

School Profile

Created Monday, October 28, 2013

Updated Thursday, November 14, 2013

Page 1

School Information

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

Level of School

Elementary (K-5 or Primary, Elementary)

Principal

Principal Name:	LaSharon McClain
Principal Position:	Principal
Principal Phone:	706-647-7540
Principal Email:	lmcclain@upson.k12.ga.us

School contact information

(the persons with rights to work on the application)

School contact information Name:	Tracy Wainwright
School contact information Position:	Instructional Coach
School contact information Phone:	706-647-7540
School contact information Email:	twainwright@upson.k12.ga.us

Grades represented in the building

example pre-k to 6

Kindergarten to 3

Number of Teachers in School

127

FTE Enrollment

1262

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 Friday, November 15, 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 in 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 Leveled 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 of 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.

School History

Upson-Lee South Elementary School (ULSE) is located in Thomaston, Georgia. The school serves students in grades K-3. Our enrollment is over 1,260 students with an ethnic/racial makeup as follows: 56% White, 35% Black, 3% Hispanic, and 6% Multi-Racial (51% males, 49% females). Approximately 42% of the student body is enrolled in compensatory programs: Special Education 13%, English Learners (EL) 2%, and EIP (Early Intervention Program) 28%. Gifted students comprise about 3% of the student body. There are 95 certified staff and 76 classified staff. Seventy-six percent (76%) of our students qualify for federally funded free or reduced price meals.

Prior to the 2011-2012 school year, ULSE made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as specified in the *No Child Left Behind* federal statute for eight consecutive years. The school has been recognized as a Title I Distinguished School. On March 20, 2012, Upson-Lee South was identified as a “focus” school by the Georgia Department of Education under its Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver because of an achievement gap between the students with disabilities subgroup and white subgroup based on data from the 2010-2011 school year. In summer 2012, a Flexible Learning Program (FLP) plan was developed to meet the needs of students in Georgia’s Title I federally rank-ordered tiers and to close the achievement gap.

Classrooms are equipped with Promethean’s Activboard Collaborative Classroom systems (interactive white board, projectors and student response devices) and three internet accessible student computer stations. One iPad cart with 20 iPads and one Macbook cart containing 20 macbooks are available for checkout from the media center. There is one computer lab with 25 computers available to classes on a signup basis. Wireless internet access is available throughout the school.

ULSE believes that parental and community involvement is essential and, therefore, solicits it. . Parents and community members are involved in decision-making and/or informed of school business (i.e. instructional programs, academic achievement data, initiatives, etc.) through our School Council, Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), Parent-Teacher Conferences, Open House, VIP Readers’ Program, Partners In Education Committee, and/or instructional programs/activities. ULSE is privileged to have an active PTO and community/business partners who share the vision of striving for academic excellence and are committed to supporting our school.

Administrative and Teacher Leadership Teams

Upson-Lee South Elementary School (ULSE) is led by Dr. LaSharon McClain (principal), Mrs. Machelles Fagan (assistant principal), Mr. Stan Searcy (assistant principal) and Mrs. Tracy Wainwright (Academic Coach for Curriculum and Instruction). A team-based structure is used to involve all staff.

ULSE has the following teams:

Team	Team Members	Purpose	Frequency of Meetings
Administrative Team	Dr. LaSharon McClain, Principal Mrs. Machelles Fagan, Asst. Principal Mr. Stan Searcy, Asst. Principal	Discuss staff evaluation/observation data, student discipline, upcoming projects/event, and ways to promote continuous improvement in teaching and learning while creating a positive climate	Weekly
Leadership Team	Joni Moore, Kindergarten Tina Rogers, Kindergarten Kim Hill, 1 st Lori Beth Reeves, 1 st Kenya Campbell, 2 nd Suzy Love, 2 nd Lethia Sneed, 3 rd Chandra Youngblood, 3 rd Tracy Wainwright, Curriculum Instructional Coach Jamie Joiner, Technology Instructional Coach Luanne Helms, EIP Carol Searcy, EIP Kimbrly Harris, Support Staff Kim Seymour, Special Ed. Vicky Lamb, CAMP Angel Brown, Counselor Kim Caldwell, Counselor Hollie Barrow, Media Tara Keahey, Media Brandy Chastain, Gifted Dr. LaSharon McClain, Principal Machelles Fagan, Asst. Principal Stan Searcy, Asst. Principal	Work collaboratively to develop, review and monitor the school's Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP); Analyze data to identify where gaps in performance exist; Monitor progress toward school goals; Provide input on school budget to ensure that expenditures align with the CIP; Conduct peer observations	Monthly

Team	Team Members	Purpose	Frequency of Meetings
	Julie English, District Staff Rhonda Ward, Behavioral Interventionist		
Grade Level Team	Grade Level Teachers, Special Education Teachers, EIP Teachers	Collaborate to discuss instructional best practices and differentiation; Revise CCGPS units; Analyze summative and formative data	Twice a Week
Literacy Team	Dr. LaSharon McClain, Principal Misty Crews, K EIP Betsy Stewart, 1 st Suzy Love, 2 nd Chandra Youngblood, 3 rd Tiffany Bentley, Sp Ed Tracy Wainwright, Inst. Coach Tara Keahey, Media Specialist	Analyze summative/ formative and survey data to determine literacy needs; Investigate instructional strategies, practices, and/or programs to promote literacy	Monthly (more frequently as needed)

Past Instructional Initiatives

Many instructional initiatives to address student achievement and engagement have been studied and implemented. These initiatives include:

- Thinking Maps*
- Ruby Payne- Understanding Poverty
- Response to Intervention- Interventions provided through specific computer programs, EIP, and tutoring*
- Guided Reading
- Standards Based Grading/Reporting
- Grade Level Common Planning Time*
- Marzano’s Researched Based Strategies*
- Transition from Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) to Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) through professional learning via webinars, redelivery from onsite teachers and instructional coach, and Griffin RESA instructional specialists
- Accelerated Reader program (AR) - Used to motivate students to read independently*
- Write From the Beginning...and Beyond (WFTB&B)*

Current Instructional Initiatives

Many of the past instructional initiatives are still being implemented (designated above by *), as well as these current initiatives:

- CCGPS- revising instructional units to align with the standards
- Implementation of Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study Program
- Small group instruction- students are grouped by instructional needs and instruction is differentiated to address individual needs
- Master Schedule- 120 minute minimum instructional blocks designated for literacy instruction (i.e. phonics, reading, writing, etc)
- Collaborative Planning during grade level common planning time
- Bring Your Own Technology

Professional Learning Needs

Based on the analysis of our literacy needs assessment and student achievement data, and reflection of teacher commentary, professional learning is needed in the following areas:

- Teaching reading and writing across the curriculum
- Selecting and implementing appropriate evidence-based interventions
- Diagnosing reading problems
- Implementing phonics, word study, vocabulary and other researched based literacy strategies
- Determining, understanding, and using lexile scores to improve student reading
- Using technology to differentiate instruction and motivate students

Need for a Striving Readers Project

ULSE staff values teaching and learning and seeks to provide instruction that promotes a strong foundation for college and careers. In order to meet the needs of our diverse population, ULSE must be aware of students with limited knowledge or application of the English language (2% EL), and our growing population of those who are economically disadvantaged (76%), have disabilities (13%), and need EIP (28%). Many students who enter our kindergarten program have not received effective early care and education and are bringing limited language and literacy skills.

Analysis of Lexile performance reveals that 42.5% of 3rd graders achieved a score below 740 on the Spring 2013 CRCT, which is the *minimal* level for beginning fourth graders on the Stretch Lexile Band. Research states “only one-third of America’s fourth graders are reading proficiently. Students who are not reading on grade level by this point will only fall farther behind their peers, and they are at much higher risk of dropping out of high school. The dropout risk is highest for struggling readers who are poor...” (*A Governor’s Guide to Early Literacy*, October 2013, p. 3). Having our students move on to fourth grade only minimally ready to read is not acceptable in these times of more demanding, rigorous common core standards that place

high premium on reading complex content in all subjects. For this reason, reading is an area of concern, as is writing across the curriculum.

Receiving a Striving Readers grant will enable ULSE to incorporate the necessary components of a research-based literacy program that are currently missing in order to support all students' acquisition and growth of grade level literacy skills.

Literacy Plan

Building Block 1. Engaged Leadership

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

Upson-Lee South Elementary School's principal and full time instructional coach are dedicated to providing the teachers/staff with the resources they need to provide effective instruction to all students. According to the "Why" document on page 156, it is essential that principals and teachers have a solid understanding of how to teach reading and writing. Currently, there are four staff members with a reading endorsement. Two teachers have worked closely with the state in writing units. Several teachers are also gifted and ESOL endorsed. Among our staff, we have certified trainers in core programs such as "Thinking Maps" and "Write from the Beginning...and Beyond".

The principal is committed to looking at literacy and determining the best way to teach phonemic awareness by adopting the Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study as a school wide phonics program. A literacy team, recently created by the principal, has been developed in order to further study and analyze literacy data and prioritize literacy needs.

The administration at ULSE demonstrates commitment to improving literacy instruction by participating in state sponsored webinars and face-to-face sessions to learn about the transition to CCGPS ("How", p. 20). These webinars were shared with teachers during the rollout process.

The principal and instructional coach led the staff in "unpacking" and implementing the CCGPS standards by conducting professional learning sessions and unit writing planning times/days. Teachers at ULSE have worked closely with Griffin RESA's school improvement specialist on revision of ELA CCGPS units, phonics instruction, and guided reading training.

