

**Literacy for Learning, Living, and Leading in Georgia 2019 (L4GA)**  
**Georgia’s Plan for the Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program**

**REQUIREMENTS**

Need for the project	2
Quality of the project	3
Specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes	3
Performance and continuous improvement	4, 9
Management plan	17
Clearly defined responsibilities, milestones	24
Adequacy of feedback and continuous improvement	9, 26
Quality of project services	8
Likelihood of impact	2, 4, 8
Sufficient training	5, 26, 30

**Literacy for Learning, Living, and Leading in Georgia 2019 (L4GA)  
Georgia’s Plan for the Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction and Priorities	1
State Agency Early Childhood Program Collaboration	2
State Needs Assessment	2
State Comprehensive Literacy Plan	4
Need 1: Evidence-based comprehensive literacy strategies	5
Need 2: Family and community engagement and empowerment	6
Need 3: Evidence-based intervention programs	7
Sustainable Change: Revising State Plan through Continuous Improvement	8
L4GA Continuous Improvement (Specified and Measurable Outcomes)	9
Research and Evaluation Questions	10
Data Collections	11
Analysis and Feedback	15
SEA Plans for Sub-grants	17
Eligible Entity for Sub-grants	17
Established Need: Calculation of System Performance	17
Application Requirements and Priorities for Sub-grants	18
Application Requirements Table (includes Rural Competitive Preference)	20
Independent Review for Sub-grants	24
SEA Monitoring Plan	26
Post-Award Technical Assistance and Local Monitoring Plans	27
Fiscal Monitoring	28
Programmatic Monitoring for Continuous Improvement	29
Sufficient Training	30

**Literacy for Learning, Living, and Leading in Georgia 2019 (L4GA)  
Georgia’s Plan for the Comprehensive Literacy State Development Program**

**NARRATIVE**

**Introduction and Priorities**

The L4GA initiative would support Local Education Agencies (LEAs) as they develop strong partnerships with local agencies and community organizations serving families to provide a well-rounded education for children from birth through high school graduation. Aligned with Georgia’s state plan, the LEA-Partnerships would agree to improve comprehensive literacy learning (**Priority 1**) by utilizing evidence-based practices (EBP) with proven success for improving student learning, teacher learning, classroom literacy instruction (birth to grade 12), family empowerment, and community-school partnerships. The state plan, *Literacy for Learning, Living, and Leading in Georgia* (L4GA), is viewable online at [L4GA.GaDOE.org](http://L4GA.GaDOE.org) (**State Comprehensive Literacy Plan**). Georgia’s state plan offers a unique approach to improving literacy by ensuring a well-rounded “whole child” education through choice in courses, activities, and programming enhanced through community partnerships with the purpose of providing students an enriched education experience (**Priority 2**). Georgia’s state plan also relies on involvement of the Governor’s Literacy Commission, with representation from all child-serving state agencies to ensure seamless services and coordinated budgeting (**State Agency Early Childhood Program Serving Collaboration**). The Governor’s Literacy Commission convenes for the purpose of empowering families to choose a high-quality education and take advantage of social services ranging from quality early learning and care to health care to housing (**Competitive Preference 1**). The Governor’s Literacy Commission, birth-five care providers, as well as the LEAs will review literacy data related to underserved children and families (English learner, foster, rural, economically disadvantaged, dyslexic) (**Competitive**

**Preference 2**), implement programs to better serve these constituencies, and develop routines that support continuous improvement. In addition, Georgia's Governor recently passed 2019 SB 48 detailing system-wide improvements for serving students with dyslexia; the L4GA implementation will support implementation of this important goal with evidence-based practices for screening, identifying, intervening, and supporting students with dyslexia.

### **State Agency Early Childhood Program Collaboration**

Georgia's plan unites all state agencies through the Governor's Literacy Commission in service to children in communities, early care centers and K-12 schools. The Governor's Literacy Commission pulls together leaders from the Department of Early Care and Learning, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Community Development, the Department of Community and Behavioral Health, the Department of Family and Children Services (foster), and the Department of Education (as well as representatives from the Governor's office), to review early learning and care data that are correlated to literacy outcomes in order to better coordinate services and improve literacy outcomes (note: The Commission reviews health, learning, care and housing data in relation to 3rd grade literacy outcomes). The Georgia Literacy plan leverages these partnerships to promote a well-rounded education, organize B-12 educator professional learning, and align system-wide child/family support services. By coordinating all child/family-serving agencies, L4GA ensures the likelihood of impact beyond simple instructional improvements to include wrap-around supports (**Likelihood of impact**).

### **State Needs Assessment**

To determine the need (**Need for the Project**), Georgia conducted a full needs assessment in 2015-17 and, for the purposes of this application, met to review needs with leaders in 20 LEA-partnerships involved in community partnerships, school improvements, and wrap-

around student-support efforts. These 20 meetings revealed the following three priority needs: (a) more awareness of evidence-based instructional strategies for B-5 and K-12; (b) more support for family and community partnerships, especially for early care and learning; and (c) more support for selection of Tier 1 evidence-based programs and materials. In addition, a review of Georgia’s literacy data reveals that Georgia’s students continue to improve on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, moving from the bottom of the state comparisons to the national average over the past decade. At the same time, over 566,000 of Georgia’s children (about 25%) are growing up in extreme poverty (Kids Count Georgia, 2018). In many of Georgia’s rural areas, poverty rates are 100%, and a visitor could drive for 100 miles before reaching a more prosperous community. Georgia’s literacy outcomes are significantly correlated to poverty ( $r^2 = .674$ ). Thus, Georgia takes a unique approach by serving the “whole child” because we know that poverty can affect health, safety, care, housing, learning, and development, and all of these affect literacy. L4GA seeks to improve instruction (**Quality of the project**) as well as ameliorate the effects of poverty.

The goal of Georgia’s plan seeks to improve literacy outcomes across all age ranges within feeder systems (early childhood, elementary, middle, and high schools) by 3% annually (**Specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes**). **We seek to improve early language outcomes in early childhood education settings.** We will measure this goal with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test in early childhood and PALS in prekindergarten. **We seek to improve early literacy outcomes in elementary settings.** We will measure this goal with growth in the Kindergarten Readiness screener, DIBELS Next components for First Sound Fluency, Phoneme Segmentation, Nonsense Word Fluency, and Oral Reading Fluency (grades K-3) and scores produced by outcomes from Georgia’s End-of-Grade Milestones Assessments

(grades 3-5). **We seek to improve literacy outcomes in middle and high school settings.** We will measure this goal using scores produced from the Milestones End-of-Grade Assessments (grades 6-8) and End-of-Course Assessments for 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Literature and Composition and American Literature and Composition. The evaluation will disaggregate outcomes by demographic sub-groups (e.g., economically disadvantaged [ED]; students with disabilities [SWD]; English Learners [EL]); and Foster (F) to investigate how to address inequities in literacy achievement (**Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Outcomes**). Performance targets will be made annually consistent with school targets identified by the State ESSA Plan.

