

School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: XX/XX/2010

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. [OMB approval forthcoming]

Revised March 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LEA Application	3
Attachments	10
Attachment 1a: Elementary School Profile.....	10
Attachment 1b: Middle School Profile	40
Attachment 1c: High School Profile	70
Attachment 2a: Turnaround Model.....	82
Attachment 2b: School Closure Model.....	86
Attachment 2c: Restart Model	88
Attachment 2d: Transformation Model.....	91
Attachment 3: Tier III Strategies with Annual Goals	96
Attachment 4: LEA SIG Budget	98
Attachment 5: LEA Application Checklist	99
Attachment 6: LEA Application Rubric	103
Attachment 7a: Capacity Factor Chart.....	109
Attachment 7b: Restructuring Team Checklist.....	110
Attachment 7c: Selecting Turnaround Leaders.....	111
Attachment 8: School Improvement Services.....	112
Appendices	116
Appendix A: Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants.....	116
Appendix B: LEA Budgets and SEA Allocations	131
Appendix C: Identifying Eligible Schools Chart	135

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Part II: LEA Application 2010

LEA Name: Georgia School for the Deaf	LEA Mailing Address: 232 Perry Farm Rd SW Cave Spring, GA 30124
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Lee Shiver Position and Office: Director Contact's Mailing Address: 232 Perry Farm Rd. SW Telephone: 706-777-2200 Fax: 706-777-2204 Email Address: lshiver@doe.k12.ga.us	
Superintendent (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of Superintendent: X_____	Date:
The District, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the District receives through this application.	

School Improvement Grant 1003(g) LEA Application 2010

LEA Name: Georgia School for the Deaf

Section A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: The LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant. Using the attachment list of eligible schools, identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and select one of the four intervention models (turnaround model, restart model, school closure model, transformation model) that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of the schools.

School Name	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention Models (Tier I and Tier II Only)			
					Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Georgia School for the Deaf		X						X

School Improvement Grant 1003(g) LEA Application 2010

LEA Name: Georgia School for the Deaf

School Name: Georgia School for the Deaf

Sections B and C must be completed for each Tier I and Tier II school applying for this grant. Section B, number 6 and Section C must be completed for each Tier III school applying for this grant.

Section B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: The LEA must include the following information to complete the School Improvement Grant application.

1. For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must analyze the needs of each school and select an intervention model for each school.
 - a) Complete the School Profile (Attachment 1a: Elementary School Profile, Attachment 1b: Middle School Profile, Attachment 1c: High School Profile).
 - b) If available, attach the “Target Areas for Improvement” section from the Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards (GAPSS) reviews completed within the last two years.

- c) Provide a narrative describing the outcomes of analyzing the data (school needs).

School needs data was collected and analyzed from the following sources: GAPSS Analysis, CRCT, ELA/Reading and Math and GHSGT ELA and Math Grade 11, STAR Reading, STAR Math, The Basic Reading Inventory, 3rd 5th and 8th Grade Writing Assessments, GHSWT, Highly Qualified data, teacher retention data, parent survey data, IEP compliance data, and technology needs. The data indicates two overarching needs under which all other needs fall. Establishment and support of an ASL/English Bilingual Education model, and the implementation and support of Standards Based Instruction across all grade levels and content areas.

The following data points provide a summary of the most salient findings from our analysis:

- School assessment scores from the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 school years for CRCT ELA, Reading, and Math (grades 3-8) and GHSGT ELA and Math (grade 11) provide inconsistent data for student achievement across years, grade levels, and subject areas, with fluctuations of up to 100% from one year to the next. Averages across the three year data period show consistently low performance in all grade levels and subject areas, with reading and ELA being the lowest.
- School wide data on reading levels using STAR Reading, John’s Basic Reading Inventory, show that no student at GSD is reading on or above grade level. Math data collected from the STAR Mathematics assessment shows that fewer than 20% of students are at or above grade level in mathematics. In addition, achievement gaps between grade-level standards and actual performance of students range up to 12 year on these tests.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

- On the 3rd grade, 5th grade, and 8th grade writing assessments, and the Georgia High School Writing Test, our students have shown rare, sporadic success. No students met expectations on these tests for this academic year.
- Sign Language Proficiency Interviews (SLPI) conducted during the 2008-2009 school year show that 41% of the GSD staff performs above the target level for their job placement. 11% of the staff is currently performing at their target level, and 48% of the GSD staff performs below the target level for their job placement.
- 23% of the current instructional staff is not classified as highly qualified according to the federal No Child Left Behind Act.
- 32% of the current faculty have been at our school three or fewer years. 60% of the current faculty have been at our school five or fewer years.
- GSD staff need training in writing IEPs including appropriate goals for each student.
- Teacher laptops are four years old, heavily used, no longer in production (making parts replacement extremely difficult), and are not covered by warranty. Classroom, media center, and lab desktop computers are 6-9 years old. Our three oldest SmartBoards and projectors are breaking down regularly and are no longer under warranty.