The principal continues to ensure growth through professional learning by providing opportunities for staff members to receive the support needed in the area of literacy instruction. Based on our literacy needs assessment results, we are fully operational in our commitment to learn about and support evidence-based literacy instruction. According to the "How" document on page 20, we plan to sustain effective literacy instruction by developing a pipeline of leaders and identifying and training leaders for succession. Several teachers will attend literacy workshops at Griffin RESA. In order to sustain capacity in the area of literacy instruction, we will continue to engage in professional learning and expand teachers' knowledge of best practices to promote literacy. Specific areas of concentration for professional learning will include:

- Buddy study training (to expand our phonics and word study program)
- Tiered vocabulary instruction
- On-going professional learning on researched based strategies for literacy instruction
- Reading Endorsements for additional teachers
- Using data to determine instructional needs and appropriate interventions
- Lexile Data

Writing across the curriculum
B. Action: Organize a Literacy Leadership Team
<p>In analyzing the “Why” document, the principal at ULSE has organized a literacy leadership team of certified faculty members with various strengths in literacy and literacy instruction (p. 67). The newly formed literacy leadership team consists of the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Dr. LaSharon McClain, PrincipalTracy Wainwright, Instructional CoachBetsy Stewart, First Grade TeacherSuzy Love, Second Grade TeacherChandra Youngblood, Third Grade TeacherMisty Crews, Kindergarten Early Intervention Program (EIP) TeacherTiffany Bentley, Special Education TeacherTara Keahey, Media Specialist <p>One member of the literacy team has a reading endorsement and three of the team members have a gifted endorsement and have extensive training in differentiated instruction. This team will be expanded to include members from other disciplines, as well as community/government leaders and parents. The team recently analyzed summative/formative and survey data to determine the literacy needs of our students and investigated instructional strategies, practices, and/or programs to develop and promote literacy. Recommendations and findings from the literacy team were shared with the school level leadership/improvement team which is comprised of kindergarten through third grade classroom teachers, instructional coaches, EIP teachers, support staff, special education teachers, a CAMP (Computers, Art, Music, or PE) teacher, media specialists, counselors, the principal and assistant principals, and central office staff members. Based on the school’s vision of improving literacy, recommendations and findings were also shared with school council members. The school council consists of community members, parents, and teacher representatives (“How”, p. 21). Grade level chairs redelivered this information to all faculty members and provided feedback from the faculty members to the literacy/leadership teams. Although we are sharing our vision with faculty, community members, and parents via the school council, it would be beneficial to expand the literacy team by adding community/parent members.</p>
C. Action: Maximize the use of time and personnel through scheduling and collaborative planning
<p>ULSE has allotted a minimum of 120 minutes of instructional time for direct, explicit instruction in literacy for all students in grades K-3 as suggested in the “What”, the “How”, and the “Why” documents. The administration ensures that time and personnel are maximized by working with a scheduling committee to plan schedules for the upcoming year. The master schedule reflects that teachers in all grade levels have a common planning time. During common planning times, teams meet twice a week to collaborate on instructional planning strategies to enhance literacy instruction (“What” p. 5 and “How” p. 22). Monthly curriculum meetings are held after school and grade level collaboration meetings are held during designated planning days and are used to discuss best practices. Teachers are given one planning day per nine weeks to revise CCGPS</p>

units that reflect rigor and differentiation based on student assessment data. District wide professional learning days are utilized for the sole purpose of expanding professional knowledge of effective teaching practices such as Thinking Maps, Write from the Beginning...and Beyond, researched based strategies for Marzano's *Classroom Instruction That Works*, and Fountas and Pinnell phonics instruction. Based on our literacy needs assessment results, this is an area of strength. However, after reviewing the "How" document, we will expand in this area by implementing self evaluation and sharing literacy strategies (p. 23).

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 suggested in the "What" document (p. 6), ULSE faculty and staff participate in ongoing, relevant professional development to support literacy instruction. In an effort to close the reading gap at ULSE and promote vertical alignment for literacy instruction, our leadership team has agreed to adopt the Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study program for each grade level. Teachers and staff have been provided training on this program. However, in order to use the program to effectively provide phonics instruction for all learners, teachers feel there is a need for additional training, modeling, and support. Adequate training and implementation of this program will reinforce a school culture in which teachers across all grade levels are assuming responsibility for differentiated literacy instruction. This will allow us to meet the foundational CCGPS reading standards by providing a common pathway to teaching phonics.

In addition, all teachers have been provided time to receive training via the webinars provided by the state to effectively transition to the CCGPS. A revision of the state frameworks is utilized by each grade level to guide all literacy instruction. Revisions to these units include the addition of Write From the Beginning...and Beyond (WFTB&B) to support the writing for ULSE students. Teachers are participating in ongoing professional learning utilizing the WFTB&B program. In order to monitor and ensure consistency of effective instructional practices, it is imperative that the literacy team develop a walk through observation form ("How", p. 24-25). In addition, ULSE plans to design and implement an infrastructure that will provide support and guidance for parents and families in regards to literacy strategies ("How", p. 24).

E. Action: Optimize literacy instruction across all content areas

During the minimum 120 minute literacy block at ULSE, teachers consistently provide writing instruction and require student produced writing in each genre. Although students produce writing during the literacy block, additional support is needed in order for writing to become an integral part of every subject, every day. Writing across the content areas is not a common practice at this time.

Currently, grade level groups provide vocabulary instruction that correlates with units of study. A systematic procedure for identifying relevant vocabulary at each grade level is needed.

Furthermore, a systematic procedure for teaching academic vocabulary in all subjects needs to be developed and implemented. ("How", p. 26)

As part of the state ELA frameworks, teachers at each grade level have begun to create and/or

revise the units utilizing more complex texts. Accelerated Reader is used as an independent, supplemental reading initiative to encourage students to read on appropriate levels. According to the “What” document (p. 6), teachers will participate in professional learning on selecting text complexity that is appropriate to grade levels as required by CCGPS. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the various ways we could utilize the existing AR program or other resources that provide Lexile levels to encourage students to read more complex text.

In the past, our school has hosted a Family Reading Night that engages parents in reading with their child. While our purpose has been to encourage reading, as suggested in the “How” document (p. 27), we would like to expand Family Reading Night to engage parents in relevant activities and strategies that demonstrate the importance of literacy beyond that of simply reading a book together.

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.

According to the results of our literacy needs assessment, 58.93% of faculty/staff believe the community at large supports schools and teachers in the development of students who are college-and-career ready as articulated in the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS). This is an area that can be improved. Low parent participation data in relevant literacy events, such as Family Reading Night and Parent Involvement workshops, validates the survey data.

According to the “Why” document (p. 31), all stakeholders, including educators, media specialists, and parents, are responsible for promoting literacy. We plan to have our literacy team explore the creation of a shared vision for literacy that will enable all stakeholders (teachers, parents, community members) to be actively involved in promoting literacy. We plan to maintain community awareness of our literacy initiatives by sharing the initiative via school newsletters, local newspapers, and/or social media. We would like to expand our literacy team to include key members of the community in order to engage more stakeholders in our literacy initiatives. We want to utilize our existing parent involvement coordinator, as well as the literacy team’s community members, to promote increased participation in the following literacy initiatives:

- parent involvement resource room
- parent involvement sessions
- Family Reading Night
- VIP Reading Program
- Technology Night with a focus on literacy

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.)

There is a daily designated forty-five minutes of planning time currently being used for collaborative planning, RTI meetings, and professional development in the areas of curriculum

and technology. We currently do not have cross curricular collaborative planning time. Write From the Beginning has been adopted and encouraged at all grade levels, but is predominantly used in the language arts classrooms. Fountas and Pinnell phonics and word study has been implemented at all grade levels. The recently formed literacy team will address ways to increase student literacy in all grade levels. Teachers offer after school tutorials in the content areas of math and hands-on science. Course content is fully aligned with CCGPS. Considering the results of our literacy needs assessment, we plan to establish cross disciplinary teams for literacy instruction and establish or select protocols for team meetings, such as those found on <http://www.lasw.org/methods.html>, which is referenced on page 7 of the “What” document and page 29 of the “How” document. Additionally, we plan to schedule time for teams to meet for cross-curricular collaboration and examination of student data/work.

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

Teachers in grades K-3 participated in Fountas and Pinnell professional development. Fountas and Pinnell is our core phonics and word study program that has a carefully articulated scope and sequence of skills and is incorporated into a rich curriculum of literary and informational texts (“What”, p. 7). Teachers are encouraged to attend conferences for professional learning. Most recently, many regular and special education teachers received professional development using Planet Literacy with Suzy Pepper Rollins. This training included literacy strategies that could be used to deepen comprehension, to promote critical thinking, and to promote student response to reading. Content area teachers collaborate with computer, music, art, and physical education teachers to supplement the instruction of CCGPS standards. All teachers have participated in state-sponsored webinars and training from staff at Griffin RESA to learn about the transition to the CCGPS. All of our classrooms have been equipped with 21st century learning Promethean ActivBoards, as well as classroom sets of ActiVotes or ActivExpressions. The ELL teacher meets annually with general education teachers of English Language (EL) students to study the English-Language Proficiency Standards for the English learners (“How”, p. 30).

We plan to evaluate current practices in all classrooms by using an observation or walk-through tool (e.g., Literacy Instruction Checklist, Eduphoria, or some other instrument) to determine strengths in literacy instruction and identify areas of improvement. We also plan to provide awareness sessions for the entire faculty to learn about CCGPS for literacy in social studies, science, and technology, as suggested on page 30 of the “How” document. Additionally, we plan to study other research-based strategies and resources, particularly those found in the “Why” document of the Georgia Literacy Plan. On-going support is needed for general education teachers of English learners.

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

In the past, several community organizations have donated school supplies to needy students, but they have been unable to do so recently. Community volunteers participate in the VIP Readers’ Program. VIP Readers adopt a classroom to visit at least once a month. During this time, they read grade appropriate books aloud to students and provide summarizing activities to reinforce student comprehension. We have a committee of approximately twenty business owners who are

members of our Partners in Education. These members provide limited monetary donations to support various teacher and student needs. The Parent-Teacher Organization provides student incentives for our Accelerated Reader program. The public library staff volunteers to read books to classrooms during holiday seasons. They also perform a puppet show to encourage student participation in the summer reading program at the public library. Through the Book-It program, Pizza Hut donates personal pan pizza gift certificates to students who reach a particular monthly reading goal. Read to Succeed is a free educational program sponsored by Six Flags Theme Parks. The program encourages students in grades K through 6 to engage in recreational reading. Students who complete six hours of recreational, non-school-related reading are eligible to earn a free admission ticket to a participating Six Flags Theme Park. Each school year, a local insurance agency donates dictionaries to every third grade student. We plan to continue to incorporate these community literacy activities and programs in our continuum of out-of-school community agencies' and organizations' collaborative literacy efforts.

While all of the above organizations help to foster a love for reading, they do not provide human resource supports (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, etc.) that will target student achievement ("How", p. 32). We plan to map available fiscal and human resources related to support services throughout the community, highlighting where gaps occur, as stated on page 32 of the "How" document. We will establish a means of continual communication (e.g., texting, Twitter, email, etc.) between faculty/staff members and out-of-school agencies and organizations ("How", p. 32). We plan to ask the local printing company to donate children's magazines to the school, as stated in the "How" document on page 33.

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

ULSE uses formative and summative assessments as a vital part of collecting data to guide our Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP). The following formative assessments- are on-going, and are used to monitor student progress and evaluate effectiveness of instruction:-:

- STAR Reading is used to determine students' independent and instructional reading levels.
- STAR Early Literacy is used to determine general readiness, understanding of phonemic awareness and phonics, and comprehension ability.
- The Online Assessment System of Georgia (OAS) and benchmark assessments are administered, and the results are used to drive instruction by determining whether students are progressing toward learning targets of the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards.

