L4GA offers a unique approach to improving literacy by unifying community-driven action with research-proven instruction. Georgia’s state plan promises to improve literacy learning by establishing partnerships that utilize evidence-based practices (EBP) with proven success for improving student learning, teacher learning, classroom literacy instruction (birth to grade 12), school climate, family literacy and community-school partnerships.

**Sustainability**

This funding is focused on creating sustainable systemic change. It is designed to support existing successes while encouraging systemic improvement in literacy for *all* students in
the district. Sustainability is vital to ensure that best practices become part of everyday practice for school leaders, community members, families, teacher educators, teachers, and students. When considering all aspects of the L4GA initiative, sustainability should be discussed. A solid plan should be in place to continue the work beyond the funding. Some examples for processes that create sustainability might include routine iterative use of data to inform leadership teams, the development of enduring community partnerships, and the strengthening of P-20 collaboration to ensure teacher quality across the career spectrum.

**Page and Word Limit Guidance**

The L4GA scored sections should be limited to 50 pages. Each scored section has a suggested word count. Please try to adhere to the word count in each section. As long as the total document is no more than 50 pages, all sections will be read and scored. Any section that is not scored, is not considered as part of the page limit.

**Local Education Agency (LEA)-Partnership Narrative (to be completed by LEA-Community Literacy Task Force)**

15 points

This narrative is a highly important factor in ensuring that the reviewer understands the community, the local education agency (in most cases, this is a school district), the feeder system identified, and how this initiative will assist with the literacy development across the identified community, including in and out of schools. **The Narrative should be limited to 2500 words.**

This section should include the following:

- LEA name
- Identification of feeder system(s) in the LEA-Partnership (preschool/early care provider(s), elementary, middle, high)
- Identification of the community served by the feeder system (name of city, neighborhood, and/or region)
- Identification of all LEA-Partnership partners (organization, role of the organization in partnership, contact person, title, contact information)

- A brief description of the feeder system(s) identified, and history of the LEA-Partnership

  Specific questions:
  - What local community assets exist to support families and children?
  - Is this an established “Get Georgia Reading” community?
  - Is this a proposed “Get Georgia Reading” community?
  - Is this community a recipient of a GOSA Community Coalition-building grant?

- Population demographics of the community
  https://public.tableau.com/profile/arcresearchanalytics#!/vizhome/GetGeorgiaReadingCampaignLandscape/GetGeorgiaReadingCampaignLandscape
  http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data#GA/2/0/char/0
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• Climate Ratings for each school involved in the proposed partnership and/or status of implementation of PBIS
  http://www.gadoe.org/Georgia-Insights/Pages/School-Climate-Star-Rating.aspx

• Student literacy/ELA outcomes of the feeder system.
  http://www.gadoe.org/Georgia-Insights/Pages/Georgia-Milestones.aspx

• Plan for routinely engaging early childhood education and care providers

• Plan for routinely engaging community-organization partners

• Plan for routinely engaging P-20 research-practitioner partnership(s) and literacy faculty in the local teacher preparation programs as part of the community coalition
  http://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/Induction%20Documents/FY18/Final%20P-20%20Infographic%208.03.17%20w%20Borders%20(RV4)%20PDF3.pdf

**LEA-Partnership Management Plan and Key Personnel (to be completed by LEA-Community Literacy Task Force)**

10 points

This section will apprise the reviewer of how the grant will be supported from the district level. Who are the key people involved in the grant? How will the grant function in terms of the whole district strategic plan? How will financial aspects of the grant be handled? Will there be a dedicated staff member at the district office with the responsibility of grants administration? Though this is certainly not an exhaustive list, these questions should be covered in your response. The Management Plan should be limited to 1000 words.

LEA office support for grant management

Key people involved in the grant (names, titles, contact information)

Statement about how this grant relates to the whole district strategic plan and comprehensive needs assessment (CNA)?

Detail how the grant will be handled internally

Detail the grant work will flow

Detail the grants management responsibility

Describe the LEA’s ability to adequately administer the funding.

• Past grant experience
- Discuss financial and programmatic audit findings over the past three years
- Discuss controls for spending

**Established Need (to be completed by district office)**

10 points

This section requires an initial analysis of current third-grade reading growth over the past three years (2015-2017) for all students in the LEA. It should include students who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learners. This analysis should be used as a basis to establish need for an L4GA project. This can include Milestones outcomes in addition to other assessments. **The Established Need section should be limited to 1000 points.**

**Assets and Needs Assessment with Root Cause Analysis (to be completed by district office)**

10 points

This section should describe the needs assessment process. What assets exist? How were root causes determined using the needs assessment process, and how will this information be used to develop a project that will impact all students birth to grade 12 in the LEA community? **The Needs Assessment and Root Cause Analysis should be limited to 1000 words.**

Some of the areas described below can and should be used in the analysis, but this is not an exhaustive list. The LEA is not required to use a particular needs assessment. Care should be taken to analyze to a level that is sensitive to established need. Consider using outcomes of analyses conducted with *Georgia’s System for Continuous Improvement* as a starting point.

Areas to consider include:

**Coherent Instructional System**

- Past instructional initiatives
- Current instructional initiatives
- Cross-curricular connections to literacy

**Community and Family Engagement (This should be completed by community and early care/learning partners working with the LEA team)**

- Community assets (How are (or how could) community assets engaged by the schools and centers?)