Analysis of the data shows a need for radical change in instruction, particularly in the areas of Reading and ELA.

Language deprivation in the early years, coupled with a continued and consistent lack of environmental exposure to printed, spoken, and written language (literacy) puts our deaf and hard of hearing students at increased risk for communication difficulties in writing, reading, speaking, language and reading delays, poor reading comprehension, poor performance on standardized testing in all content areas, and difficulty assimilating into and achieving success in post-highs school pursuits including job placement, technical school, and college (Algozzine & Lockavitch, 1998). These issues must be addressed by implementing support specific to the needs of these language and literacy deprived students.

GSD contracted with Dr. Maribel Garate from Gallaudet University (B.S. in Communication Sciences and Disorders, M.A. in Linguistics of American Sign Language, M.A. in Deaf Education, and a Ph.D in Deaf Education). Dr. Garate spent two days observing teachers and students' interactions in the classroom. Her findings indicate that there is a major disconnect between the language of instruction and the language of the deaf students. She further explained that, in particular, when a teacher uses ASL and exact English simultaneously to instruct in the classroom, what actually occurs is that the student neither acquires accurate ASL or English language and, in fact, the information that is being communicated to the students by the teacher is incomplete and in many cases, incomprehensible. Dr. Garate explained that it is like using two different languages at the same time, neither of which the student has mastered, to teach unfamiliar academic content standards that the student is expected to master.

- Transformational, job-embedded professional development endeavors, such as creating an ASL/English bilingual culture at GSD, require sustained, diligent, consistent, and specific

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

monitoring and evaluation. In order to accomplish this huge task, we will recruit and secure an ASL/English Bilingual Specialist (*attachment #1*) [**budget items #4 & #14**]. Both the ASL English Bi-lingual Professional Development (AEBPD) and the Fairview Learning programs will be fully implemented during the grant period. As the ASL/English Bilingual Specialist monitors, supports, and evaluates these programs and other aspects of our bilingual culture, he/she will be engaged in the coaching cycle with teachers and other staff as needed, fostering self-monitoring, modeling, providing individualized support and taking the lead in establishing and maintaining the bilingual culture at GSD. It is our hope that this position would be supported by State funds at the conclusion of the grant period. If it is not, the administrators and coaches would have to somehow maintain this vital role.

- GSD will contract with Dr. Maribel Garate (B.S. in Communication Sciences and Disorders, M.A. in Linguistics of American Sign Language, M.A. in Deaf Education, and a Ph.D in Deaf Education) to provide monthly consultative visits and feedback [**budget item #28**]. Dr. Garate will gauge the overall school bilingual culture, perform classroom observations, provide individual, small, and whole group feedback. She will work closely with the school's ASL/English Bilingual Specialist to determine strengths, weaknesses, and next steps. Dr. Garate, as one of the nation's leading experts in the field of bilingual education, will provide invaluable input into the formation, maintenance, and continuous improvement of our bilingual culture at GSD.
- In order for the bilingual culture to permeate the GSD culture, and for the academic parts of these programs to be correctly extended to homework and other residential times, we will recruit and secure the services of a Residential Learning Coordinator (*attachment #2*) [**budget items #5 & #15**], who will oversee and support the continuation of these programs in the residential setting. It is our hope that this vital position would be supported by State funds at the conclusion of the grant period. If it is not, we would distribute these responsibilities among the residential paraprofessionals, and ask for teacher assistance.
- A final response to school assessment score data is the inclusion in our calendar of 17 Extended Learning Weekends (ELW) [**budget items #2, #3, #32, #33, #35-47**]. During this extended learning time (approximately 256 hours), all students will have the opportunity to participate in literacy building activities – to be exposed to printed, spoken (signed), and written language (see full description in A8). As the literacy standards of their classrooms are applied to real life learning child situations, as their background knowledge is built, as their vocabulary grows and strengthens through interaction with both deaf and hearing adults and peers, as they are making vital connections between school skill sets and life skill sets, as bilingual experiences permeate these weekends, our students' academic achievement will be positively influenced.

Early literacy research indicates that “literacy develops when children have encounters in print; presumably written in a language the child speaks” (Perez 2004). Since ASL cannot be printed, these

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

encounters must couple ASL with printed English (Mayer, 2007). Mayer & Wells (1996), consider the minimal conditions for language acquisition to be a) adequate exposure in quality and quantity, b) to accessible linguistic input, c) in meaningful interactions, d) with others who are capable users of the language. Since ELW will satisfy all of these requirements, it stands to reason that the students' literacy levels will be positively impacted, thereby positively impacting their achievement.