The following summative assessments provides a snapshot of students' mastery of grade level standards and expectations:

- Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State (ACCESS) is used to assess English language development of students who are English learners.
- The 3rd Grade Writing Assessment measures students' writing ability.
- The Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) is used to determine whether 3rd grade students have mastered the CCGPS.
- Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing t Skills (GKIDS) provides diagnostic information about kindergarten students' developing skills in the core content areas of ELA (including reading, language, listening, and speaking skills) and Mathematics social and emotional development, and approaches to learning.

Summative assessments are also included within grade level instructional units to determine whether students have mastered the learning targets of that unit. Progress monitoring and diagnostic tools for literacy have been selected. However, based on teacher observation and assessment data, concerns have been noted that some of these tools may not be effective in helping teachers accurately identify students who require additional interventions. We plan to research, select, and purchase effective screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools to identify readiness levels of all students as stated in the "How" document on p. 34. Also included on p. 34 in the "How" document, we plan to develop common mid-course literacy assessments used across classrooms and include a variety of formats (multiple choice, short answer, constructed response, essay).

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

Formative and summative assessments, listed in Section A of Building Block 3, are administered regularly, and data is reported using excel sheets (updated in August, December, and May). However, the results of assessment data are not consistently used to drive instruction, possibly due to the lack of understanding of these assessments based on the literacy competencies listed on p. 36 of the "How" document. The "Why" document (p. 96) states that having the "right" assessments in place is one element of an effective literacy assessment plan. Therefore, we plan to research and select progress monitoring tools and supporting technology to effectively progress monitor literacy competencies (e.g., phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, written expression, vocabulary) as stated on p. 36 of the "How" document. These monitoring tools will include recommendations and guidelines for grades 1-3 from the "Why" document on p. 102. We plan to purchase intervention materials and provide professional development on the use of the materials that align with students' needs based on the results of the selected progress monitoring tools ("What", p. 8).

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

Universal screeners are currently used to identify students who are performing below grade level. According to p. 99 of the "Why" document, a universal screener is a general outcome measure used to identify underperforming students, but the screener will not identify why students are underperforming by identifying specific skill weaknesses. The utilization of diagnostic assessments to analyze problems found in screening as stated on p. 9 of the "What" document would be beneficial. We plan to research and purchase effective assessments to ensure that students who are identified by screening receive further diagnostic assessment by isolating the

<p>component skills needed for mastery of literacy standards also included on p. 9 of the “What” document and p. 37 of the “How” document. The diagnostic assessment selected will identify literacy skills that are problematic so that appropriate individualized interventions can be selected to target these problems and avoid a one-size-fits-all approach (“How”, p. 37).</p>
<p>D. Action: Use summative data to make programming decisions as well as to monitor individual student progress</p>
<p>Results from the CRCT in grade 3 and benchmark tests in grades 1 and 2 are reviewed and analyzed to identify necessary program and instructional adjustments as stated in the “What” document on p. 9. In addition, data is disaggregated to ensure the progress of subgroups. Teacher teams meet to review assessment results and discuss changes that can be made to improve the instructional program for all students as stated on p. 38 of the “How” document. However, we plan to evaluate and upgrade the capacity of technology infrastructure to support test administration and disseminate results. We will research a technology tool capable of allowing teachers to review and analyze summative assessment results in a time efficient manner so that needed programmatic and instructional adjustments can be identified.</p>
<p>E. Action: Develop a clearly articulated strategy for using data to improve teaching and learning (See V. A.)</p>
<p>State and federal guidelines are adhered to for identification of instructional needs of students through RTI and special education. The current data storage and retrieval system (called Data Director) is adequate, understood, and used by all appropriate staff members as stated in the “What” document on p. 9. Its multi-faceted features allow teachers at all grade levels to generate individual, group, and other customized data reports that can be used to assist in developing learning plans. However, we will soon no longer have access to this system since the school district intends to discontinue it. We plan to research and develop a data storage and retrieval system, create a protocol, and provide professional development for using the assessment data to identify the instructional needs of students and to implement this protocol with fidelity.</p> <p>Additionally, we will continue to evaluate the process for using data to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of students and teachers (“How”, p. 39). We need to develop a protocol for making decisions to identify the instructional needs of all students and train teachers to use the protocol (“How”, p. 39)</p>
<p>Building Block 4. Best Practices in Literacy Instruction</p>
<p>A. Action: Provide direct, explicit literacy instruction for all students</p>
<p>Literacy instruction at ULSE includes whole group, explicit instruction in word identification, vocabulary, and comprehension, and adds small group instruction for differentiation. The following core programs are currently used to provide continuity based on a carefully articulated scope and sequence of skills and integrated into our curriculum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Write From the Beginning...and Beyond• CCGPS English/Language Arts units• Guided reading

- Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study
- Thinking Maps
- Accelerated Reader (supplemental)
- Lexia reading software (EIP only)
- Wilson Reading Program (students with disabilities only)
- Wilson Foundations
- Wilson Reading System

We plan to evaluate literacy instruction by conducting classroom observations using the Georgia Literacy Instruction Checklist and to examine student data regularly in order to identify areas of instruction with the greatest needs (phonological awareness, word identification, fluency, vocabulary, word study, comprehension, motivation and engagement) as explained in the “What” document on pp. 9-10 and p. 40 of the “How” document. We plan to evaluate our current core programs and provide ongoing training in the use of these core programs as stated in the “How” document on p. 40. Improving instruction is planned by providing professional learning in the tenets of explicit instruction, suggested on p. 40 of the “How” document, which will include using data to inform instructional decisions and explicit teaching, the selection of appropriate text for strategy instruction (“Why” p. 52), guided independent practice with feedback, and differentiated instructional options for literacy assignments.

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

Write From the Beginning...and Beyond is one of our core programs used for writing instruction. We will receive ongoing professional development on how to utilize the Write From the Beginning...and Beyond program to teach writing across the curriculum. We will ensure that writing instruction is consistent with CCGPS (argumentative, informative/explanatory, and narrative writing) and articulated vertically and horizontally. This plan will include writing across all subjects and include explicit instruction, guided practice, and independent practice (“What” p.10 and “How” p. 42). The plan will also include increasing how much students write and improving instruction of writing skills and processes that go into creating text (“Why” p. 46).

We plan to create a plan that describes how technology will be used for production, publishing, and communication across the curriculum and purchase the necessary materials to carry out this plan (“How” p. 42). We also plan to research and develop formative assessment strategies that provide students with feedback while developing drafts and to employ multiple assessment measures and portfolios to assess students’ development as writers (“Why” p. 44).

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

Students at ULSE are provided with opportunities to self-select reading material through our school’s media center as explained on p. 11 of the “What”, p. 41 of the “How”, and p. 51 of the “Why” documents. Incentives are currently used through the school wide use of the Accelerated Reader program. However, we plan to reevaluate our incentive program including making our incentive minimal, voluntary, not tied to grades, and used with students who are unmotivated to

read rather than with those already excited about reading, as informed in the “How” document, p. 41. We may also consider a different incentive program such as myOn reader, which has been rated the best reading website by the ComputED Gazette (eSchool News, October 29, 2013).

Should we adopt this program, it would also provide a ready connection to student lexiles. We plan to increase access to texts that students consider interesting and to provide more opportunities to self-select reading material (“How”, p. 41) by building classroom libraries with a variety of text forms such as nonfiction, fiction, and non print (“Why”, p. 49). We plan to increase student engagement by implementing the suggestions found on p. 54 of the “Why” document. These include helping students discover the purpose and benefits of reading, creating opportunities for students to see themselves as successful readers, providing reading choices, and providing students with the opportunity to learn by collaborating with their peers.

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.)

ULSE has a universal screening process in place where students are screened three times per year. Our school-based data teams are comprised of EIP teachers, classroom teachers, school counselors, administration, and instructional coach. To determine early intervention and remediation needs, all students are screened at the beginning of each school year and mid-year. The screeners are used on an on-going basis for students at the Tier II and Tier III levels to monitor their progress on assigned interventions. We currently serve the following number of students in each tier level:

- Tier II -103 students (8%)
- Tier III -66 students (5%)
- Tier IV -169 students (13%)

Of the Tier II and Tier III students, 33% have been in the RTI process for more than one year.

We plan to evaluate the current screeners being utilized to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of identifying at-risk students. We will utilize DIBELS as a screener at the Tier I level. We will seek a diagnostic assessment in order for teachers to identify general weaknesses in Tier I instruction, as well as for struggling students (“How”, p. 44). We plan to provide training for teachers in order to ensure that the use of the screening and diagnostic tools are implemented with fidelity and that data analysis is used to inform instructional decisions.

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

Tier I is General Education/Standards Based Regular Classroom Instruction for all students. Tier I includes feedback, differentiation, curriculum intervention and re-teaching for all students. In order to better organize RTI paperwork and documentation as students enter new tiers, folders

are placed inside permanent records to reflect the following classifications:

Tier II: orange

Tier III (SST): green

Tier IV (Sped): purple

The use of word walls, differentiated instruction, and flexible grouping are evident in some classrooms. All teachers are utilizing a revision of the ELA frameworks to ensure that CCGPS is being implemented during their 120 minute daily literacy block. Student data is available for teachers; however, the current screeners do not provide the level of data that teachers feel would best guide their instruction. An assessment tool (DIBELS Next, SRI) that encompasses all areas of reading will be selected. We plan to ensure school-wide understanding of the assessment tool to be chosen using on-going professional learning as suggested in the “What” document (p. 12) in order to increase the percentage of students performing at the mastery level.

We also plan to increase teacher knowledge regarding best practices, such as direct, explicit instructional strategies that build students’ word identification, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills to expand the rigor of our current ELA units (“What”, p.11 and “How”, p. 44). Follow-up observations will be conducted to ensure that teachers are implementing targeted literacy practices utilizing the Georgia Literacy Instruction Observation Checklist, 2013.

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

In order to move a student into Tier II, the indicators from the universal screening and classroom assignments/assessments must show a need for interventions. Evidence-based interventions are selected and implemented for at least 4 weeks before meeting to discuss student progress. Documented progress monitoring is done bimonthly and graphed. If interventions are deemed ineffective, changes to the student’s intervention plan are made and additional progress monitoring occurs.

Tier II interventions currently being used at ULSE include the following:

- Early Intervention Program (EIP) (45 minutes/4 days per week - reading)
- Guided Reading small group instruction (45-60 minutes daily)
- Lexia Reading Software (20 minutes/4 days per week - reading)
- Orchard Reading software (20 minutes/4 days per week - reading)
- Study Island software (3rd grade)
- Locoture Software (Students with articulation delays)
- Earobics(Students with language delays; Builds phonemic awareness, phonics and auditory processing)

According to the “Why” document (p. 126), teachers need to use specific research-based

practices during interventions to address the group’s reading needs while keeping a focus on CCGPS, grade level expectations in the content areas, and transfer of learning to the general classroom.