Sustainability of these improvements will be, in part, influenced by aligning agencies and partnerships that include state Agencies, early childhood education providers, Regional Education Service agencies (RESAs), Local Education Agencies (LEAs), schools, and community organizations so that they collectively focus on literacy as a priority (Huffman, Guindon, Takahashi-Rial, & Socol, 2014). The strength and influence of these coalition partnerships will be demonstrated through a social network analysis. Together, the partnerships will review data and engage in conversations regarding continuous improvement for the purpose of better serving children in their local communities (**Performance and Continuous Improvement**). The **likelihood of impact** occurs via thoughtful and strategic convergence of effort across multiple agencies and organizations all focused on literacy outcomes.

### **State Comprehensive Literacy Plan**

Georgia's L4GA plan guides the state level activities and sub-grantees will align to this plan. Developed over two years and published in 2017, Georgia's plan emerged from conversations with P-12 teachers, higher education faculty, community leaders, school leaders,

and state leaders about what has worked in their communities and what challenges they still face. Georgia's literacy plan, L4GA, also includes three items that are specifically related to needs most recently identified through the 20 interviews with LEA-Partnerships:

**Need 1: Evidence-based comprehensive literacy strategies**

The L4GA project builds on a plethora of evidence-based practices for literacy instruction (see IES Practice Guides here <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuides>). When designing their sub-grant applications, LEA-Partnerships and professional learning providers will be advised to use IES practice guides. Topics are promoted because they have strong to moderate evidence for improving literacy include, but are not limited to: dialogic reading (**moderate evidence**); peer-assisted learning (**strong evidence**); small-group reading interventions (**strong evidence**); developing academic English (**strong evidence**); and explicit comprehension strategy instruction (**strong evidence**); and explicit vocabulary instruction (**strong evidence**). IES offers practice guides complement and support many of the literacy instructional practices promoted by Georgia's literacy plan (Berninger, Nagy, & Beers, 2011; Bielenberg, & Fillmore, 2005; Diamond, Justice, Siegler, & Snyder, 2013; Foorman et al., 2016; Gallagher, Woodworth, & Arshan, 2015; Graham et al., 2016; Graham, & Hebert, 2012; Graham, McKeown, Kiuvara, & Harris, 2012; Gersten, Newman-Gonchar, Haymond, & Dimino, 2017; MacArthur, 2012; MacArthur, 2014; Ogletree, & Allen, 2013; Philippakos, & MacArthur, 2019; Sadler, 2007; Saddler, Behforooz, & Asaro, 2008; Troia, 2014). District and care center leaders determined a need for aligning this evidence-based focus in all training and coaching in schools and centers; therefore, L4GA will allow all partners to receive the same training and coaching supports by allocating funding for travel and registration (**Sufficient training**).

## **Need 2: Family and community engagement and empowerment**

L4GA supports enduring and sustainable promotion of evidence-based practices through community coalitions and coordinated family services. The *Get Georgia Reading Campaign* (2019), part of the National Campaign for Grade-Level Reading (2019), has already begun some of this coalition building among community organizations, early care providers, and schools; thus, L4GA seeks to reinforce these coalitions. The Campaign has recruited 70+ communities (thus 70 of 181 Georgia's LEAs are involved as "Get Georgia Reading Campaign Communities") to analyze data from K-12 schools, providers of early care and learning, and local family service agencies in order to identify needs and create local solutions. In addition to a strong partnership with the Department of Education, the *Get Georgia Reading Campaign* Cabinet has benefited from a tremendous level of involvement of leaders from multiple state agencies, including Georgia's Governor's Office of Student Achievement, Department of Health, Department of Child and Family Services, Department of Early Care and Learning, University System of Georgia, Technical College System, community and legislative leaders, state-wide social services organizations, and philanthropic partners. The Campaign primarily targets issues related to poverty that correlate to literacy outcomes, such as attendance. The Georgia Literacy Commission's work has grown out of the Get Georgia Reading Campaign efforts and will specifically target coordination among state agencies with regards to budgeting, human resources, and effort. L4GA sub-grantees will design plans that include community partners who can support literacy-related services that improve children's access to print and language through activities such as book fairs, summer reading camps, library services, and after/before-school programs that utilize evidence-based practices for literacy learning. A rich literature supports this comprehensive, community-driven approach to improving learning (c.f., Alexander, Entwisle, &

Olson, 2007; Allington, & McGill-Franzen, 2013; Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2011; Hiebert, & Mesmer, 2013; Kim & Quinn, 2013; Melosh, 2013; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017; Neuman, & Celano, 2001; Schacter & Jo, 2005; Smith & Foorman, 2015).

### **Need 3: Evidence-based intervention programs**

The L4GA plan uses Georgia's definition of evidence-based programs consistent with *Georgia's State Plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Evidence-based programs are research-proven (e.g., strong, moderate, and promising practices), data-informed, appropriate to the community, and include educators in professional decision-making processes. L4GA Partnerships that apply for sub-grants will describe how their plans align to the following:

*Research-based* –The Georgia Department of Education encourages the use of high-quality research to inform practice. LEAs are encouraged to use repositories of research, such as the What Works Clearinghouse, Promising Practices Network, Blueprints for Violence Prevention, Social Programs that Work, as well as Regional Education Labs that can provide timely research advisement.

*Data-informed* - The Georgia Department of Education assists LEAs to create a means of conducting on-going formative assessment of interventions so that continuous improvement can take shape. These data can include student-level outcomes and outputs, opportunities to learn (e.g., courses provided), and supplementary support services in partnership with schools. Data literacy will be a focus of professional learning throughout the regions and LEAs.

*Responsive to the Community* - The Georgia Department of Education assists LEAs in selecting interventions that have been effective in serving identified communities.

Instructional practices should be culturally, linguistically, and developmentally appropriate (Hollie, 2011). Furthermore, the LEAs must consult with local community stakeholders in a meaningful way to ensure that interventions are appropriate for the community context.

Sub-grantees are encouraged to use tools for evaluating evidence-based practices developed by the Institutes of Education Sciences (IES) in collaboration with the Southeast Regional Education Lab (REL-SE) and the National Implementation Research Network (Blase, Kiser, & Van Dyke, 2013). Specifically, the Literacy Roadmap (see <http://fcrr.org/literacyroadmap>) provided by REL-SE for local literacy planning will be particularly helpful to LEA-Partnerships as they design their local plans.