The sustainability of ELW beyond the three year grant period is difficult to gauge. Many years ago, GSD students were kept on campus for several weeks at a time, so we know that it is possible to maintain that aspect. We are hopeful that the literacy activities could be supplemented with volunteer hours, community support, flexible hours for support staff, and other creative methods.

- **On the 3rd grade, 5th grade, and 8th grade writing assessments, and the Georgia High School Writing Test, our students have shown rare, sporadic success. No students met expectations on these tests for this academic year.**

As previously cited, research concludes that early language deprivation, and lack of environmental exposure to printed, spoken, and written language (literacy) contribute significantly to deaf students' communication difficulties in all forms of standard English, including writing. Again, to address this deficiency, implementation of support specific to these unique needs is necessary.

I. Programs

Our research indicates that the following programs are available to address the unique and specific deficiencies in writing as indicated by the data.

A. The development of a bilingual culture at GSD will influence our students' performance on these standardized writing assessments. As previously stated, this cultural shift will allow the solid foundation in our students' first language, which leads to better performance in English over time. The ASL/English Bilingual Professional Development (AEBPD) [**budget item #20**], as described earlier in this document, will be our means of transforming our culture at GSD.

B. The implementation of the Fairview Learning Program for the Deaf [**budget item #19**] will also impact our students' proficiency in writing standard English. The use of the adapted Dolch words, the implementation of the bridging process, and specifically the Spontaneous Written English component of the program will serve to increase student achievement in this important area.

C. Writer's Workshop [**budget item #30**] is an interdisciplinary writing technique which can build students' fluency in writing through continuous, repeated exposure to the process of writing. The following description is taken directly from <http://www.teachersfirst.com/lessons/writers/writer-k.html>.

Writer's Workshop is a teaching technique that invites students to write by making the process a meaningful part of the classroom curriculum. Writing is an expected activity on a daily basis. Students are exposed to the organization and thought required to create a story or write about a favorite topic. Because they are allowed to choose the topic, students are motivated to create and complete works to read to classmates. The Writer's Workshop format includes story planning, revision, teacher editing, and direct instruction in the mechanics of grammar. Ideally, students become enamored by the power of their words, and will strive for the independence of fluency. Writer's Workshop and can be paired with reading activities to create a powerful motivating tool when teaching literacy.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

The Writer's Workshop is typically a part of each day, however, for teachers with a schedule problem it can be a 3 day a week activity. The main components of the Writer's Workshop include a Mini-lesson, Status of the class, Writing & Conferencing, and Sharing & Author's Chair. Some of these components may already be a part of your classroom routine.

1. Mini-Lesson

A Mini- Lesson is usually a 5-10 minutes whole class activity and may be as simple as doing guided writing from a story. An example is to lay out a favorite story's events in beginning, middle, and end form, create an idea web about the student's reactions to the story, or bring attention to basic use of punctuation. A group reading activity such as a big book, or song or poem written on chart paper can introduce patterns in language and rhyming words, it could be used to search for phonetic sounds, or even to recognize beginning site words. This is a direct teaching opportunity for teachers to present the information a class is ready to learn. Some teachers require students to use the mini-lesson information immediately; other teachers will gently re-introduce information to students at the conferring sessions according to their individual readiness.

2. Status of the Class

The Status of the Class takes about 2-3 minutes and provides the student and teacher with information about how the student's work is progressing. It can be done with a quick handing out of the folders and a quick response from the students such as Illustrating, Work in progress, Publishing, or it may be a bulletin board that has color coded cards. A written work must have the following format:

- Front cover
- Title Page: with title, author's name, and illustration and date of completion.
- Dedication Page
- Story pages
- Back Cover

3. Write and Confer

Writing & Conferencing is ideally a 20 - 40 minute session. In the beginning of the Kindergarten year however, shorter sessions may work better. As noted earlier students will begin by dictating, with the teacher taking down the student's words with a yellow highlighter after they finish an illustration. The student is then asked to write over the words with pencils or markers to make them all their own. This process provides small motor development, handwriting practice, and brings meaning to the written word. This process becomes increasingly independent as the child progresses through each grade.

4. Sharing: Author's Chair

Sharing and Author's Chair usually take 10 minutes and be done either by having the students read to the class a "published book" or by children sharing their work in pairs. If peer editing is to be part of your classroom structure, careful introduction to a process such as TAG will be required. TAG stands for - tell one thing you liked about the story, ask one question, and give one suggestion.

Student Assessment is done by keeping a portfolio of revisions and copies of completed work. Since all

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

outside training will be complete and all materials purchased during the grant period, Writer's Workshop is completely sustainable beyond the 3-year grant period.

