruction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>OAS, Study Island, SRI, STAR Math/Reading</i> ● Available for teacher use at professional development on or off campus. 	1 set	\$21,000.00 (\$700/ea.)
Professional Learning for Integrating Technology in Literacy Instruction	Teachers need training on how to integrate technology into literacy instruction. Teachers attending Griffin RESA Technology Conference and GA Technology Conference.		\$6000.00
Consumable Technology Resources and Printing Supplies	Supplies for Technology such as bulbs, toner, etc.		\$4000.00

Thomaston-Upson County Schools-Upson-Lee North Elementary

CCGPS Planning Days/Reading & Writing Instruction	Substitutes for Planning Days	10 Planning days	\$30,000.00
Materials (readers, magazines, etc.) specific for Math, Science, and Social Studies.	Readers and magazines to enrich instruction of math, science, and social studies classrooms.		\$30,000.00
Novels, informational text and non-fiction books related to CCGPS standards	Books to use for CCGPS instruction		\$50,000.00
<i>Lexia</i>	Software used in Tier 2	\$10,225 x 5 years	\$51,125.00
Additional Intervention Software	Software used in Tier 3	\$10,225 x 5 years	\$51,125.00
Additional Intervention software	Software used in Tier 4	\$10,225 x 5 years	\$51,125.00
<i>Renaissance Learning Software (STAR Reading /Math, Accelerated Math Accelerated Reading)</i>	AR-Independent Student Reading Program STAR Reading & Math-Progress Monitoring, Accelerated Math- Tier II Math	\$9,000 x 5 years (AR-\$3000 AM-\$1000 SR-\$2000 SM-\$2000 Web Hosting \$1000)	\$45,000.00
Media Center Reading Lab	Progress Monitoring Technology Based Projects Publishing student writing Research projects in all content areas 30 computers 30 chairs 15 tables	30 x \$600 30 x \$80 15 x \$300	\$18,000.00 \$2,400.00 +\$4,500.00 \$24,900.00
		TOTAL	\$409,775