### **Sustainable Change: Revising State Plan through Continuous Improvement**

Updates to the existing State Literacy Plan will be informed by data from the Evaluation of this project (**Likelihood of Impact**). The data will be communicated annually to the Governor's Literacy Commission and a working committee of Advisors from LEAs, early childhood education providers, and community organizations, and teacher education programs. These groups will review outcomes and make recommendations for State Plan updates, technical assistance to enable sub-grantees to improve literacy programs, and possible improvements to teacher preparation programs. Furthermore, throughout the five-year implementation of this project, data on student performance and partnership efforts will be fed back to the LEA-Partnerships through face-to-face and online monitoring visits to continuously improve the system-wide supports and implementation strategies. Georgia's Department of Education will also hold an annual Summit for LEA-Partnerships to review their local data and conduct deeper analysis as the LEA-Partnerships engage in continuous improvement. Follow up support for data

literacy will be provided through local visits (**Adequacy of feedback and continuous improvement**). Georgia is supporting LEAs and their communities to create systems that are more purposively organized to improve literacy learning, especially for high-poverty communities. We are doing this by promoting the use of data to support continuous improvement. As such, we hope to reduce the complexity of the system--from a reactive system that serves many interests to a singularly focused system that promotes literacy.

*Georgia's System for Continuous Improvement* (see <https://tinyurl.com/yc52tjyr>) is modeled after successful comprehensive school reform efforts (Bryk, 2010; Bryk, Gomez, & Grunow, 2010). As part of Georgia's state plan for the *Every Student Succeeds Act*, every Georgia LEA must use *Georgia's System for Continuous Improvement* in order to allocate federal Title formula funds to improve school quality. Each LEA must conduct a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) for this process; therefore, the sub-grantees will use the same CNA to inform their sub-grant applications and use the same continuous improvement model to monitor progress. This aligns the SEA demands on LEAs. (**Performance and Continuous Improvement**)

#### **L4GA Continuous Improvement (Specified and Measurable Outcomes)**

A three-tiered approach to evaluating L4GA will ensure that the project itself benefits from a continuous improvement cycle by (a) documenting positive practices; (b) gauging the overall the impact of the L4GA project; and (c) ensuring that emerging needs are met. Generally, and across tiers, L4GA will be evaluated utilizing a longitudinal, mixed methods design. This approach allows for (a) the evaluation of program impacts consistent with rigorous evaluation research and (b) the examination of how certain factors or changes/improvements within a community, school, classroom, and home relate to student learning. The first evaluation tier focuses on examining the impacts of L4GA implementation with attention to student

performance using a regression discontinuity design (RDD). This design allows us to document the overall effects of the L4GA approach. The second evaluation tier uses a sequential, mixed methods approach for a deeper dive into L4GA activities with attention to how each activity relates to student achievement. This approach involves a more fine-grained examination of mechanisms and factors associated with successful L4GA implementation as well as a closer look at important teacher and student outcomes across time. The third tier evaluation approach includes a complex system/social network analysis of L4GA with attention to community, school, classroom, and student variables.

### **Research and Evaluation Questions**

Tier 1 Research Questions: To what extent does participation in L4GA program impact students' literacy achievement outcomes on state assessments in PreK, Kindergarten, and grades 3-8? For whom is the L4GA program most effective? To what extent does student improvement vary as function of student demographic (i.e., economic disadvantage, race, sex, disability status, ELL status) and achievement (i.e., initial literacy scores) variables?

Tier 2 Research Questions: If programs improved student achievement, what specific mechanisms, strategies and resources produced these gains?

Tier 3 Research Questions: Who is involved in L4GA partnerships? What is the nature of each partner (type [school, community org, etc.], location, size, reach)? Which organizations and institutions influence whether and how L4GA partnerships use evidence-based literacy interventions? What is the efficacy of the partners' involvement as reported by others in the network?

## Data Collections

Data to answer the research questions will come from the assessments listed in Table 1.

The table below describes the measures to report for **Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance measure**. While the SEA already collects many assessments noted in this table, for documenting student success, others will be collected expressly for the purpose of this project.

Table 1

*Overview of Measures Used for Program Continuous Improvement, Evaluation and Reporting*

Assessment	Purposes	Age	Skills Measured	Data Source
<b>Student Outcomes</b>				
Work Sampling Online (WSO)	Formative assessment	PreK	Learning and Development across Domains	Existing Data 2X a year
<i>Reliability &amp; Validity:</i> Measure demonstrates high internal reliability across time (school year; $r_s = .69-.89$ ). Strong concurrent validity estimates when compared with standardized achievement measures ( $r = .66 - .75$ ) and good predictive validity ( $b = .17, p < .01$ ) (Meisels, Liaw, Dorfman, & Nelson, 1995).				
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-4)- <b>GPRA 1</b>	Formative/ Summative	PreK	Oral Language Skill	*Teacher Administered 2X a year
<i>Reliability &amp; Validity:</i> PPVT evidences good to excellent split-half reliability ranging from .89 to .97. Test-retest correlations range from .92 to .96 suggesting strong stability over time. Content validity and correlations to other tests is strong (Dunn & Dunn, 2017).				

Phonological Literacy Screening (PALS)	Screener/ Formative Assessment	PreK-K	Early Reading (alphabet knowledge, concepts of print, phonological awareness) and Writing Skills.	*Teacher Administered 3X a year
	Reliability and validity: Individual domains on the PALS evidence strong inter-rater reliability ( <i>rs</i> range from .96 to .99) and good test-retest reliability ( <i>rs</i> range from .83 to .92) (Invernizzi, Justice, Landum, & Booker, 2004).			
GKids/ Readiness Check & GKids Performance Based Assessment	Screener/ Formative assessment	Kindergarten	Literacy, Math & General Learning and Development	Existing Data 2X Year
	<i>Reliability and Validity:</i> Good interrater reliability on individual items (ranging from 79% to 90%). Concurrent validity for GKids Readiness Check demonstrate modest associations with WSO scores ( <i>rs</i> . 37 to .39). Content validity established through alignment to performance standards.			
DIBELS-Next	Screener/ Progress Monitoring	K – 3 <sup>rd</sup>	Reading K = Composite 1 <sup>st</sup> = Nonsense Word, Oral Reading Fluency 2 <sup>nd</sup> - 3 <sup>rd</sup> = Oral Reading Fluency	*Teacher Administered 3X Year
	Reliability & Validity: Measure demonstrated high levels of test-retest ( <i>rs</i> = .74 - .93) and high levels of inter-rater ( <i>rs</i> = .82 – .94) reliability. Moderate to high concurrent validity ( <i>rs</i> = .62 - .81) when compared to other standardized reading measures (Elliott, Lee, & Tollefson, 2001).			
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Reading Assessment (formerly Scholastic)	Screener	3 <sup>rd</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup>	Reading Comprehension	*Teacher Administered 3X Year