D. Shurley English [budget item #21] is a dynamic English curriculum for grades K–8 known for its unique blend of grammar, skills, and writing. Shurley English is a rigorous curriculum that reinforces student teacher interaction, promotes higher-order thinking skills, and provides measurable academic achievement. The program's most defining teaching model, the *Question and Answer Flow*, is highly successful because it utilizes the different learning styles of students, includes enough repetition for students to master grammar easily, and incorporates the part-to whole philosophy. Shurley English writing teaches concrete organizational patterns for a variety of writing purposes. Shurley students produce writing that is clear, readable, and understandable. This description was taken from Shurley English: Why it Works (*attachment #3*). This attachment booklet provides clear, definable, research-based rationale for the implementation of this program. Anecdotal evidence from our teachers who were previously trained and have implemented the program supports these findings.

Since all outside training will be complete and all materials purchased during the grant period, Shurley English is completely sustainable beyond the 3-year grant period.

II. Personnel

Our previously mentioned specialists will assist in the writing portion in the following ways: the

- A. ASL/English Bilingual Specialist [**budget items #4 & #14**] will supervise the implementation of the bilingual aspect of the writing process
- B. Dr. Garate [**budget item #28**] will aid in this process
- C. The Residential Learning Coordinator [**budget items #5 & #15**] will facilitate the continuation of the programs in the residential setting.

III. Life Application

Our Extended Learning Weekends (ELW) [**budget item #2, #3, #32, #33, #35-47**] will foster improvement in student writing achievement by positively impacting student literacy levels (as previously addressed).

- **Sign Language Proficiency Interviews (SLPI) conducted during the 2008-2009 school year show that 41% of the GSD staff performs above the target level for their job placement. 11% of the staff is currently performing at their target level, and 48% of the GSD staff performs below the target level for their job placement.**

ASL is the first language of our very unique students. Teachers and staff need to be proficient in this language in order to fully communicate with the students and provide the instruction that they need (please see prior research on bilingual education). Clearly, with nearly half of the staff performing below their targeted level, communication deficits are present, and need to be addressed.

I. Programs

A. Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced ASL classes are offered throughout each school year. Participation in these classes is currently voluntary, but may be included in teacher's individualized

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

professional development plan in the grant period and beyond. Teachers whose SLPI scores are below the Advanced level may be motivated to attend because of bonuses tied to the score [budget item #10].

Although the bonuses will not be available following the grant period, the program is not dependent on grant funds.

B. Sign Language Proficiency Interviews [budget item #18] will be administered annually for all staff excluding staff who earn a rating of “Advanced” or above in year one (2010-11).

C. The implementation of a bilingual culture at GSD through the AEBPD [budget item #20] will promote the development of ASL skills in all staff members. As ASL is used in all instruction and “verbal” communication on the campus, incidental and intentional improvement will occur.

II. Personnel

A. The ASL/English Bilingual Specialist [budget item #4 & #14] will be observing teachers and other staff as they communicate and instruct. Support for ASL development/improvement is included in this job.

B. Dr. Garate’s [budget item #28] work will include support for ASL development/improvement

C. The Residential Learning Coordinator [budget item #5 & #15] will support this development/improvement in the residential setting

- **23% of the current instructional staff is not classified as highly qualified according to the federal No Child Left Behind Act.**

GSD has experienced a 42% growth in student enrollment since 2006. Locating and securing highly qualified staff has proven to be a frustrating and most often fruitless endeavor. Past and current strategies include: advertising on the GADOE website, advertising on the GSD website, running ads on deaf websites, and contacts at national conferences (CEASD). Several factors account for this difficulty: Deaf Education programs are not included at most colleges (Georgia has only one), Georgia offers no reciprocity with respect to teacher certifications from other states, Deaf Education programs do not adequately prepare graduates to be highly qualified in a content field (these degrees are not content-based), and Cave Spring is a very small, isolated community.

I. Programs

A program is already in place using Title II-A, Improving Teacher Quality funds to reimburse teachers for taking appropriate Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Educators (GACE) tests, to pay for needed professional development for test preparation.

This program is not dependent on grant funds.

Although the bonuses are dependent on grant funds, highly qualified status is necessary for continued employment.

II. Personnel

A. A Recruiting Coordinator (*attachment #4*) [budget items #6 & #16] will be employed to facilitate the process of finding and securing highly qualified teachers to fill current (Language Arts – High School,

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Math – High School, Graduation Coach, Literacy Content Specialist, Speech Language Pathologist) and future (due to retirement, transfers, and inability to attain highly qualified status) vacancies.

This position is totally dependent on grant funding. The contacts made and relationships formed will facilitate sustainability beyond the grant period.

B. The Principal will be actively involved in promoting completion of highly qualified requirements among current staff members.

This position is not dependent on grant funds.