We will expand our research-based interventions by purchasing and implementing direct instruction programs and/or strategies based upon diagnostic student assessment data. The EIP program needs a more structured reading approach that is aligned to CCGPS. As suggested in the “How” document (p. 45), sufficient resources, such as materials and training, will be provided to implement appropriate interventions.

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

School counselors schedule and facilitate Tier III meetings. To move a student to Tier III, 8 to 9 weeks of consistent interventions (20-30 minutes/3 times a week) and progress monitoring must have occurred bimonthly. Formative/summative data and student work are examined at Tier III meetings. Appropriate interventions are determined and implemented and progress monitored weekly for a minimum of 4 weeks.

The following Tier III interventions are currently in use:

- Guided Reading small group instruction - intensified focus (45-60 minutes daily)
- Lexia Reading Software (duration increased from Tier II - reading)
- Orchard Reading software (duration increased and level made skill specific from Tier II - reading)
- Study Island software (3rd grade)
- Fine Arts Resource Teachers provide 1:1-1:3 support
- One-on-one tutoring from resource teachers

The “Why” document (p. 127) indicates that Tier III (SST teams) should be tailoring to the individual needs of students based on data-driven evidence and should be aggressively monitoring the student’s response to the intervention and the transfer of learning to the general education classroom. At the Tier III level, teams are expanded to include the school psychologists, EL teacher, parents, behavior interventionists, speech pathologists, and other personnel (as needed). Currently, ULSE has a limited number of resources for Tier III that are different from those used in Tier II.

As stated in the “How” document (p. 46), we need to expand our research-based interventions that are designed to meet the individual student’s needs based on diagnostic student assessment data. We plan to develop a menu of evidence-based practices to provide instructors with appropriate interventions based on specific areas of need and to purchase any needed resources/programs. Teachers will receive professional learning on Student Support Team processes and procedures as outlined in the GaDOE manual (“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

Students identified as gifted and those with disabilities receive Tier 4 interventions and programs. Administrators and other teacher leaders received training on how to maximize funding formulas affecting students in special programs (“How”, p. 47). We will continue to ensure that all students with disabilities are allowed to be in the least restrictive environment as suggested in the “What” document (p. 12). Settings for special needs students include resource, co-teach, instructional support, and self-contained classes.

The following Tier IV interventions are currently in use:

- Wilson Reading System -SWD
- Edmark -SWD
- SRA Language for Learning -SWD
- UNIQUE -SWD
- Ellis (EL students)
- Enrichment via Gifted Resource Class Model –Gifted
- Assistive Technology (i.e. Communication-Go Talk, switches; Writing-highlighters, pencil grips, hand weights; Reading- read aloud)– SWD
- Computers with Accessibility Features (i.e. touch screen, read aloud) -SWD

There is a need to increase collaboration time between special education, EL, and gifted case managers in order to meet, plan, and discuss students’ progress with general education teachers (“How”, p. 47). All teachers working with special needs students should be provided with professional learning opportunities to meet the unique needs of the students they serve.

Building Block 6. Improved Instruction through Professional Learning

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

We currently have a mentor/mentee teaching program in place for our new teachers. Administrators and classroom supervising teachers collaborate with the college site supervisor of the assigned preservice teacher. In addition, the Thomaston-Upson School System seeks to ensure that the necessary communication regarding literacy instruction, with regard to a preservice teacher, is consistent and deliberate. The Thomaston-Upson School System's Human Resources' Department will begin to share with colleges and universities the district’s intense emphasis on literacy instruction and the importance of a literacy focus in preservice education programs. The district will explain how literacy instruction is integrated into content specific classes and the impact that it has on student success. The school superintendent will also share the district's focus and expectations about literacy instruction with the local RESA staff during their quarterly Board of Control Committee meetings.

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

The Thomaston-Upson school district provides for limited conference attendance. However, because of budget cuts, off campus professional learning opportunities are limited. Attendees must redeliver the conference content to the faculty and staff. The list below highlights some of the professional learning activities held on ULSE's campus:

- Developing a Curriculum Map Unit Planning
- Implementing Activities to meet the Needs of Diverse Learners
- Data Director Training; Faculty Book Study: *Love and Logic* by Fay & Funk
- Activboard- Inspire Software Training
- Thinking Maps
- Faculty Book Study: *Classroom Instruction That Works* by Robert Marzano
- Thinking Maps & Marzano: Making the Connection and Write from the Beginning... and Beyond
- Common Core Georgia Performance Standards Elluminate Training
- Co-Teaching
- Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study

We will continue to partner experienced teachers with pre-service and beginning teachers. We plan to revisit and revise professional learning based on student mastery of CCGPS and classroom observation. We plan to continue to analyze student data to evaluate effectiveness of current professional learning on student mastery of CCGPS in all subgroups, as stated on page 48 of the "How" document. We will meet in collaborative teams to support teachers in using literacy strategies effectively ("How", p. 48). We will ensure that new personnel receive vital learning from earlier years, as stated on page 48 in the "How" document.

As stated previously in Building Block 1A, we plan to build capacity in the area of literacy instruction by engaging in professional learning in order to expand teachers' knowledge on the best practices to promote literacy.

Needs Assessment, Concerns, and Root Cause Analysis

ULSE is continuously studying the needs of our students and staff by examining test data and surveying teachers to determine their professional learning needs. We recently administered the Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment for literacy to our teachers. Students and parents were given a similar literacy needs assessment created by the district. The online survey was designed to determine how teachers, students, and parents felt about the current literacy instruction at our school and to determine additional needs.

FACULTY SURVEY

The faculty literacy needs assessment was disseminated to all certified and noncertified faculty and staff via a link to surveymonkey.com. All content and ancillary teachers, including special education, ELL, media specialists, and paraprofessionals, were asked to participate. Out of 134 faculty members, 56 responded to the survey, for a response rate of 42%. The survey was available for completion during a two week window, and faculty members were sent reminders. The literacy team identified items on the needs assessment receiving the highest percentage of “emergent” or “not addressed” ratings under each building block. Next the literacy team analyzed the results for concerns by grade levels and established root causes. The chart below summarizes the concerns and root causes relating to each building block and includes documentation to support root causes. The steps that we have taken and are proposing to take regarding the areas of concern are addressed in the literacy plan under the related building block.

Building Block	Area of Concern	Grade Level(s)	Root Cause	Documentation
1.Engaged Leadership	<p>Better communication between personnel and community members; implement self evaluation and share literacy strategies; expand Family Reading Night</p> <p>A network of learning supports within the community that targets students improvement is active (The What, p. 7)</p> <p>Multiple forms of student, school, and teacher data have been analyzed to develop a list of prioritized</p>	K-3	<p>Literacy team not including community members and parents.</p> <p>Lack of strategies and resources for literacy instruction in all content areas.</p> <p>Low participation in school literacy functions.</p>	<p>Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment for Literacy- Parent</p> <p>Family Reading Night sign in sheet</p>

Building Block	Area of Concern	Grade Level(s)	Root Cause	Documentation
	<p>recommendations and goals for improvement (The What, p. 7)</p>			
<p>2. Continuity of Instruction</p>	<p>Resources to write across the curriculum</p> <p>Resources to teach reading for information</p> <p>Evaluate current practices in all classrooms by using an observation or walk-through tool; map available fiscal and human resources related to support services throughout the community</p> <p>Cross-disciplinary teams for literacy instruction (“What”, p. 7)</p> <p>Reading teachers in grades K-5 use core programs that provide continuity and a carefully articulated scope and sequence of skills that is integrated into a rich curriculum of literary and informational texts (“What”, p. 7)</p> <p>A walk through and/or observation form is used to ensure consistency of effective instructional practices that include</p>	<p>K-3</p>	<p>Lack of specific, measurable student achievement goals aligned with CCGPS in all content</p> <p>Lack of professional development on teaching writing across the curriculum.</p>	<p>3rd grade Georgia Writing Test Data</p> <p>3rd grade CRCT scores</p> <p>Benchmark scores</p> <p>GKIDS</p> <p>Kindergarten screener</p> <p>Fluency Screener</p>

Building Block	Area of Concern	Grade Level(s)	Root Cause	Documentation
	<p>disciplinary literacy across content areas (“What”, p. 6)</p> <p>A comprehensive system of learning supports to enhance motivation and capability of the critical mass of stakeholders is in place (“What”, p. 8)</p>			
<p>3. Ongoing formative and summative assessments</p>	<p>Progress Monitoring Tools; Technology to progress monitor; Technology related data retrieval system;</p> <p>Effective screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools have been selected to identify achievement levels of all students, advanced as well as struggling (“What”, p. 8)</p> <p>Technology infrastructure is adequate to support administration and storage of assessments as well as the dissemination of results (“What”, p. 8).</p>	<p>K-3</p>	<p>Lack of effective progress monitoring tools</p> <p>Lack of student computers</p> <p>Lack of data retrieval system to analyze data</p>	<p>RTI documentation</p> <p>3rd grade CRCT scores</p> <p>3rd grade Writing Test Data</p> <p>Benchmarks</p>

Building Block	Area of Concern	Grade Level(s)	Root Cause	Documentation
<p>4. Best Practices in Literacy Instruction</p>	<p>Classroom libraries</p> <p>Technology to support student engagement and learning</p> <p>Reading incentive program</p> <p>Increase Lexile scores</p> <p>Language and Vocabulary Development</p> <p>Small group literacy manipulatives</p> <p>Student data is examined regularly to identify areas of instruction with greatest needs (e.g., phonological awareness, word identification, fluency, vocabulary, word study, comprehension, motivation and engagement) (“What”, p. 9)</p> <p>Technology is used for publication, publishing, and communication across the curriculum (“What”, p. 10)</p> <p>Increasing access to texts that students consider engaging (“What”, p. 11)</p> <p>Leveraging the creative use of technology</p>	<p>K-3</p>	<p>Lack of printed and nonprinted material for classrooms</p> <p>Lack of printed material and spoken language in the home due to low economic status</p> <p>Lack of student motivation</p> <p>Budget cuts</p>	<p>Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment for Literacy- Faculty</p> <p>STAR scores</p> <p>STAR Early Literacy Scores</p> <p>AR Goal Report</p>

Building Block	Area of Concern	Grade Level(s)	Root Cause	Documentation
	<p>within the learning process to promote engagement and relevance (“What”, p. 11)</p>			
<p>5. System of Tiered Intervention for all students</p>	<p>Diagnostic Assessments</p> <p>Programs that provide direct instruction</p> <p>Appropriate interventions and strategies</p> <p>Teachers participate in ongoing professional learning in using appropriate supplemental and intervention materials, diagnosing reading difficulties, using direct, explicit instructional strategies to address instructional needs (“What”, p. 12)</p>	<p>K-3</p>	<p>Insufficient training of staff</p> <p>Lack of research based intervention program</p>	<p>RTI documentation</p> <p>Annual Summative Data</p> <p>Benchmark Scores</p> <p>CRCT scores</p>
<p>6. Improved Instruction through Professional Learning</p>	<p>Cross curricular collaboration</p> <p>Increase Lexiles</p> <p>Dibels</p>	<p>K-3</p>	<p>Budget cuts</p> <p>Lack of adequate professional learning for reading and</p>	<p>3rd Grade Writing Scores</p> <p>Benchmarks</p> <p>CRCT scores</p>