Reading Inventory (SRI)	Reliability & Validity: High test-retest reliability ( $r_s = .83- .90$ ). High concurrent validity ( $r = .89$ ) when compared with a similar reading measures (e.g., STAR assessment) (Scholastic, 2014).			
Georgia Milestones- End of Grade (EOG) 3-8 End of Course (EOC) <b>GPRA 2</b> <b>GPRA 3</b> <b>GPRA 4</b>	Summative Assessment	EOG 3 <sup>rd</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> 9 <sup>th</sup> Lit. and Comp EOC American Lit. and Comp. EOC	Achievement	Existing Data
	Reliability & Validity: Measure demonstrated high levels of internal consistency ( $\alpha_s = .87 - .92$ ). Content validity established through content mapping with Georgia Performance Standards (Georgia DOE, 2016).			
Analytic Writing Continuum (AWC)	Formative Assessment	3 <sup>rd</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup>	Writing	*Teacher Administered 3X Year
	Reliability & Validity: high inter-rater reliability (89%-93%) and test-retest reliability. Construct validity established through factor analysis and good concurrent validity as evidenced through associations with other writing assessments (National Writing Project. 2006, 2008).			

**Teacher/Classroom Assessments**

Professional Learning Survey	Survey	Teacher	Professional capacity	Evaluation Team
TKES	Classroom observation	Teacher	Instructional Quality	Existing Data
	Reliability & Validity: Measure demonstrated moderate to high levels of internal consistency ( $r_s = .49 - .73$ ). Demonstrated construct validity ( $r_s = .75 - .87$ ). (Georgia Center for Assessment, 2014)			
Classroom Assessment Scoring System (Pre-K & K-3 versions)	Classroom observation	Teacher	Instructional quality	Evaluation Team
	Reliability & Validity: Good internal consistency and factor structure. Predictive validity demonstrated through associations with children’s social and academic outcomes (Hamre, Pianta, Mashburn & Downer, 2010; Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008).			

Report of evidence-based practices/surveys	Survey	Teacher	Instructional Quality	Evaluation Team
	To Be Developed			
Fidelity of evidenced-based Practices	Classroom Observation	Teacher	Instructional Quality	Evaluation Team
	To Be Developed			
<b>Community Measures</b>				
Survey of Participation/Involvement	Survey	Community	Community Involvement	Evaluation Team
Social Network Analysis		Community	Community Involvement	Evaluation Team
<b>Program Quality and School Climate</b>				
Quality Rated Child Care Centers (QRIS)	Summative	ECE Program	Program Quality	Existing Data
	Reliability & Validity: Ratings are based upon portfolio review and observations with the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS; Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2014), which have strong inter-rater agreement, internal consistency and good predictive validity.			
School Climate Star Rating	Summative, yearly Ratings	3 <sup>rd</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup>	School climate: Safety, Relationships, Teaching and Learning, and External Environment	Existing Data
	Reliability & Validity: Establish construct validity. Good internal consistency ( $\alpha=.74$ to $.85$ ) (GA DOE, 2016; La Salle et al., 2016).			

## **Analysis and Feedback**

Tier 1 evaluation efforts focus on examining growth in student literacy outcomes as a function of L4GA involvement. To accomplish this, a regression-discontinuity (RD) design (Hahn, Todd, & Van der Klaauw, 2001) will be employed to examine program impacts. Student outcome data used for these analyses, across age bands (PreK, K, 3-12), will be culled from existing data sources collected by the state of Georgia. As outlined in the *What Works Clearinghouse*, RD design is an approach that allows for researchers to evaluate program impacts when random assignment to a program is not deemed possible (Schochet et al., 2010).

Tier 2 program evaluation efforts focus on understanding specific mechanisms, strategies and resources that produced positive teacher and student outcomes. Tier 2 measures include a variety of summative and performance-based assessments to show who benefited the most and why. This will be accomplished by employing a sequential mixed-methods approach (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) designed to demonstrate the relative impact of grant activities on teacher and child outcomes and to explore factors associated with L4GA project activities. In addition to using existing data within the RD design (i.e., Tier 1), additional data will be collected on L4GA programs for the express purpose of evaluating teachers' implementation of evidenced based approaches and their association with student learning gains on progress monitoring and summative student outcomes (see Table 2 for a list of measures that will be collected by teachers during Tier 2 activities). They also allow for more direct attention to **GPRAs 1-4**. In addition to examining L4GA student level outcomes for all LEA-Partnerships, a random sample of programs will be selected by the evaluation team for deeper dive data collection activities. These activities will involve direct observations of teachers' implementation of evidenced-based literacy practices as well as standardized assessments of teacher quality using the Classroom

Assessment Scoring System (Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008). Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) will be employed to examine factors associated with student literacy growth across various years of implementation. HLM allows examination of how a variety of school level (school climate data, % of children in poverty, etc.) and classroom level factors (teacher qualifications & characteristics, classroom instruction variables, etc.) relate to students' literacy growth. Consistent with a sequential mixed methods design, L4GA-Partnerships that are "beating the odds" (i.e., literacy performance in relation to student poverty is better than others') across the B-12 continuum will be selected for case studies.

Tier 3 program evaluation will demonstrate how LEA-partnerships support important community, school, and student improvement. Using community coalitions and partnerships among B-5, K-12, and community organizations the L4GA plan is designed to influence the multiple levels of the ecosystem that may affect student literacy outcomes. Consistent with this methodological approach, Social Network Analysis (SNA) is an appropriate method to examine the relationships that exist among all of the L4GA-Partnerships, and can provide important information regarding the nature and strength of the relationships that exist within L4GA networks. The use of SNA will provide a number of advantages to this project, including identifying L4GA partners, understanding the relationships that exist between partners (i.e., strength of ties between partners), and understanding the manner in which information flows. The ties that exist between L4GA partners can provide further information regarding how information regarding literacy interventions flows throughout the state, where gaps may exist, and who may act as an important "bridge" in the network to pass information to less connected care providers and LEAs.

## **SEA Plans for Sub-grants**

This section describes how LEA-Partnerships will apply for sub-grants, how peer-reviewers will be selected and conduct their reviews, and how the sub-grants will be allocated (**Management Plan**).

### **Eligible Entity for Sub-grants**

LEA-Partnerships eligible for sub-grants (a) serve a high percentage or number of high-need schools, (b) have a high percentage or number of children reading and writing below grade level; (c) show growth over the past three years in literacy; and (d) have a significant percentage or number of schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support under Section 111(d) of the ESEA; and (e) include one or more early childhood education programs that serve low-income or otherwise disadvantaged children. In addition, a high-performing LEA could partner with one of these eligible entities to provide professional learning and support.