- **GSD needs to improve it's ability to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers**

The task set before the teachers at GSD is formidable. Our students often come to us with very limited or no language, and always with a sizeable gap between their actual performance levels and expected performance levels. Sixty percent of our current students have been at GSD for two or fewer years. In grades 3-8, 67% of students have been at GSD for two or fewer years, and 50% have been here for one or fewer years. Data that is represented to teachers about the academic achievement of these transfer students entering GSD is almost always inflated, and comprehensive profiles for these students are not available. Almost all students are severely lacking or completely devoid of the vocabulary and experiences necessary to accommodate new learning. Every student has an Individualized Education Plan that must be written, updated, monitored, abridged, and followed. Every student requires an individual remediation plan in every class. Every teacher must administer record, analyze, and respond to formal diagnostic, benchmark, Curriculum Based Measures (CBM), framework, progress monitoring, and State assessments, as well as efficiently use classroom formative and summative assessment data. They must scaffold instruction so that GPS on grade level can be mastered by students who are frequently 8-12 years behind. Instruction must be differentiated at levels unknown in hearing schools. Achievement gaps between students in one classroom are often 8-10 years. Hearing loss in that same classroom may range from 52 decibels (mild) to 120 decibels (profound). Use of standard English in reading, writing, or speaking is typically deficient. Research in deaf education is minimal due to the relatively low number of students affected, and many "best practices" are not successfully adapted for deaf learners. Teacher burnout rates are high. Cave Spring is a very small and isolated community, with few amenities to attract and hold these highly qualified teachers. Teachers who have options to transfer often exercise those options, creating quite a challenge to recruit and retain high quality teachers at GSD.

I. Programs

These bonuses are dependent on grant funds. The school culture, climate, and perception at the end of the grant period may render such financial bonuses unnecessary.

A mentoring program is being implemented beginning Fall 2010 in conjunction with our School Improvement Plan (SIP). This will pair our new (beginning teachers, or new to GSD) staff with qualified veterans, and includes monitoring and evaluating instruments. Grant funded stipends [**budget item**] will be paid to participating mentors.

These stipends are dependent on grant funds. It is possible that the program will be sustainable through other mentoring funding through the State or Title II-A funds.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

II. Personnel

A. Current teachers qualifying to be mentors [budget item #11] can apply.

B. School counselor will oversee mentoring program.

- **The Parent Survey (attachment #5) conducted in April 2009 indicates that 20% of responding parents would like summer programs and resources to keep their children on track.**

Many of our parents are unable to communicate with their deaf student. They do not know how to engage them in appropriate educational activities to sustain or continue the learning accomplished in the school year. Parents who can communicate are often stymied by lack of content knowledge, or lack of understanding of how to find and use appropriate materials and strategies to convey that knowledge.

I. Programs

A. Technology in Homes to Elevate Student Achievement (THESA) [budget items #9 & #26] will provide selected students with school-issued laptops to use during the summer under the supervision of teachers connected via the internet. Students will be assigned academic tasks and work products designed to help them develop their vocabulary, writing, reading, and overall communication skills.

This program will not require the use of grant funds, and is therefore sustainable past the grant period.

B. A Summer Family Outreach Program [budget items #12 & #48] will be implemented to facilitate summer learning. Teachers will visit students' families that live within a two hour driving distance of our school to assist parents with their sign communication skills and facilitate parental involvement in the student's education.

This program is dependent on grant funding, and is sustainable only through volunteer commitments and possible Title I Family Involvement funds.

II. Personnel

A. Teachers willing to be involved in the Summer Family Outreach Program [budget items #12 & #48]

B. We will recruit and secure a Parent Involvement Coordinator (attachment #6) [budget item #7 & #17] to coordinate, monitor and evaluate the THESA and teacher visitation summer programs, as well as other responsibilities noted in the job description.

- **GSD staff need training in writing IEPs including appropriate goals for each student**

Every student at GSD has an IEP. As we implement the transformational plan for our school, all IEP's

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

must include goals for bi-lingual communication, reading and writing skill acquisition. Our teachers will need training and support to insure that all new intervention strategies are appropriately addressed in each IEP and provide appropriate supports for students. Therefore, the following are necessary:

I. Programs

A. Training on new IEP software [**budget item #27**] will be provided for all teachers. This will solve many of the issues of inconsistency, inappropriate goals, and monitoring.

Since all software and training will be paid for during the grant period, this program is completely sustainable beyond the grant period.

B. A Summer IEP Development Stipend [**budget item #13**] will allow teachers to work on their IEP caseload using the software and training to assure that each IEP will meet compliance criteria.

Funding during the grant period will allow for development of each student's IEP to meet compliance criteria. Teachers will be able to handle any new students beyond that point, so this program will no longer be necessary after the close of the grant period.