Building Block	Area of Concern	Grade Level(s)	Root Cause	Documentation
	<p>Special needs</p> <p>Writing, phonics, and vocabulary</p> <p>CCGPS</p> <p>Diagnostic reading assessment</p> <p>Teachers participate in professional learning in the CCGPS based on the needs revealed by student data as well as by surveys, interest inventories and teacher observations (“What”, p. 13)</p> <p>The school calendar includes protected time for teachers to collaboratively analyze data, share expertise, study the standards, plan lessons, examine student work, and reflect on practice (The What, p. 13)</p>		<p>writing instruction</p> <p>Limited resources to plan and implement research based strategies to close the achievement gap in literacy.</p>	<p>Georgia Literacy Plan Needs Assessment for Literacy- Faculty</p>

PARENT SURVEY

The parent survey was posted on our school’s website. The ten item survey solicited information about the parent’s knowledge related to literacy instruction in their child’s classroom. The survey also asked the parent on what level they believed their child was reading. Finally the survey inquired about suggestions parents might have related to writing and literacy instruction. A school reach call was sent to all parents multiple times to inform them of the survey and of the option of receiving a paper copy. With 1,264 students enrolled, twenty-seven parents (27) completed the needs assessment survey. Due to the low sample, root causes were not able to be determined. However, there is a need for increased parent involvement so parents can become more informed. Based on the relatively small response from parents, it appears that they are unaware of how to use the reading strategies taught at school to help their children at home.

Some parents indicated that they are unclear about our school's literacy programs and grade level expectations.

STUDENT SURVEY

The online needs assessment survey, which consisted of seven questions, was given to the 3rd grade students at ULSE. As a K-3 school, we chose 3rd graders to complete the survey because the students in the lower grades are still learning to read. The survey solicited information from students related to their feelings about their ability to read and write. The survey also inquired about whether or not students felt that they were receiving additional help or support with reading when needed. Additionally, it asked about the student's enjoyment of reading and writing. The survey was completed by 266 students with their computer teacher during their computer resource class. Survey results indicated that, for the most part, students feel they are good readers despite data indicating that many of them are reading below grade level. The literacy team believes that students feel good about their reading abilities, possibly due to the positive learning environment that has been created at ULSE. However, it is clear from the results that we need to ensure that every student understands his or her actual level of performance in reading and writing relative to grade level expectations.

Analysis of Student/Teacher Data

ULSE data has been analyzed from sources below to identify student literacy needs:

GKIDS

The percentage of ELA standards passed by ULSE’s kindergartners over three school years has decreased (see chart below). The greatest area of concern is writing with students passing approximately half of the ELA standards in 2013. Our students have consistently passed most standards related to curiosity/initiative, but have not done well on those related to creativity/problem-solving.

GKIDS ELA				
GPS	2010-2011	2011-2012	CCGPS	2012-2013
Reading	84.7	84.6	Reading	79.2
Writing	61.6	71.7	Writing	53.3
Listening/Speaking/Viewing	89.2	89.6	Speaking/Listening	87.8
			Language	77.2
ELA Total	81.5	83.4	Total	75.6
Approaches to Learning				
Curiosity/Initiative	88.6	90.5	Curiosity/Initiative	92.2
Creativity/Problem Solving	75.7	73.6	Creativity/Problem Solving	75.3
Attention/Engagement	72.0	75.4	Attention/Engagement	81.0
Approaches Total	78.1	79.4	Total	82.6

Deeper analysis of GKIDS data (2012/2013) indicates that students with disabilities and students in early intervention programs met fewer standards than students in other subgroups. Overall, all student subgroups met the fewest standards in writing.

CRCTs

Third graders typically meet expectations on the CRCT in reading and ELA. However, a closer look at data revealed that 11% of the students passing met with minimal proficiency scoring between 800 and 815. SWD, Black and Hispanic subgroups have fewer students performing in the exceeds range for reading. Overall, the highest achieving subgroups on literacy standards are gifted and white students.

Grade 3 Reading	2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
All Students	6	59	35	8	46	46	5	48	47
SWD	7	63	31	23	59	18	5	59	36
Economically Disadvantaged (ED)	7	63	31	10	53	38	7	53	40
Black	13	67	23	15	52	32	10	63	27
White	2	52	46	3	44	52	2	42	56
Hispanic	0	75	25	0	25	75	9	55	36
Gifted	0	0	100	0	4	96	0	10	90

Grade 3 ELA	2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
All Students	8	63	29	9	58	34	7	63	30
SWD	9	66	25	29	47	24	6	56	38
ED	9	66	25	10	64	27	10	68	22
Black	13	66	20	10	70	20	9	75	17
White	6	59	35	7	52	41	7	56	37
Hispanic	0	50	50	0	50	50	10	40	50
Gifted	0	14	86	0	4	96	0	20	80

GRADE 3 WRITING ASSESSMENT

The chart below shows the most recent performance of our 3rd grade students on the writing test. Students are struggling in all areas of each writing genre. Students are able to formulate ideas; however, they are unable to write with style using appropriate organization and conventions. These scores reflect typical performance over the last three years.

2012-2013	IDEAS			ORGANIZATION			STYLE			CONVENTIONS		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
Informational	21	70	9	41	52	7	40	53	7	37	58	5
Persuasive	18	74	7	33	61	6	41	52	7	39	56	5
Narrative	17	69	13	35	54	11	35	52	12	42	50	8

BENCHMARKS

First and second graders take a cumulative benchmark assessment created from Georgia Online Assessment System (OAS).

The number of first graders meeting/exceeding standards in reading and ELA is decreasing. While our pass rate for reading and ELA in 2012-2013 was not alarming, approximately 38% in reading and 44% in ELA scored below 80%. Students scoring 60% are considered to have minimally met the standard. SWDs are consistently the lowest performing subgroup in reading and ELA.

Grade 1 Reading	2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
All Students	10	49	41	12	49	39	15	45	41
SWD	27	58	15	47	42	11	35	52	13
ED	12	51	37	15	54	31	17	46	36
Black	10	61	30	19	50	31	16	50	35
White	11	44	44	9	47	44	13	43	44
Hispanic	13	50	38	18	64	18	0	17	83

Thomaston-Upson School System: Upson-Lee South Elementary

Grade 1 ELA	2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
All Students	14	65	21	16	60	24	16	51	33
SWD	37	48	15	64	31	6	45	49	6
ED	16	66	18	20	61	19	18	51	31
Black	16	73	11	18	63	19	14	59	26
White	14	62	23	15	58	26	17	48	35
Hispanic	0	88	13	27	64	9	0	17	83

The number of second graders meeting/exceeding standards in reading and ELA has decreased. Pass rates were high, but performance was at the basic competency level. SWDs are again the lowest performing group. All subgroups demonstrated weaker proficiency in ELA than reading skills.

Grade 2 Reading	2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
All Students	6	41	53	5	48	47	5	37	57
SWD	27	47	27	37	40	23	44	41	15
ED	7	48	55	6	54	40	7	42	51
Black	7	53	40	9	57	34	10	42	48
White	5	35	60	5	43	52	4	36	60
Hispanic	0	50	50	0	67	33	0	56	44

Grade 2 ELA	2010/2011			2011/2012			2012/2013		
	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E	DNM	M	E
All Students	13	66	21	16	69	15	17	61	22
SWD	57	33	10	63	27	10	71	24	6
ED	16	69	15	19	66	15	22	59	20
Black	21	68	11	24	65	11	23	59	18
White	9	67	25	13	71	17	15	62	23
Hispanic	0	75	25	0	78	22	11	56	33

LEXILES

On the Mock CRCT for first and second graders in 2011-2012 only 9.8% of first graders achieved a Lexile of 420+ and 22.7% of second graders achieved a Lexile of 520+. These are the lowest levels of the Stretch Lexile Bands for the next grade level.

In 2011-2012 46.4% of 3rd graders scored below the minimal level (740) for beginning fourth graders on CRCT Lexiles. This number decreased in 2012-2013 to 42.5%.

UNIVERSAL SCREENING

Improvement is needed in developing foundational reading skills based on the following grade level averages from Star Reading reports:

- 1st grade students 25th percentile
- 2nd grade students - 41st percentile
- 3rd grade students - 34th percentile

A weakness exists in phonemic awareness in grades 2-3 and comprehension and fluency in (1st).

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES BASED ON FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE DATA

Goal 1: Collaborative planning teams will focus on being data driven to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum.

- Increase Reading/ELA scores by 1.5% for all students with special emphasis on underachieving subgroups with appropriate grade level assessments.
- Increase the percentage of students meeting writing expectations using appropriate grade level rubrics.

FACULTY/STAFF DATA

Administration

- 1 Principal
- Assistant Principals

Teachers

- 58 K-3
- 11Sp Ed
- 8 EIP
- 2Art
- 2 PE
- 1 ESOL
- 1 Gifted

Other Faculty/Staff

- 1 Curriculum Coach
- 1Technology Coach
- 2 Counselors
- 2 Media Specialists
- 1 School Psychologist
- 39 Paraprofessionals
- 9 Custodians
- 18 School Nutrition Staff 1 School Nurse, 1 Nurse Aide
- 7 Clerical Staff

Staff Certification Levels	
Level 4	29
Level 5	34
Level 6	31
Level 7	1

Teacher Retention		
2011	2012	2013
96%	91%	96%

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

All certified staff participates in professional learning activities as previously indicated in Building Block 6-Professional Learning and Resources in the Literacy Plan.

Project Plan, Procedures, Goals, Objectives, and Support

ULSE strives to increase literacy achievement by focusing on school improvement goals, using researched based instructional strategies, and targeting professional learning. Currently ULSE uses QBE, SPLOST, Title I, Title II, Title VI, School Improvement Funds, and local funds to purchase educational resources, provide professional learning, employ first grade paraprofessionals, one instructional coach and one instructional technologist, and four general education teachers. The following goals will be funded with these same sources, as budgets permit. However, it is our hope that a Striving Reader grant will allow us to supplement existing budgets, where permitted by federal regulations.