### **Established Need: Calculation of System Performance**

To prioritize need, three factors are considered as part of the selection process of systems receiving sub-grant funds. These factors are: (a) poverty index, calculated as a percent of estimated number of children 5-17 years old in poverty of the estimated total number of children 5-17 in the school district (under section 1124(c) of the ESEA); (b) the percentage of students reading below grade level, calculated by the percent of third grade students having a Lexile score less than 514L; and (c) the rate of growth of the number of students reading at or above grade level over the past three years. One additional factor, the number of schools implementing comprehensive and targeted improvement activities in a district was included in the final calculation. An algorithm was designed to merge the first three factors into one metric called “against the odds performance.” Districts were ranked by this metric—with high poverty and high performance as the highest ranking and low poverty and low performance as the lowest

ranking. Then the rank-ordered districts were assigned up to 50 points based on the need established by this metric. To prioritize comprehensive and targeted school improvements (under section 1111(d) of the ESEA), school systems could also received up to 51 points (17 per grade band, i.e., elementary, middle, high). The percentages were calculated as a percentage of schools in a grade band that are receiving support. For example, for a system with 10 elementary schools, if 5 are identified as needing support, the system will earn 8.5 extra points (50% of 17). (See Appendix 3 for list of need-based points.)

**Application Requirements for Eligible Sub-grants**

Georgia will initiate a competitive sub-granting process among identified LEAs and their community partners (including early education centers, schools that matriculate students as a “feeder system,” schools and educational settings that provide a high-quality personalized path for learning, and other local organizations, such as libraries, museums, parks, and theatres). The LEA is the eligible entity for administering the partnership sub-grant. Table 2 (below) lists Priorities (1-7) for Georgia’s LEA-Partnerships.

Table 2

*LAGA LEA-Partnership Priorities (1-7)*

<p><b>1.</b> Each LEA-Partnership must include a feeder system that includes at least one early education center (e.g., Headstart, Early Headstart, Quality Rated (QR) child care (or a QR applicant), and/or Georgia’s PreK), a community partner organization, and schools serving students from Kindergarten through grade 12.</p>	<p><b>2.</b> Each LEA-Partnership must allocate funds according to the following ratios:          15% to serve students from birth to age 5;          40% to serve students from Kindergarten to grade 5;          40% to serve students from grade 6 to grade 12 in an equal distribution (20% grades 6-8; 20% grades 9-12).</p>
---	---

<p><b>3.</b> Each LEA-Partnership must have at least one school with a K-12 School Climate Rating of 4 or 5 and/or be implementing Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS).</p>	<p><b>4.</b> LEA-Partnerships must describe how they will increase the proportion of students with access to educational choice to create a high-quality personalized path for learning for children who are served in rural communities, children with disabilities, children learning English, and children in foster care. Subgrantees can describe how opportunities are made available in public education programs, learning in the workplace, dual/concurrent enrollment programs, and other educational services (credit-recovery, accelerated learning, tutoring).</p>
<p><b>5 .</b> Each LEA-Partnership must already be involved as a Get Georgia Reading Campaign community or applying to become one.</p>	<p><b>6.</b> Each LEA-Partnership must include a P-20 partner from a Georgia Institution of Higher Education.</p>
<p><b>7.</b> Each LEA-Partnership must include a liaison from the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) that serves that LEA.</p>	

LEA-Partnerships will coordinate to create funding proposals based on these partnership priorities and the following requirements listed in Table 3, below.

Table 3

*L4GA Sub-grant Application Requirements*

L4GA Sub-grant	Areas Addressed	Quality Points
<b>Total Points Possible = 200</b>		
<b>1. LEA-Partnership Narrative</b>	<p>Absolute Priorities for L4GA-Sub-grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identification of feeder system(s) and community served</li> <li>● Identification of all LEA-Partnership partners, including early childhood service providers</li> <li>● A brief description of the feeder system(s) identified, and history of the L4GA LEA-Partnership</li> <li>● Population demographics of the community</li> <li>● Climate Ratings for each school involved in the proposed partnership and/or status of implementation of PBIS</li> <li>● Student literacy/ELA outcomes of the feeder system</li> </ul> <p>Plan for engaging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● early childhood education providers</li> <li>● P-20 research-practitioner partnership(s) and literacy faculty in the local teacher preparation programs</li> <li>● community coalition</li> </ul>	<b>15</b>
<b>Priority Points for Established Need</b>	To prioritize need, the Georgia Department of Education established a point system explained in the section above titled “Established Need: Calculation of System Performance” (see Appendix 3 for list of need-based points).	<b>101</b>
<b>2. Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis</b>	<p><b>B-5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Analysis of data related to other learning outcomes and school readiness</li> <li>● Analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Developmentally appropriate instruction and curriculum</li> <li>● Professional learning provided to educators and directors</li> <li>● Family engagement strategies</li> <li>● Leadership effectiveness</li> <li>● Other supports for the the Whole Child and Well-rounded Education</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>10</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Coordination efforts with K-12</li> </ul> <p><b>K-12</b></p> <p>Comprehensive needs assessment and root cause analysis using <i>Georgia's System for Continuous Improvement</i> (NOTE: LEAs use approach for their federal Comprehensive LEA Improvement Plans; therefore, this approach should create convergence):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Coherent Instructional System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Past instructional initiatives</li> <li>○ Current instructional initiatives</li> <li>○ How to identify students for interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Community and Family Engagement and Empowerment</li> <li>● Engaged Leadership</li> <li>● Positive Learning Environment</li> <li>● Professional Capacity</li> <li>● Other Supports for the Whole Child and Well-rounded Education</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Coordination efforts with B-5 and out-of-school providers</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. Literacy Plans for B-5 and K-12</b></p>	<p>Leadership Team members (including, but not limited to, teachers, specialized staff, school librarians, community organization representatives, teacher educators, families, and leaders)</p> <p>Literacy assessments</p> <p>Plans to use evidence-based practices and activities</p> <p>How to identify students for literacy intervention or other support services</p> <p>How the B-5 and K-12 literacy team will coordinate comprehensive literacy instruction and activities</p>	<p><b>15</b></p>
<p><b>4. Professional Learning Plans for B-5 and K-12</b></p>	<p>Plan for engaging LEA-Partners with Professional Learning offerings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Time allocated for collaborative planning time per age/grade level team and vertical teams.</li> <li>● Local PL supports (e.g., PLCs, collaborative planning, coaching, mentoring)</li> <li>● Online PL supports</li> <li>● Institutes</li> </ul> <p>Topics of interest for PL for each audience (e.g., early learning; literacy interventionists; community/family liaisons; school leaders, etc.)</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>