II. Personnel

A. Teachers involved in Summer IEP Development [**budget item #13**].

B. IEP compliance monitoring is under the supervision of the Assistant Director of Student Services

- **Teacher laptops are four years old, heavily used, no longer in production (making parts replacement extremely difficult), and are not covered by warranty. Classroom, media center, and lab desktop computers are 6-9 years old. Our three oldest SmartBoards and projectors are breaking down regularly and are no longer under warranty.**

Research on the effects of technology on student achievement indicate a positive relationship between students' appropriate use of technology and student achievement. Kulik (1994) found that students who consistently used appropriate technology on average scored in the 64th percentile on tests of student achievement, compared to students in the control group who scored on average in the 50th percentile. He also found that these students were able to learn in less time, and had a more positive attitude about their classes.

Jay Sivin-Kachala (1998) reviewed 219 research studies and found that students in technology rich environments experienced positive effects on achievement in all major subject areas, that these effects are consistently positive from Pre-Kindergarten through post-graduate levels, and that students' attitudes toward learning and self concept were positively impacted as well.

Our unique students must learn through visual and tactile methods. Technology is the perfect provision for this learning style need.

Purchase appropriate technology (*attachment #7*) [**budget item #34**].

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

d) Provide rationale for the intervention model selected.

We selected the transformation intervention model because its constructs are the most likely to support the extreme systemic changes that are needed at our school based on a comprehensive analysis of longitudinal student academic achievement data, needs surveys, the SACS CASI Quality Assurance Review Team Report (April 2009) and the GAPSS analysis conducted at our school in May 2010. Of primary importance is the transformation model's capacity to support and sustain standards-based instruction and a school wide transition from a total communication school environment to a research-based, developmentally appropriate bilingual learning environment that emphasizes student mastery of American Sign Language (ASL) and standard English in concert. This dynamic change in the way we communicate and its impact on our organization and the relationships between and among students and staff in our unique school is representative of the strongest commitment to meaningful, sustainable school improvement unfettered by financial constraints and traditional approaches to reform. In addition to providing for a substantial increase in, and emphasis on, job-embedded professional learning, the transformation model enables us to take advantage of our school's unique residential setting in order to implement a genuinely significant increase in learning time by extending the regular school day and creating 17 specially designed Extended Learning Weekends (ELW). These literacy enriched ELWs will accelerate our students' mastery of ASL and English by providing alternative experiential learning opportunities that serve to build their background knowledge, develop vocabulary, and connect the GPS to the world beyond the classroom.

It is also the model that most closely reflects the intent and strategic planning behind the changes that our school has initiated and implemented since 2006. These changes include previous extensions of the regular school day and implementing block scheduling in 2007-08; the IEP-directed pursuit of regular diplomas for the vast majority of students; recruiting and retaining instructional staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of our students by setting performance expectations on the Sign Language Proficiency Interview (SLPI) in 2008-09 for all staff; and, providing staff with ongoing, job-embedded professional development designed to enable more effective teaching (e.g. Assertive Discipline, Fairview Learning, use of assistive technology). Although these initiatives are ongoing and continue to provide our instructional staff with some of the tools and strategies needed to meet the unique needs of our students, the optimal use of SIG funds to support the newly developed interventions described herein will immediately jumpstart a profound transformation that in three years will result in unprecedented student achievement levels at our school.

The transformation model not only requires new ways of working to recruit highly qualified staff, engage more families in the education of their children, and differentiate instruction based on individual student needs, it also enables us to provide the additional instructional time our students need to master the GPS and their need to be involved in experiential, hands-on learning that extends well beyond the traditionally structured classroom. This model clearly supports the alternative instructional and support strategies we are proposing.

As the state's only residential school for deaf and hard of hearing students, we are unique in Georgia, and this intervention model provides us with the opportunity to adopt both research-based school improvement strategies as well as data-driven interventions and a language-rich learning environment that reflect best practices for deaf and hard of hearing learners.

Operating flexibility has varied markedly over the 164 year history of our school and the transformation model will enable us to expand on the Locally Managed Schools (LMS) initiative championed by State

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Superintendent of Schools Kathy Cox. This initiative has enjoyed widespread support from stakeholder groups including the GSD Alumni Association, School Council, PTDA, SACS CASI, Cave Spring City Council, GADOE, CEASD (Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf), Georgia Association of the Deaf (GAD), and Gallaudet University.

- e) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must describe how the LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required strategies of the school intervention model it has selected.

The Georgia School for the Deaf is one of three state owned and state-operated schools in the State of Georgia. While each state school functions under a Local School Management Model of shared governance, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) serves as the central office support system, or the LEA, for Georgia School for the Deaf, and the other two state-operated schools.