A. Project goals directly related to the identified needs

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Measurable Objectives</u>	<u>Research-Based Practices</u>	<u>Accountability</u>
1. Implement effective writing instruction across the curriculum	a. Coordinate writing instruction plans across all subject areas to increase performance of grade 3 students meeting and exceeding the 3 rd grade writing assessment	Provide professional learning in writing instruction in all content areas. Integrate writing approaches in all content areas (“Why”, p. 48) Continue professional development in WFTB&B.	Notebooking Focus walks using the Georgia Literacy Observation Checklist Formative/Summative assessments 3 rd grade writing assessment Professional development logs
	b. K-3 teachers participate in professional learning to improve cross curricular writing	Purchase technology software/devices for students to produce and publish writing and receive feedback. (“What”, p. 10) Provide professional learning opportunities to analyze student writing using rubrics.	3 rd grade writing assessment Formative/Summative assessments Writing rubrics Lesson plans Professional development logs
2. Increase family/community	a. Equip parents with the knowledge	Fund resources for parent readiness	Percentage of parent participation

Thomaston-Upson School System: Upson-Lee South Elementary

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Measurable Objectives</u>	<u>Research-Based Practices</u>	<u>Accountability</u>
involvement in literacy.	and resources to provide literacy support at home via workshops.	workshops. Train school personnel to develop/implement literacy workshops. Utilize parent mentor to conduct literacy workshops.	Parent survey
	b. Provide extracurricular activities to promote student/parent engagement in literacy.	Seek assistance from community & faith based organizations to increase parent participation in extracurricular activities (family meals, door prizes, transportation to/from event, etc.) Provide student incentives for participation (homework pass, free book, Royal behavior incentive)	Percentage of parent/student participation Parent/student survey
	c. Involve community members/parents with the literacy team to analyze literacy needs and plan extracurricular literacy events.	Stakeholders, community, and parents collaborate to share literacy plan. Literacy teams will survey community/parents for input.	Parent/community survey Percentage of community members/parents participating
3. Increase student reading achievement	a. Improve student Lexile levels so all	Provide professional learning on Lexile	Increased Lexile levels

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Measurable Objectives</u>	<u>Research-Based Practices</u>	<u>Accountability</u>
	<p>students exit grade at/above grade level range</p> <p>b. Increase classroom libraries</p> <p>c. Students apply grade level phonics and word analysis skills</p>	<p>Research and purchase a Lexile based reading program</p> <p>Continue professional learning on Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study program, vocabulary, and other evidence-based literacy strategies</p>	<p>Increased number of books in classroom libraries</p> <p>Growth on DIBELS Next assessment</p>
<p>4. Establish an infrastructure for ongoing formative/summative assessments and increase teacher understanding of how to select and implement interventions</p>	<p>Provide teachers with diagnostic assessments that confirm results of universal screenings and identify causes of students' weaknesses ("What", p. 12)</p> <p>Train teachers to use data to diagnose students' needs, place students in the correct tier of intervention, implement and progress monitor interventions, and determine the next steps ("Why", p. 133)</p>	<p>Research and purchase evidence-based interventions for Tiers 2, 3, and 4</p> <p>Provide professional learning and support on selected interventions</p>	<p>Growth shown through progress monitoring tools and universal screeners</p> <p>Diagnostic assessment data</p> <p>RTI intervention logs</p> <p>Professional development logs</p>
<p>5. Collaborative teams ensure a consistent literacy focus across the curriculum</p>	<p>Implement cross curricular collaboration to analyze data, share</p>	<p>Continue content planning by providing common planning times</p>	<p>Collaborative planning meeting minutes\logs</p> <p>Lesson plans</p>

Thomaston-Upson School System: Upson-Lee South Elementary

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Measurable Objectives</u>	<u>Research-Based Practices</u>	<u>Accountability</u>
	<p>expertise, study the standards, plan lessons, examine student work, and reflect on practice (“What”, p. 13)</p>	<p>Provide time for cross collaboration among content planning teams</p> <p>Provide professional learning in analyzing and using data for collaboration</p>	<p>Professional development logs</p>

Thomaston-Upson School System: Upson-Lee South Elementary

Below are samples of grade level schedules, including literacy and tiered instruction time blocks. We have discussed literacy instruction relating to these schedules in our Literacy Plan under Building Block 1: E-Optimize Literacy Instruction Across All Content Areas and throughout Building Block 2: Continuity of Instruction. Our discussion of tiered instruction at ULSE and a description of our RTI model are found in Building Block 5.

Kindergarten

Time	Instruction	Teachers/Students Involved
7:55-8:15	Breakfast	
8:15-8:45	Calendar/ Number Corner	classroom teacher, paraprofessional, all students
8:45-9:15	ELA/Reading/ Phonics	
9:15-10:15	Guided Reading-Tiered Instruction Early Intervention Program (EIP) (augmented) RTI SPED specialized reading instruction	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
10:15-11:00	ELA/WFTB&B	classroom teacher, paraprofessional, all students
11:00-11:30	Lunch	
11:30-12:00	Science/Social Studies	
12:00-12:30	Math	
12:30-1:20	Guided Math Math EIP (augmented) RTI SPED specialized math instruction	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
1:20-1:40	Recess	classroom teacher all students
1:40-2:25	CAMP (Computers, Art, Music, PE)	CAMP teachers all students

Total K ELA Time: 135 minutes

First Grade

Time	Instruction	Teachers/Students Involved
7:55-8:15	Calendar/Numeracy/Number Talks	classroom teacher, all students
8:15-8:40	Math	
8:40-9:25	Guided Math Math EIP (augmented) RTI SPED specialized math instruction	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
9:25-10:10	CAMP	CAMP teachers all students
10:10-10:40	ELA/Reading/ Phonics	classroom teacher, all students
10:40-11:40	Guided Reading-Tiered Instruction Early Intervention Program (EIP) (augmented) RTI SPED specialized reading instruction	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
11:40-12:10	Lunch	classroom teacher, all students
12:10-12:30	Recess	
12:30-1:30	ELA/WFTB&B	
1:30-2:30	Science/Social Studies	
<p>*The resource class model is utilized to provide differentiated instruction to gifted students. The schedule for 1st grade gifted students is below: Mondays- 12:10-2:30 Wednesdays- 7:55-11:40</p>		

*Paraprofessionals are shared among 1st grade classes.

Total First Grade ELA Time: 150 minutes

Second Grade

Time	Instruction	Teachers/Students Involved
7:55-8:40	Math	classroom teacher, all students
8:40-9:25	CAMP	CAMP teachers all students
9:25-10:20	Guided Math Math EIP (Pull Out) RTI SPED specialized math instruction	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
10:20-10:55	ELA/WFTB&B	classroom teacher, all students
10:55-11:40	Guided Reading-Tiered Instruction Reading EIP (Pull Out) RTI SPED specialized reading instruction	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
11:40-12:10	ELA/Reading	classroom teacher, all students
12:10-12:40	Lunch	
12:40-1:05	ELA/Phonics	
1:05-1:25	Recess	
1:25-2:25	Science/Social Studies	
<p>The resource class model is utilized to provide differentiated instruction to gifted students. The schedule for 2nd grade gifted students is below: Mondays- 9:25-10:10 Thursdays- 7:55-11:40 & 12:10-2:30</p>		

Total Second Grade ELA Time: 135 minutes

Third Grade

Time	Instruction		Teachers/Students Involved
	Group 1	Group 2	
7:55-8:40	Guided Reading-Tiered Instruction Reading EIP (Pull Out) RTI SPED specialized reading instruction	Guided Math Math EIP (Pull Out) RTI	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
8:40-10:10	ELA/Reading/Phonics/ Writing	Math	classroom teacher, all students
10:10-10:35	Social Studies	Science	classroom teacher, all students
10:35-10:55	Recess		
10:55-11:40	CAMP		CAMP teachers
11:40-12:10	Lunch		
	Group 2	Group 1	
12:10-12:55	Guided Reading-Tiered Instruction Reading EIP (Augmented or Push Out) RTI SPED specialized reading instruction	Guided Math Math EIP (Pull Out) RTI	classroom/ EIP teachers all students (flexible grouping) SPED resource and and coteachers
12:55-1:40	ELA/Reading/Phonics/ Writing	Math	classroom teacher, all students
1:40-2:25	Social Studies	Science	classroom teacher, all students
<p>The resource class model is utilized to provide differentiated instruction to gifted students. The schedule for 3rd grade gifted students is below: Mondays- 7:55-8:40 Tuesdays- 7:55-10:10 & 12:10-2:30</p>			

Total Third Grade ELA Time: 135 minutes

Assessments/Data Analysis Plan

Upson-Lee South Elementary (ULSE) uses many assessment tools in driving instructional decisions. We have a comprehensive assessment plan for the purpose of identifying individuals needing support. During faculty and grade level meetings, a breakdown of the student data is presented by grade, content area, domains, and subgroups. The data provides teachers with an overview of their students’ abilities to make informed instructional decisions (“Why”, p. 96-97). The following chart provides a detailed listing of our school’s current assessment protocol.

A. Detailed listing of the school’s current assessment protocol.

Assessment	Purpose	Skills	Frequency
STAR Reading	Screening and Progress Monitoring	Reading Comprehension	5 times a year
STAR Early Literacy	Screening and Progress Monitoring	Alphabetic Principle, Concept of Word, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Structural Analysis, Vocabulary, Comprehension	Screening 3 times a year Progress monitoring as needed
Sight Word (Dolch)	Progress Monitoring	Word Identification	3 times a year
Grade Level Fluency Passages	Screening and Progress Monitoring	Words Per Minute	3 times a year
ACCESS for ELL	Screening	Language	Once annually
CRCT -3 rd Grade	Outcome: Assess mastery of CCGPS and GPS standards	Reading, ELA, Math, Science, & Social Studies	Once annually
3rd Grade Writing Assessment	Outcome: Assess student writing performance on domain specific topics	Ideas, Organization, Conventions, and Style	Once annually
OAS CRCT Cumulative Benchmark Assessment	Outcome: Assess mastery of CCGPS and GPS standards and Instructional Effectiveness	Reading, ELA, Math (1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd grades) Science (3 rd grade)	3 times a year
GKIDS	Outcome: Assess	ELA, Math, Approaches to	Quarterly

	performance of grade level standards	Learning, and Personal/Social Development	
--	--------------------------------------	---	--

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

ULSE’s assessment protocol partially aligns with the Striving Readers’ assessment plan. While we are currently utilizing universal screener and progress monitoring tools, these assessments are not the same assessments required by the Striving Readers’ protocol. In order to align with the Striving Readers’ protocol for assessment, we will adopt the Scholastic Reading Inventory and DIBELS Next. The utilization of diagnostic assessments will also be implemented to further analyze problems found in screening, as stated on p. 9 of the “What” document. The diagnostic assessment will allow problematic literacy skills to be identified so that appropriate individualized interventions can be selected to target these problems and avoid a one-size-fits-all approach, as stated on p. 37 of the “How” document.

C. A brief narrative detailing how the new assessments will be implemented into the current assessment schedule.

DIBELS Next and the Scholastic Reading Inventory will be incorporated into the current assessment schedule. These assessments will become our new universal screeners and progress monitoring tools and will be administered according to the Striving Readers’ assessment plan.