<b>5. Assurances and Memo of Understanding</b>	Compliance with FERPA, GPRA, GADOE rules and state and federal laws	Required
<b>6. LEA-Partnership Management Plan and Key Personnel</b>	<p>LEA office support for grant management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Who are the key people involved in the grant?</li> <li>● How will the grant ensure services in B-5?</li> <li>● How will the grant function in terms of the whole district strategic plan and comprehensive needs assessment?</li> <li>● How will financial aspects of the grant be handled?</li> <li>● Will there be a dedicated staff member at the district office with the responsibility of grants administration?</li> </ul> <p>Ability of the LEA to adequately administer the funding.</p> <p>Any financial audit findings over the past three years should be discussed in this section.</p> <p>Controls for spending should be pointed out.</p>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. Project Goals, Objectives, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, and Supports needed</b>	<p>Implementation plan proposed for funding.</p> <p>The plan should show how the instructional strategies, delivery models and programs are consistent with EBP and directly address the needs of the students and educators.</p>	<b>10</b>
<b>8. Assessment/Data Analysis Plan</b>	<p>Assurance that assessment and evaluation requirements for the SEA will be completed.</p> <p>Estimated cost for assessments included in proposed LEA-Partnership budget</p> <p>Detailed assessment protocols are specifically detailed including: who, what, and when the assessments will be given as well as analyzed.</p> <p>Procedures for educators' analysis of local assessment data to inform instruction</p>	<b>10</b>

<p><b>9. Resources, Strategies and Materials including Technology to Support Implementation of the Literacy Plan</b></p>	<p>Instructional resources that will be used or purchased as a result of L4GA funding. Services that will be purchased as a result of the L4GA funding.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All expenditures should all tie back to community and student data, the comprehensive needs assessment, and root cause analysis.</li> <li>● All expenditures should directly impact literacy, access to print, student engagement, and teacher support. They should be consistent with EBP.</li> <li>● Expenditures should support activities primarily offered during the regular school day but may also include out-of-school time and instruction.</li> <li>● This is not a technology grant; only technology supports vital to literacy improvement and instruction should be allocated.</li> </ul>	<p><b>10</b></p>
<p><b>10. Rural Competitive Preference</b></p>	<p>If the LEA is rural, then competitive preference points are awarded. At least one of the following criteria must be met for an LEA to be considered “rural”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Has fewer than 600 pupils in average daily attendance at all of the schools</li> <li>● All of the schools have a school locale code of 41, 42, or 43 as designated by the US Secretary of Education</li> <li>● Each county served by the LEA has a total population density of fewer than 10 people per square mile</li> </ul>	<p><b>9</b></p>
<p><b>11. Budget</b></p>		<p><b>No points</b></p>

**Independent Review for Sub-grants**

The independent review process is an integral step in the success of L4GA, which begins by only funding sub-grants with well-articulated goals grounded in evidence-based practices with clear procedures for implementation. The call for peer reviewers will be distributed to universities, school systems, and professional organizations. As the review is instrumental to the sub-grant process, use of a selection rubric will be employed to choose members for the grant review. Criteria for a peer reviewer includes:

- Demonstrated expertise in teaching birth to five, K-5, middle and high school;
- Practitioner experience working in schools either as a teacher, school leader, or member of a research-practitioner partnership;
- Master's degree or higher in Early Childhood, English Education, Reading, Literacy, Educational Psychology, Speech and Language, or Educational Leadership.
- Extensive knowledge and understanding of evidence-based instructional practices.

Peer reviewers will submit an application via *Fluid Review*, which includes:

- A copy of their vita
- Information about any past or ongoing contracts held with a publisher or company that might constitute conflict of interest, including anyone who produces for-profit reading materials, assessments, or commercial professional learning.

Once selected, peer reviewers will be required to sign a Georgia Department of Education contract that includes a confidentiality agreement and disclosure of conflict of interest. Peer reviewers will attend one of two required reviewer online trainings. These trainings will explain the L4GA project and the use of *Fluid Review*. Each reviewer will complete a sample review and submit prior to beginning the reading period. Peer reviewers will receive \$100.00 per application read, scored, and submitted. Peer reviewers will likely review at least 15 sub-grant applications. Table 4 provides a timeline for the sub-granting period (**Clearly defined responsibilities, milestones**).

Table 4

*Sub-grantee Selection Timeline*

<b>SEA Sub-grant Timeline</b>	
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Activity</b>
10/1/2019- 11/1/2019	<p><b>Sub-grant Awareness for eligible LEA-Partnerships and support staff:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Determine district eligibility.</li> <li>● Contact eligible superintendents via email to ensure all are informed of the upcoming sub-grant competition.</li> <li>● Set up face-to-face meeting with RESA directors to provide information on upcoming sub-grant competition.</li> <li>● Hold online awareness sessions for all GaDOE employees that work in eligible schools.</li> <li>● LEAs will submit letters of intent which will include schools, early learning providers, and community partners within the feeder patterns that will participate in the grant competition.</li> </ul>
10/1/2019- 11/1/2019	<p><b>Sub-grant competition development:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Develop <i>Fluid Review</i> workflow for the grant competition</li> <li>● Develop and circulate request for peer-reviewers</li> <li>● Develop and load online interactive resources including those developed by outside providers.</li> <li>● Develop sub-grant assurance document that includes compliance guidance in the event of discontinuation of funding.</li> </ul>
11/1/2019- 1/30/2020	<p><b>Conduct sub-grant competition and review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Launch <i>Fluid Review</i> and assist LEAs with developing their individual platforms</li> <li>● Conduct online interactive meetings and load recordings into <i>Fluid Review</i> for on-demand viewing</li> <li>● Provide additional face to face technical assistance to LEAs and community partners upon request.</li> </ul>

---

11/1/2019- 1/30/2020	<p><b>Conduct sub-grant review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Select and contract with peer reviewers</li> <li>● Conduct online interactive trainings and load recordings for peer reviewers who will read and score grants</li> <li>● Conduct internal review on all projects recommended for funding by peer reviewers.</li> <li>● Prepare all required State Board of Education documents to fund sub-grantees.</li> </ul>
<hr/>	
02/1/2020- 4/1/2020	<p><b>Award new grants</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Recommend LEAs for funding by State School Superintendent/State Board of Education</li> <li>● Contact LEA superintendents and send official notice of sub-grant awards</li> <li>● Conduct online meeting to give preliminary requirements and information about the upcoming new grantee summit.</li> <li>● Plan new sub-grantee summit for district and school leaders.</li> </ul>
<hr/>	
Thereafter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Meet with LEA-Partnership teams quarterly</li> <li>● Meet quarterly with Georgia Literacy Commission to share LEA-Partnership stories and coordinate state responses as needed (e.g., Professional Learning, communications about child/family support services)</li> <li>● Coordinate professional learning with RESAs, GaNWP, etc. in response to identified needs</li> <li>● Conduct Annual Data Summit to assist LEA-Partnerships with data literacy and hone local literacy plans</li> </ul>

---

### **SEA Monitoring Plan**

The SEA views grant monitoring both fiscally and programmatically (**Management Plan: Adequacy of feedback and continuous improvement**). Tools have been developed to address both fiscal and programmatic monitoring, virtually and face-to-face. The SEA team will use online tools so that proximity is not a deterrent to outstanding technical assistance. By using virtual communications, the monitoring team can provide just-in-time support. These efficiencies

also allow for a reduced monitoring staff, thus allowing financial resources to be used to provide more resources and supports (**Sufficient Training**).