Under the auspices of the State Superintendent of Schools the Georgia School for the Deaf has functioned for the past three school years under the Local School Management Model (LMS), which is a site-based model of shared governance. In this model the local school council plays an essential role in the decision-making process in the school. A GaDOE state schools liaison has been appointed by the State Superintendent of Schools to work closely with each State School Director and the three state-operated schools. This liaison, working under the direction of the Chief of Staff, serves as a facilitator who collaborates with other GaDOE departments on behalf of GSD as needed. Additionally a staff member from each GaDOE department has been assigned to work with GSD to provide technical and direct support as needed in the implementation and delivery of services. This system has been put in place to remove any barriers, or obstacles that may hinder the school from effectively implementing its school improvement initiatives.

Under the LMS Model, and with the organizational support structure from the LEA, the Georgia School for the Deaf will have the capacity and capability of using school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required strategies of the school intervention model it has selected. There will be: (1) increased opportunities for technical support, communication, and collaboration between the GSD staff and GaDOE staff; (2) a closer examination, review and use of data in working with the school improvement initiatives; (3) a reorganization of resources and services to better serve students; and (4) two-way consultation on school-based efforts.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)
LEA Application 2010

2. If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

The following guiding questions can be used to respond:

- a) Is there evidence of past failures of the LEA to support school improvement initiatives?
- b) Is there evidence that the LEA has diligently worked to implement, support and monitor such initiatives as standards-based classrooms, data rooms, and appropriate assessment practices?
- c) Is there a School Improvement Specialist working in the LEA?
- d) Has the LEA demonstrated support of the School Improvement Specialist's efforts?
- e) Is there a person at the LEA level that has been hired to work specifically with school improvement efforts?
- f) Is there evidence that the LEA has required specific school improvement initiatives for all schools? Examples include, but are not limited to: implementation of the Georgia School Standards, GAPSS reviews in many or all schools, analysis of high-impact practices shown in the Georgia's Implementation Resource Guide, functional leadership teams in all schools, and a LEA representative on all leadership teams.

(Respond Here)

LEA Application 2010

3. Complete the appropriate portion of Attachment 2 (2a: Turnaround Model, 2b: School Closure Model, 2c: Restart Model, 2d: Transformation Model) that corresponds to the model selected for each Tier I and Tier II school. Attachment 2 addresses the LEA's actions it has taken, or will take, to:
- a. Design and implement the interventions consistent with the final requirements of the model selected for each school.
 - b. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
 - c. Align other resources with the interventions.
 - d. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
 - e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

4. Complete the appropriate portion of Attachment 2 that delineates the timeline to implement the selected intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school.

5. Complete the appropriate portion of Attachment 2 that pertains to annual goals. The annual goals will be used to monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds. The LEA must report each school's annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessment in Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as graduation rate for high schools. This does not apply to the school closure model.

- 6/7. Complete Attachment 3 for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. The LEA must describe the services the school will receive and/or the activities the school will implement as well as the annual goals that the LEA will use to monitor progress.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

8. The LEA must describe and provide evidence of how it has consulted with relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents, community representatives, business and industry leaders, school staff, school council members, students, higher education leaders, etc.) regarding the LEA's application and plans for implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

Our School Council was first advised of our application and the availability of the SIG at our monthly meeting held on March 11, 2010 (*attachment #8*). Our School Council chair (a parent) attended the GADOE's briefing in Atlanta on March 3 when we first learned of the SIG and received the application notebook.

We presented the SIG application requirements and our intervention model selection to the faculty on March 10 and provided an initial opportunity for teachers to discuss the extended learning time requirement and other required elements of the application the afternoon of March 10, 2010 (*attachment #9*). Teachers were also invited to participate in discussions during spring break when our SIG writing team remained at school to work toward completing the application.

As the application has been developed, we have posted draft responses on our in-house intranet to keep faculty and staff informed. Parents attending Family Learning Weekend April 17-18, 2010 were informed of the SIG and our proposed extended learning weekends and lengthened school day. We received general support from those attending for our application and the proposed extended school day and selected extended learning weekends (*attachment #10*).

Stakeholder input has also been gathered from at least one deaf education consultant from Gallaudet University and a school improvement specialist from the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education recommended by the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement. A presentation was made to an assembly of the GSD Alumni Association on our campus in June. A SIG application update has been provided in almost all of our Leadership Team, School Council, and faculty meetings since March .

School Improvement Grant 1003(g) LEA Application 2010

Section C. BUDGET: An LEA must complete a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

1. The LEA must provide a budget (Attachment 4: Budget Detail) that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to:
 - a. Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.
 - b. Conduct LEA-level strategies designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools.
 - c. Support school improvement strategies, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000. The funding range for each school is between \$50,000 and \$2,000,000 annually. The actual award for each school may vary. The LEA should submit a comprehensive, three-year budget that provides an explanation of expenditures for each year. Budget renewal for years 2 and 3 will be based upon annual approval.