D. A narrative listing current assessments that might be discontinued as a result of the implementation of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant.

Some of our current assessments might be discontinued as a result of the implementation of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant. Our current grade level fluency passages will no longer be used to assess reading fluency. In addition, STAR Early Literacy assessment will no longer be used as a screening tool. Other assessments may be discontinued as we determine that they add no value and/or that they are duplicative of new tools brought in through the grant.

E. A listing of professional learning needs those teachers will need to implement any new assessments.

The implementation of DIBELS Next and the Scholastic Reading Inventory will be a priority for ULSE. Professional development will be provided for teachers on how to administer these new assessments, how to disaggregate data, and how to use results to improve classroom instruction. The training will include data collection methods and tools from purchased programs. Professional development will assist teachers and interventionists in using assessment data to address individual student needs and drive instruction. All teachers will be trained on the proper

way to implement appropriate reading interventions with fidelity based on assessment results. The following personnel will be included in professional development and assessment administration that are pertinent to the role they serve in accomplishing our literacy goals:

- All Teachers (General Ed, Special Ed, EIP, EL, and Gifted)
- Interventionists/Early Intervention Program
- Administrators
- Counselors
- Pre-service teachers working at school
- Support Staff
- Paraprofessionals
- Representatives from out-of-school agencies (when necessary)

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

Individual student literacy assessment results will continue to be presented to parents through progress reports, Response to Intervention meetings, conferences, and report cards. Aggregate data on students' literacy performance will be presented to parents and stakeholders at school council meetings that occur quarterly. Aggregate data will also be shared at PIE (Partners in Education) meetings, which take place quarterly. Our "Data Wall" will continue to be displayed in our school's main hallway so that it is visible to parents and stakeholders visiting our school.

G. A description of how the data will be used to develop instructional strategies, as well as determined materials and need.

After assessments are administered, teachers at each grade level will input and analyze assessment data according to the school's established timeline and protocol. During teacher team meetings, results of assessments will be disaggregated by subgroups for reading, ELA, and writing, then summarized, identifying performance strengths and weaknesses for individual students and groups of students. Grade level instructional goals will be established based on assessment results and evidence-based interventions and materials will be identified to support literacy instruction in areas targeted. Interventionists and classroom teachers will collaborate on the specific needs of students. Assessment data will be utilized to determine placement of students in appropriate small groups for instruction as well as to monitor the progress of students at designated checkpoints. , Teacher teams will also analyze data to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies.

H. A plan detailing who will perform assessments and how it will be accomplished.
 ULSE’s principal, curriculum coach, and designated testing coordinator will ensure that the following assessment plan is implemented following district-approved test administration procedures.

Assessment	Responsible Staff	Frequency
DIBELS Next	Classroom Teachers EIP Teachers	3 times a year
Scholastic Reading Inventory	Classroom Teachers EIP Teachers	3 times a year
Diagnostic Assessment	RTI Team	As needed
Benchmarks	Classroom Teachers	3 times a year
ACCESS for ELL	ESOL Teacher	Once annually
CRCT	Classroom Teachers	Once annually
3rd Grade Writing Assessment	Classroom Teachers All Certified Staff	Once annually
GKIDS	Kindergarten Teachers	Quarterly

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

ULSE will use funding from the SRCL grant to support and enhance the strategies and resources outlined below. All strategies and resources directly align with the needs assessment results, student data, and root cause analysis. They also directly impact literacy, access to print, instructional engagement, and teacher support.

A. Resources Needed:

- Variety of high quality books (including eBooks) on different reading levels including informational and complex text in content areas to add to classroom libraries and media center
- High quality resources to teach informational reading
- Resources to teach writing across the curriculum (professional development)
- Electronic devices for focus walk to evaluate literacy instruction
- Progress monitoring tool (technology to support progress monitoring tool)
- Technology related data retrieval system
- Instructional Technology to support student engagement such as tablets, software, and interactive apps
- Effective screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic tools
- Educational supplies for literacy interventions such as hands on materials and teacher resources
- Substitutes' salaries for CCGPS professional learning
- Literacy consultants' fees for professional learning
- Stipends, travel expenses, fees and materials for professional learning
- High quality, evidence-based intervention materials
- Purchase Lexile based reading program
- Web-based computer intervention programs
- Up to date equipment for listening centers
- Instructional technology to expand media titles for student access to print, increase student engagement, and add more current periodicals for teacher/student use for research, planning and instruction

B. List of activities that support literacy intervention programs

- Professional learning in Writing Instruction
- Professional learning in Literacy Instruction
- Professional learning in administering screeners and using data to diagnose reading difficulties
- Professional learning in providing literacy interventions
- Professional learning on DIBELS Next and Scholastic Reading Inventory
- Parent Literacy Workshops

C. A list of shared resources available at each building

- 20 interactive technology devices (iPads)
- 20 Macbooks
- One computer sign up lab with 25 computers
- Wi-Fi Network
- Activotes/ActivExpression
- 13 scanners
- Fountas and Pinnell phonics materials
- Document cameras

Since we have a large population of students, ULSE needs additional interactive devices (iPads) to be shared among the 1265 students in our school. We could also utilize another computer lab since our school population is so large. Our current computer lab is not easily accessible to our kindergarten and first grade students because of its location in the building.

D. A general list of library resources

The ULSE media center houses 21,054 books with an average copyright date of 1996. SACS recommends that we have an average of 10 books per student. Our collection has an average of 16.82 books per student. The average number of checkouts per day is 700. Many of our books are outdated. They are not aligned with the current CCGPS standards, and we do not have a range of Lexile levels that meets the needs of the school as a whole since Lexiles have not been a major focus for our school. The following collections are in the media center:

Category	Category Total	Average Age
General Fiction	2638	1996
Reference	482	1991
Biography	938	1997
Story Collection	10	1992
Collective Biography	35	1994
Easy	224	1995
Book Sets	1941	1992
Guided Reading	1985	1999
Read Alongs	583	1999

- 1 ActivBoard/Projector
- 3 student computers
- 2 printers
- 1 scanner
- 13 digital cameras
- 7 video cameras
- 11 outdated cassette tape/CD players

E. A list of activities that support classroom practices

- Professional learning activities (see Building Block 6 of the Literacy Plan for list of professional learning)
- Family Reading Night
- Response to intervention teams that assist teachers in differentiation and intervention strategies
- Co-teaching provided by special education and ELL teachers
- Math and Reading interventions
- Thinking Maps
- Guided Reading
- Accelerated Reader program
- Write from the Beginning...and Beyond
- VIP Readers program

F. A list of additional strategies needed to support student success

- Literacy Team needs to include parent and community stakeholders
- Design and implement an initiative for community members to invest in literacy for our schools and community
- Accountability for providing writing instruction/practice time
- Have more teachers obtain reading, gifted, ESOL endorsements in order to expand options for use of personnel
- Additional, high quality, diverse technology tools, media and software to engage and support all students

G. A general list of current classroom resources for each classroom in the school

- ActivBoard
- Teacher Computer
- Student Computer (1 to 3 in each classroom)
- Core Reading Program
- Write From The Beginning...and Beyond
- 1 set of leveled readers
- Short and extended text (1 per teacher) to accompany CCGPS units

H. A clear alignment plan for SRCL and all funding

We will continue to leverage funds from other federal sources, such as Title I and Title IIA, Title VI-B, along with state and local funds, to purchase materials to enhance literacy instruction and interventions, as permissible by state and federal funding requirements. SRCL funds will be used for the following:

- Provide professional training for teachers in all areas of literacy and writing including any new programs and/or technology purchases
- Purchase technology and software to extend initiatives that are already in place
- Offer literacy programs and materials to parents to help them understand the curriculum and ways they can help their children at home

- Purchase supplemental, evidence-based instructional programs to improve reading interventions
- Resources purchased will focus on materials to increase administrators', teachers', and all stakeholders' expertise in literacy strategies across the content area.

I. A demonstration of how any proposed technology purchases support RTI, student engagement, instructional practices, writing, etc.

- Teachers will have access to a progress monitoring program that has an accompanying technology component, thus allowing for efficiency in developing and collecting student data in support of tiered instruction/RTI.
- Students will have more opportunities to use technology in literacy related activities that require them to access digital materials or make presentations using selected digital software due to availability of more computers, tablets, etc.
- Students will be more motivated and engaged as a result of having access to more varied technology tools, media and software.
- Writing will be part of the comprehensive literacy plan. Accountability and integration across the curriculum will be sustained through student displays of work through multiple types of media and through students' test data.

Professional Learning Strategies

Activities, Percent of Staff Attending, List of On-going PL

The Thomaston-Upson school district and the ULSE administration are dedicated to providing professional learning opportunities for faculty and staff in order to improve the literacy skills of all learners. As stated in Building Block 6 of the Literacy Plan, staff members at ULSE have participated in various professional development trainings specifically relating to literacy. While budget cuts have prevented large group participation in training sessions off campus, many of our teachers have been able to attend sessions and redeliver valuable information learned.

Building capacity and sustaining on-going professional learning is important to our system and our school. The opportunities include developing relevant curricular units, technology integration, Thinking Maps, Write From the Beginning...and Beyond, CCGPS Illuminate sessions, and various book studies on common best practices in the classroom.

In 2010-2011, 52 faculty members were trained in the use of Thinking Maps, which has become an integral part of daily instruction in all classrooms. The following year, on-going training occurred when ULSE staff members led professional learning called Thinking Maps & Marzano: Making the Connection (90 participants). This training made connections between specific processing skills involved with Thinking Maps and the best practices learned from the faculty book study on Classroom Instruction That Works by Robert Marzano (78 participants). In addition, two staff members were certified to train teachers in how to teach Write From the Beginning...and Beyond (WFTB&B), which also uses Thinking Maps to guide the writing process. We have had approximately 90 faculty members partially trained in WFTB&B.

For the past two years, 100% of co-teaching teams (regular education and special education teachers) have participated in a professional learning project provided by the local RESA. The focus of the project was to teach best practices associated with co-teaching models, necessary skills to achieve parity among co-teachers, and effective techniques to assist students with disabilities to be successful in the general education setting. Appropriate professional learning sessions have also been provided for special education paraprofessionals.

Most recently (2012-2013), 98% of our teachers participated in training on how to use the newly purchased Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study program. This one day training was provided by a Heinemann consultant with no follow-up training scheduled. ULSE teachers have met collaboratively and viewed model lesson via DVDs provided by the Heinemann trainer.

Professional development is consistently evaluated at the conclusion of sessions offered at the school or within the school system using a district-designed evaluation form. Feedback provided on the session evaluation is used to improve future sessions relating to the same topic, coupled with student performance results that may be relevant.