**Engaged Leadership**

- Routines and processes for on-going engagement of leaders (administrators as well as the leadership team)
Positive Learning Environment

- Social and emotional supports for families and students
- School Climate ratings over the past few years
- Other developmental supports available for the Whole Child (see http://www.gadoe.org/Documents/Whole%20Child2pgr.pdf and http://www.ascd.org/whole-child.aspx)

Professional Capacity

- Time for professional learning for all levels (early care and learning, elementary, middle, high) and all relevant staff (e.g., family-community engagement specialists, school library-media specialists and community librarians, mental health providers, social workers, school leaders, teachers)
- Approaches to professional learning
- Teaching workforce credentials and needs (e.g., degrees for early care and learning providers, advanced degrees for P-12 teachers, certification status, retention/attrition of staff, and future retirement forecasts)

Project Plan, Procedures, Goals, Objectives, and Support (to be completed by district office)

10 Points

This section should provide the reviewer with the actual implementation plan proposed for funding. The reviewer will utilize assets and address the needs determined in the “root cause” analysis. It will not be enough to name programs and strategies; the application should show how the strategies and programs align to best practices and directly address the needs of the children in the community by working through community organizations, early care/learning providers, and schools. The plan should show how the community-level supports, instructional strategies, delivery models are consistent with Evidenced Based Practices and directly address the needs of the students, educators, parents and community. The Project Plan should be limited to 1000 words.

Assessment/Data Analysis Plan (to be completed by district office)

10 Points

In this section, indicate what community-level data will be utilized (e.g., poverty, transportation, healthcare, etc.) in addition to assessment data. For example, vision screeners may be an essential data point as a way to target vision supports for students.

In addition, it is important to spell out specifically who, what, when and how the assessments will be given at the school level and how they will be analyzed by a team representing the early care providers, the community, local teacher educators/professional development providers, the schools, and the district.
The procedures involved in determining how instruction is developed based on the assessment data should be carefully described. Assessment protocols are specifically detailed including: who, what, and when the assessments will be given as well as analyzed. Procedures for educators’ analysis of local assessment data to inform instruction should also be included. **The Assessment/Data Analysis Plan should be limited to 1000 words.**

**Professional Learning Strategies Identified on the Basis of Documented Need (to be completed by district office)**
10 Points

Professional learning is a key component of the grant. There should be a direct tie to literacy instruction as well as include all teachers of reading/literacy including early care and learning providers, CTAE, Special Education teachers, all content teachers as well as community partners and parents as appropriate. This section of the grant should provide the district’s overall plan for engaging LEA-Partners with L4GA Professional Learning offerings. NOTE: LEA-Partners must agree to utilize their L4GA professional learning plan as their singular plan for literacy-related professional learning to avoid layering conflicting professional learning opportunities that could be available in a large LEA. **The Professional Learning plan should be limited to 1000 words.**

Institutes

Online PL supports

Local PL assets and supports (e.g., training and consulting for early care providers, PLCs, collaborative planning, coaching, mentoring)

Professional learning associated with any purchased or adopted program

Time allocated for collaborative planning time per age/grade level team and vertical teams

Topics of interest for PL for each audience (e.g., early learning; secondary education; community/family liaisons; etc.).

Topics that the LEA-Partnership could provide to the L4GA PL catalog due to particular LEA-Partners’ expertise or experiences with positive outcomes. (Involve the P-20 and RESA partners and outstanding teacher leaders when determining what the LEA-Partnership can offer to the L4GA program).

**Resources, Strategies and Materials to Support Implementation of the Literacy Plan (to be completed by district office)**
10 Points
This section details all of the strategies and instructional resources that will be used or purchased as a result of L4GA funding. They should all tie back to the needs assessment, student data and root cause analysis. They should directly impact literacy, access to print, community engagement, student supports, instructional engagement and/or teacher support. It is not necessary to name specific products; generic descriptions will be adequate. Any technology purchases must be justified as a way to support literacy improvement. The Resources, Strategies and Materials section should be limited to 1000 words.

School/Center Literacy Plans (to be completed by each school and/or early care center involved)

15 Points

Each school in an LEA is unique and therefore should have a detailed literacy plan that supports literacy implementation for children and families that are part of the school and/or early care center(s). This literacy plan should be consistent with LEA-partnership goals, objectives, professional learning and models of tiered supports. It also should support coordination of all resources available so that L4GA funding is used to fill strategic gaps determined in needs assessments. The school/center literacy plan (1 plan for birth to five) should be limited to 2500 words. It is not necessary to write the plan in narrative form if the school/lea would rather develop or use a template.

When crafting literacy plans, there is no required template or guide. Consider using REL plan tools as guidance. It is vital that schools and early care providers coordinate both internally with staff during development and in partnership with the LEA-partnership team to ensure consistency with LEA goals. Discussion in the plan should include:

- School History
- Administrative and Teacher Leadership Team
- Community assets
- Past Instructional Initiatives
- Current Instructional Initiatives
- Individual school professional learning needs
- Need for a Striving Readers Project

Budget Summary (to be completed by district office)

Unscored

Each application should have a budget summary in narrative form. The budget summary will highlight how the LEA/schools/centers/organizations plan to use their L4GA grant funds. The readers will have access to the budget summary so they can get a sense of the completed project. The budget summary will not be scored by readers. The budget summary will be reviewed
by a committee of GaDOE staff including: Federal Program managers, Grants Accounting Personnel, L4GA program staff and a member of the Audit team. The budget summary should be limited to 600 points.

Prepare a brief narrative informing the readers about the budget indicating what the LEA/agency or organization has determined as overarching needs and how the budget supports strategic activities.

Unallowable Expenditures

**Preparation of the Proposal:** Costs to develop, prepare, and/or write the L4GA 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)

**Decorative Items**

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

**Land acquisition**

**Capital Improvements, Permanent Renovations**

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

**Dues to organizations, federations or societies for personal benefits**


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