### **Post-Award Technical Assistance and Local Monitoring Plans**

After sub-grants are awarded, leadership teams from each LEA-Partnership will attend a post-award kickoff summit. Attendance at this meeting will be mandatory for the release of grant funds. The purpose of this two-day event is to (a) discuss grant basics, (b) allow each school time to develop their year one implementation plan and budget timeline, (c) create a plan for initial project assessment collection, and (d) receive training on delivering a state of the school and district address to all stakeholders. This meeting will provide time for the grant evaluators to discuss the assessment design and plan trainings. The Grants Accounting manager will explain the budget, monitoring, and compliances requirements of the grant. Travel and registration costs for the summit will be paid via district L4GA grant funds.

During the first semester of the grant, a L4GA education specialist will meet with each sub-grantee to (a) develop a personal relationship with leadership, (b) assist with implementation needs, and (c) ensure that all teachers and leaders are aware of specific technical requirements for conducting assessments. In addition, the GaDOE team will provide interactive virtual resources to clarify expectations about L4GA assessments and to ensure reliable administration. Each L4GA education specialist will be then be responsible for communicating with each district quarterly via electronic platform (GoToMeeting). These online meetings will have a consistent agenda developed by the GaDOE L4GA team. Each LEA-Partnership leadership team should include a total of eight representatives: a district leader, a RESA liaison, a local teacher preparation provider (P-20 partner), an early childhood education provider, a community partner, and the K-12 school leaders. While specific topics about project implementation will be

discussed, one of the desired outcomes of the online meeting will be to discuss positive outcomes as well as discuss possible solutions to ongoing challenges the school and LEAs are facing. The results of each meeting will be collected and submitted to the project director with any feedback needed. The outcome of the quarterly meeting is to determine which LEA-Partnerships require more direct technical assistance so that the L4GA team and others in GADOE can help the partners achieve their best outcomes. Use of this model will ensure that challenges are addressed in a timely fashion so that solutions can be developed and implemented swiftly and all team members are informed.

### **Fiscal Monitoring**

Once grants are competitively awarded and approved by the Georgia State Board of Education, letters of award are sent to school superintendents and the district grant contact. Each budget is loaded into the State's Consolidated Application (Con App) by grade band. Con App is designed to control for drawdowns by LEAs; this grants management system contains accounts of all grant funds and creates workflow between the LEAs and GaDOE. The following steps are in place before grant funds are released: 1) Each LEA creates budgets for each LEA-Partnership within the Con App in accordance with the grade band. 2) Budget amendments are approved by the LEA superintendent and sent to the L4GA program manager for GaDOE approval. 3) LEA-Partnership's funding then transfers into the Invoice Application. 4) The L4GA grant funds are paid out on a reimbursement basis. 5) The LEA creates a request for payment of invoices that is submitted by either individual invoice or detailed general ledger report. 6) The LEA submits their request for reimbursement. Upon approval by the L4GA program manager, the LEA receives their reimbursement of grant funds. The L4GA Project Director will review annual

budgets and performance plans to ensure that required earmark ratios are followed within LEA-Partnership sub-grants.

### **Programmatic Monitoring**

When LEA-Partnerships receive sub-grant awards from the Georgia State Board of Education, time must be spent clarifying and refining annual implementation plans and budget timelines. During the initial grant rollout summit, LEA-Partnership leadership teams (which include a school leader from each school involved) will receive training about performance expectations, planning for performance, and performance assessment for each school in the partnership. The performance plans will be used during face-to-face monitoring visits as well as during online meetings and may be revised as LEA-Partnership leadership teams review their data. The plans provide guidance to the district, school personnel and creates a strategy for GaDOE staff to assist with implementing. Additionally, the performance plan will assist with transition should a leadership change occur. A school's performance plan informs teachers, parents, and community members about what they can expect. Prior to LEA-Partnership budgets being approved, each school within the Partnership must upload the performance plan, timeline, and budget into *the LAGA Hive* grant management program for approval by the LAGA specialist. When their plans are approved, the responsible party will receive a message back from *the LAGA Hive*. When all schools in an LEA-Partnership have approved plans, the LEA contact person will receive a message.

Sites will be monitored both in-person and by online meetings. Each site will receive an initial face-to-face meeting with another online meeting scheduled later in the school year. With limited SEA staff, this monitoring provides opportunities to work directly with individual schools in a state that is very large. GaDOE staff will follow established monitoring/technical

assistance protocols so that all members of the team, including appropriate district personnel, are informed should a challenge arise.

The performance plan and the budget timeline are the documents used for programmatic monitoring. Upon completion of site visit or online meeting, the L4GA member conducting the review will complete a form that is uploaded into the *Hive* workflow. This workflow will be shared with the L4GA Project Director and school leadership. Should follow up be required, the Project Director will meet with GaDOE staff to determine the level of challenges a site is facing and schedule follow-up contact. In the event of a severe compliance transgression, the Project Director, Deputy Superintendent, and GaDOE Legal Office will send a memo of non-compliance in accordance with the Compliance Protocol established within the grant application and approved by the LEA Superintendent.

### **Sufficient Training**

To ensure sufficient training, GaDOE will hire specialists and contractual services to train coaches (RESA and LEA) and other state agency personnel on **evidence-based** instructional practices for B12 literacy, community/family engagement strategies, and identification/interventions for students experiencing difficulty learning to read, including those with dyslexia. These specialists will help create resources and provide technical assistance for coaches.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2007). Lasting consequences of the summer learning gap. *American Sociological Review*, 72(2), 167-180.
- Allington, R. L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (2013). *Summer reading: Closing the rich/poor reading achievement gap*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Berninger, V. W., Nagy, W., & Beers, S. (2011). Child writers' construction and reconstruction of single sentences and construction of multi-sentence texts: contributions of syntax and transcription to translation. *Reading and Writing: an Interdisciplinary Journal*, 24(2), 151-182.
- Bielenberg, B., & Fillmore, L. W. (2005). The English they need for the test. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 45-49.
- Blase, K., Kiser, L. and Van Dyke, M. (2013). *The Hexagon Tool: Exploring Context*. Chapel Hill, NC: National Implementation Research Network, FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Bryk, A. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(7), 23-30.
- Bryk A. S., Gomez L. M., & Grunow A. (2010). *Getting ideas into action: Building Networked Improvement Communities in education*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Stanford, CA, essay, retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/spotlight/webinar-bryk-gomez-building-networked-improvement-communities-in-education>
- Campaign for Grade Level Reading (2019). Retrieved from <http://gradelevelreading.net/>
- Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy (2011). *Evidence summary for annual book fairs in high-poverty elementary schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Diamond, K.E., Justice, L.M., Siegler, R.S., & Snyder, P.A. (2013). *Synthesis of IES Research on Early Intervention and Early Childhood Education*. (NCSER 2013-3001). Washington, DC:

National Center for Special Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education. This report is available on the IES website at <http://ies.ed.gov>.

Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, D. M., (2007). Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – 4. New York: Pearson.

Elliott, J., Lee, S. W., & Tollefson, N. (2001). A reliability and validity study of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills--Modified. *School Psychology Review*, 30(1), 33-49.

Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). *Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade* (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <http://whatworks.ed.gov>.

Gallagher, H.A., Woodworth, K.R., & Arshan, N.A. (2015). *Impact of the National Writing Project's College-Ready Writers Program on Teachers and Students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Get Georgia Reading (2019). Retrieved from <http://getgeorgiareading.org/>

Georgia Department of Education (2015). *Teacher Keys Effectiveness System*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Pages/Teacher-Keys-Effectiveness-System.aspx>.

Georgia Department of Education (2016). *Georgia Milestones Assessment System*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Assessment/Pages/Georgia-Milestones-Assessment-System.aspx>.

Georgia Department of Education (2016). *School Climate Survey*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/Policy/Pages/School-Climate.aspx>

Gersten, R., Newman-Gonchar, R. A., Haymond, K. S., & Dimino, J. (2017). *What is the evidence base to support reading interventions for improving student outcomes in grades 1–3?* (REL 2017–271). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C.B., & Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). *Teaching secondary students to write effectively* (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <http://whatworks.ed.gov>.

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2012). Writing to read: A meta-analysis of the impact of writing and writing instruction on reading. *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(4), 710-744.

Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuahara, S. A., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104, 879-896.

Hahn, J., Todd, P., & Van der Klaauw, W. (2001). Identification and estimation of treatment effects with a Regression-Discontinuity design. *Econometrica*, 69(1), 201-209.

Harms, T., Clifford, R. M., & Cryer, D. (2014) *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – 3*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hollie, S. (2011). *Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning: Responsive teaching and learning*. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education.

Huffman, H., Guindon, M., Takahashi-Rial, S. & Socol, A. (2014). *Evidenced-based models: School-community partnerships*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/intern-research/reports/evidence2014.pdf>.

Invernizzi, M., Justice, L., Landrum, T. J., & Booker, K. (2004). Early literacy screening in kindergarten: Widespread implementation in Virginia. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(4), 479-500.

Kids Count Georgia (2018). Retrieved on May 25, 2019, from <http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/map/9011-young-children-not-in-school-by-poverty-status?loc=12&loct=2#2/any/false/1572/5599/17979/Orange/-10659339.060381,4069639.5603808,3,452,541>

Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386–431.

La Salle, T. P., McIntosh, K., & Eliason, B. M. (2016). *School climate survey suite administration manual*. Eugene, OR: OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. University of Oregon.

MacArthur, C. A. (2014). Strategy instruction in writing in academic disciplines. In P. Klein, P. Boscolo, L. Kirkpatrick, & C. Gelati, (Eds.), *Writing as a learning activity* (pp. 149-168). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

MacArthur, C. A. (2012). Evaluation and revision processes in writing. In Berninger, V. W. (Ed.), *Past, Present, and Future Contributions of Cognitive Writing Research to Cognitive Psychology* (pp. 461-483). London: Psychology Press.

Meisels, S. J., Liaw, F. R., Dorfman, A., & Nelson, R. F. (1995). The Work Sampling System: Reliability and validity of a performance assessment for young children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 10*(3), 277-296.

Melosh, G. (2013). Stemming summer reading loss in high-poverty primary grade students during summer vacation break. In R. L. Allington & A. McGill-Franzen (Eds.), *Summer reading: Closing the rich/poor reading achievement gap*. New York: Teachers College.

Miller, V. (2011). *Understanding digital culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017). *Implementing Evidence-Based Prevention by Communities to Promote Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Health in Children: Proceedings of a Workshop*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.17226/24709>.

National Campaign for Grade-Level Reading (2019)

National Writing Project. 2006, 2008. *Analytic writing continuum*. Berkeley, CA: National Writing Project.

Neuman, S., & Celano, D. (2001). Access to print in low-income and middle-income communities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(1), 8-26.

Ogletree, T., & Allen, J. (2013). The writing workshop: Giving voice to the silenced. In D. Coffey, & E. Roberts (Eds.), *Keys to literacy instruction for the NET generation, grades 4–12* (pp. 113–132). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Philippakos, Z. A., & MacArthur, C. A. (2019). The effects of giving feedback on the persuasive writing of fourth and fifth-grade students. Paper to appear in *Reading Research Quarterly*.

Pianta, R. C., LaParo, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS): Pre-K*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

- Pianta, R. C., LaParo, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2007, 2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS): K-3*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saddler, B. (2007). Best practices in teaching sentence construction skills. In S. Graham, C. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 163–178). New York: Guilford.
- Saddler, B., Behforouz, B., & Asaro, K. (2008). The effects of sentence combining instruction on the writing of fourth grade students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education, 42*, 79–90.
- Schacter, J., & Jo, B. (2005). Learning when school is not in session: A reading summer day-camp intervention to improve the achievement of exiting first-grade students who are economically disadvantaged. *Journal of Research in Reading, 28*(2), 158–169.
- Schochet, P., Cook, T., Deke, J., Imbens, G., Lockwood, J.R., Porter, J., & Smith, J. (2010). *Standards for Regression Discontinuity Designs*. Retrieved from What Works Clearinghouse website: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc\\_rd.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_rd.pdf)
- Scholastic. (2014). *SRI: Technical Guide*. Retrieved from: [https://www.hmhco.com/products/assessment-solutions/assets/pdfs/sri/SRI\\_TechGuide.pdf](https://www.hmhco.com/products/assessment-solutions/assets/pdfs/sri/SRI_TechGuide.pdf).
- Smith, K. & Foorman, B. (2015). *Summer reading camp self-study guide*. Washington, D.C: Institutes of Education Sciences.
- Southern Education Foundation and Annenberg Institute for School Reform (2015). *Investing in what works: Community-driven strategies for strong public schools in Georgia*.

Troia, G. (2014). *Evidence-based practices for writing instruction* (Document No. IC-5). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development Accountability, and Reform Center website: <http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/innovation-configurations/>

Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and applications* (Structural analysis in the social sciences, 8). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.