Thomaston-Upson School System: Upson-Lee South Elementary

Some of Upson-Lee South Elementary School’s professional development activities provided over the last several years are as follow:

Professional Learning Activity	Year(s) Offered	% of Required Participants
Developing a Curriculum Map; Unit Planning; Implementing Activities to meet the Needs of Diverse Learners	2009-ongoing	100% (K-3 teachers, Sped teachers, EIP teachers)
Activboard- Inspire Software Training	2010-2011	100% (K-3, Sped EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers)
Thinking Maps	2010-2011	100% (initial year) (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, counselors, administrators, and instructional coaches)
Faculty Book Study: <i>Love and Logic</i> by Fay & Funk	2009-2010	95% (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, counselors, administrators, and instructional coach)
Faculty Book Study: <i>Classroom Instruction That Works</i> by Robert Marzano	2010-2011	90% (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, counselors, administrators, and instructional coach)
Guided Math with Laney Sammons	2011-2012	90% (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, counselors, administrators, and instructional coach)
Book Study: <i>Guided Math: A Framework for Mathematics Instruction</i> by Sammons	2011-2012	97% (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, counselors, administrators, instructional coach)
Thinking Maps & Marzano: Making the	2011-	99%

Professional Learning Activity	Year(s) Offered	% of Required Participants
Connection	2012	(K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, counselors, administrators, and instructional coach)
Write From the Beginning...and Beyond	2011- oning	100% (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, ELL, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, counselors, administrators, and instructional coach)
Common Core Georgia Performance Standards Elluminate Training	2011- 2012	92% (K-3, Sped, EIP , Gifted, fine arts teachers, media, psychologist, principal, and instructional coach)
Project Leap: Co-Teaching Project	2012- 2013 2013- 2014	100% (co-teaching teams)
Fountas and Pinnell Phonics and Word Study	2012- 2013	98% (K-3 ELA teachers, SpEd lead teacher, Reading EIP teachers, instructional coach, and principal)
Planet Literacy with Suzy Pepper Rollins	2013- 2014	(Grade Level representatives and special education teachers)

Ongoing professional learning initiatives are as follows:

- Phonics and Word Study
- Write from the Beginning...and Beyond
- Common Core GPS Unit Planning
- Standards Based Instruction

The professional learning opportunities listed above have provided great benefits to our students and our teachers. However, in order to sustain the level of implementation needed and to see on-going gains in student achievement, we plan to build on the programs, resources, and trainings listed to receive the greatest value of the resources we currently have. Our professional learning plan will also allow us to continuously explore additional 21st century learning strategies and provide on-going training to support their implementation. The literacy needs assessment that

we recently conducted probed for feedback on the programmatic professional learning needs of all staff in the area of literacy. The literacy team analyzed the feedback provided and coupled it with results of classroom observations and student performance data to determine the professional learning needs to be addressed in the plan shown below.

Professional Learning Plan, Targeted Related Goals and Objectives, and Methods of Measuring Effectiveness

*Please note that a complete listing of goals and objectives is found in the Project Plan section of this application.

Professional Learning Area of Need	Related Goal/Objectives*	How will effectiveness be measured?
<p>On-going training in WFTB&B including analysis of student work using rubrics to identify exemplars and evaluate student performance.</p> <p>Implement training on the use of notebooking. (Notebooking is a term that refers to educational journaling which allows students to record what has been learned and/or experienced during classroom instruction).</p>	<p>Implement effective writing instruction across the curriculum</p>	<p>Classroom focus walks will be conducted during scheduled writing blocks as well as in other content areas.</p> <p>Grade level debriefing will occur upon completion of focus walks.</p> <p>Student work/writing portfolios will be analyzed during grade level collaboration.</p> <p>Grade 3 Writing Assessment Scores</p>
<p>Professional learning on the development of effective home-school communication for the implementation of any new literacy strategies or programs.</p>	<p>Increase family and community involvement in the area of literacy.</p>	<p>End of session evaluations and/or parent surveys will be completed.</p>
<p>Professional learning on using lexiles</p>	<p>Increase student reading achievement</p>	<p>End of session evaluations and/or parent surveys will be completed.</p>

Professional Learning Area of Need	Related Goal/Objectives*	How will effectiveness be measured?
Professional learning on research-based strategies/best practices in literacy instruction.		<p>Review of lesson plans to ensure evidence of best practices.</p> <p>Utilize classroom focus walks to monitor the implementation of strategies learned.</p> <p>CRCT Data</p>
<p>Professional learning on updated RTI processes and with any interventions purchased</p> <p>Professional learning to support the use of screeners and diagnostic assessments such as: SRI DIBELS</p>	Establish an infrastructure for ongoing formative and summative assessments and increase teacher understanding of how to select and implement interventions	<p>Analysis of universal screener data</p> <p>RTI Excel data sheet</p> <p>RTI progress monitoring data</p>
Professional learning and modeling in data analysis and collaboration	Collaborative teams ensure a consistent literacy focus across the curriculum	<p>Meeting agendas and minutes that reflect literacy planning/discussions.</p> <p>Classroom/Grade Level Data Analysis Documents</p> <p>Unit/Lesson plans</p> <p>Common Assessments</p>

Sustainability

ULSE and our system will continue to have a shared commitment for implementing a gold standard literacy program after the project funding concludes. We will continue to use federal, state, and local budgets, as appropriate and permissible under program guidelines to sustain our literacy activities and implement the following plans.

Plan for Sustainability of Literacy Goals

- Success stories will be shared on the school web page.
- Student work will be displayed through various media (radio, local newspaper, school newsletter, web page, etc.).
- Literacy successes of students will be celebrated in a timely manner.
- Teachers will continue to expand types of writing across all subject areas.
- Literacy goals will be placed on the school's web page and will be shared with parents and stakeholders.
- Community volunteers, such as tutors, mentors, etc., will continue to be utilized.
- ULSE will continue to host a Family Reading/Literacy Night with a focus on proficiency in literacy.

Plan for Extending Professional Learning and Lessons Learned

- Master teachers and instructional coaches will serve as literacy coaches to facilitate job embedded professional learning. Over the five-year period of the grant, we will assist a number of teachers in getting reading endorsements so that we will have a pipeline of master literacy teachers on staff.
All teachers will have the opportunity to receive job embedded professional learning during the summer and throughout the school year using GADOE modules, Webinars and online resources.
- Teachers and administrators will attend sessions sponsored by GADOE Striving Reader project staff to participate in discussions on lessons learned. Lessons learned will be included in project updates and used to improve literacy implementation, when appropriate.
- Teachers new to ULSE and to the profession will be assigned a master teacher mentor to assist with on-going literacy training on topics previously covered.
-
- Teachers will be provided instructional planning days throughout the school year to revise units based on the CCGPS standards using local funds.
- Collaborative teams will function as professional learning communities and support teachers in using literacy strategies effectively.
- Peer observations will be conducted in model literacy classrooms for ongoing modeling and support of evidence-based literacy practices.

- Leadership/Literacy Team will continuously analyze student data to evaluate the effectiveness of professional learning on mastery of the CCGPS in all subgroups. Topics for on-going literacy PL will be selected based on student and teacher identified needs.

Plan for Extending Assessment Protocols, Replacing Print Materials, Sustaining Technology

- Purchase assessment protocols and replacement materials as part of the annual Title I and VI-B budgets.
- Use faculty members with technology expertise, system technology staff, and RESA consultants to train new personnel and update current staff on use of ULSE's literacy technology inventory.
- Continue to use SPLOST funds (if applicable) to update technology.
- Use system technology staff to troubleshoot technology, as needed. Utilize Title I funds to renew technology license subscriptions.
- Continue to seek technology grants to update devices for students to use as part of the system's "Bring Your Own Technology (BYOT)" initiative.

Plan for Developing Community Partnerships and/or Sources to Assist with Funding

- Continue to use school improvement dollars to assist in funding literacy resources.
- Foster relationships with and seek help from community partners to heighten awareness about reading and literacy.
- Continue to share student successes in the local newspaper, school newsletters, and via social networks.
- Continue to communicate with our Partners in Education and Parent/Teacher organization to continue funding for teacher and student incentives and request additional funds for literacy resources.

Budget Summary

All stakeholders at ULSE understand the importance of having a high quality and highly effective literacy program. In order to assure quality learning for our students, we are hoping to secure the SRCL grant so that we can be in a position to achieve a higher level of success for our students. We plan to utilize the funds from this grant to further develop goals identified in our needs assessment. These goals can be found in the Needs Assessment, Concerns, and Root Cause Analysis section of the SRCL grant application. For example, school data indicates a weakness in phonemic awareness in the upper elementary grades and comprehension and fluency in the lower elementary grades. There are also achievement gaps with the students with disabilities subgroup and the economically disadvantaged subgroup compared to all students. We plan to address these gaps with diverse leveled texts which are needed to support instruction in content area standards.

The SRLC grant will fund items that our school system cannot otherwise afford and make it possible for us to strengthen and enrich our students’ abilities “to access, use, and produce multiple forms of media information and knowledge in all content areas at all grade levels” (Why, p. 31). Thus, we will equip our students to meet Georgia’s goal for all students to “become self-sustaining, lifelong learners and contributors to their communities” (Why, p. 31). By accomplishing this we will create a continuous cycle of literacy in our community. A large portion of the funds will be allocated to professional development, technology, and high quality, high interest reading and writing materials. Sufficient funds will be allotted for professional learning, as well as materials and supplies needed for the development and implementation of effective literacy strategies (reading, writing, listening, viewing and speaking), and other professional learning needs. Technology expenditures may include software, desktop computers, iPads, laptops, e-readers, or other mobile devices

Budget Items	
Item	Quantity
21 st Century Technology (software and hardware)	TBD
e-book library	TBD
Digital book publishing software	TBD
High quality, high interest , complex text and leveled books for classroom libraries	TBD
Screening/Progress Monitoring/Diagnostic Tools	TBD
RTI (intervention programs/materials)	TBD

Thomaston-Upson School System: Upson-Lee South Elementary

Materials and supplies to support literacy instruction	TBD
Home Support Literacy Materials	TBD
Planning/Professional learning days for K-3 teachers, special education teachers, EL teacher, EIP teachers, gifted teacher, and fine arts teachers to collaborate and align instruction	TBD
Professional Learning	
Item	Quantity
Research Based Strategies/Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	TBD
Understanding and Using Lexile levels	TBD
Formative, summative, and diagnostic assessment training	TBD
Professional learning communities	TBD
Use of classroom technologies	TBD
How to analyze data and use it to inform instruction	TBD
Community initiatives and workshops	TBD
DIBELS Next training	TBD
Scholastic Reading Inventory training	TBD
Reading Endorsement	TBD
Writing across the curriculum and assessment	TBD
Training in core programs	TBD
Stipends and/or substitute pay for professional learning	TBD
RTI protocol	TBD