Section D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will:

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with final requirements.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (3) If the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements.
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)
LEA Application 2010

Section E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: If an SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

- "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Note: If an SEA has not requested and received a waiver of any of these requirements, an LEA may submit a request to the Secretary.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

LEA Application 2010

Attachment 2d

Transformation Model

LEA Name: Georgia Department of Education

School Name: Georgia School for the Deaf

The LEA must:

<p>A1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.</p>	
<p>Actions:</p> <p>Five candidates were interviewed for the principal position (<i>attachment #11</i>). The interviews were conducted by the State Schools Liaison Dr. Deloris Banks, and Director Dr. Lee Shiver.</p> <p>The interview committee’s unanimous recommendation to hire a new principal was made to the GADOE.</p>	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>June 7, 2010</p> <p>June 9, 2010</p>
<p>A2. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that</p> <p>(1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and</p> <p>(2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.</p>	
<p>Actions:</p> <p>We will conduct a year-long study of the CLASS Keys teacher evaluation system in 2010-11. An overview will be presented to all teachers during preplanning. Each teacher will receive a CLASS Keys notebook containing a detailed description of the process and evaluation rubric.</p> <p>The school director and principal will participate in CLASS Keys training in the summer of 2010 and will coordinate redelivery during the 2010-11 school year.</p> <p>Monthly faculty meeting agendas will include round table discussions of CLASS Keys teacher evaluation elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aug. CLASS Keys introduction • Sept./Oct. Curriculum and Planning • Nov./Dec. Standards-Based Instruction • Jan./Feb. Assessment of Student Learning • Mar./Apr. Professionalism • May Student Achievement 	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Introduce CLASS Keys to faculty and develop year-long study program. Administrative participation in CLASS Keys training. Teachers and administrators will continue to be evaluated using the state’s Performance Management Form.</p> <p>Year 2 Implement CLASS Keys teacher evaluation system. Modify the state’s Performance Management Form to include the principal’s responsibilities associated with the management and supervision of the CLASS Keys evaluation system. Instructional Leadership will be evaluated using Leadership Keys.</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>The school director and principal will collaborate with the State Director to identify CLASS Keys exemplars among the faculty and methods for determining individual teacher impact on student learning and academic achievement (CLASS Keys SA 1.1 & 1.2).</p> <p>In addition, we will use the Leadership Keys to evaluate instructional leadership.</p>	<p>Year 3 Continue implementation of CLASS Keys and Leadership Keys and include the proposed financial reward system described in our response to section A3 of this application.</p>
--	--

A3. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

<p>Actions:</p> <p>We will implement a financial reward system [budget item #8] that provides monetary awards to teachers and support staff whose students demonstrate increased achievement levels on standardized measurements of student academic progress.</p> <p>Teachers of students in grades 1-5 will receive a bonus of \$1250 if the percentage of students in their class meeting or exceeding the state standard on the math CRCT increases by 10% over the previous year (i.e. 2010) and/or \$1250 for the same performance increase on the reading CRCT. These teachers will earn a bonus of \$2500 if the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state standard on both of these tests increases by 25% or more. (Teachers who maintain a student passing rate of 100% for any grade level on either the math or reading CRCT will be eligible for the same bonus.)</p> <p>Subject area teachers (i.e. math, English/language arts, science, and social studies) of students in grades 6-8 will receive a bonus of \$1500 if the percentage of students in their classes meeting or exceeding the state standard on the CRCT increases by 10% over the previous year (i.e. 2010). Subject area teachers in grades 6-8 will earn a bonus of \$2500 if the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state standard on the CRCT increases by 25% or more.</p> <p>High school teachers whose students are required to take the EOCT will receive a bonus of \$1500 if the number of students passing the EOCT increases by at least 10% over the previous school year (i.e. 2009-10). \$2500 bonuses will be paid to teachers with a 25% increase in the number of students who pass the EOCT compared to the previous year.</p>	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Inform faculty of financial incentives for increased student achievement and implement reward system. Calculate the test performance results and graduation rates necessary to earn a bonus. Pay earned bonuses in the summer of 2011.</p> <p>Year 2 Continue reward system and pay earned bonuses at the end of the year (i.e. 2011-12) to those eligible teachers (and selected support staff and school leaders) who have increased the graduation rate and passing rates on the CRCT, EOCT, and GHSGT by an additional 10% over Year 1 graduation and state tests passing rates.</p> <p>Year 3 Continue reward system and pay earned bonuses at the end of the year (i.e. 2012-13) to those eligible teachers (and selected support staff and school leaders) who have increased the graduation rate and passing rates on the CRCT, EOCT, and GHSGT by an additional 10% over Year 2 graduation and state tests passing rates.</p>
---	---

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

High school core subject area (i.e. English/language arts, math, science, and social studies) teachers will receive a bonus of \$1500 if the passing rate of first time test taking students on their subject area GHSGT increases by 10% over the previous year (i.e. 2009-10). \$3000 bonuses will be paid to subject area teachers if the number of first time test taking students passing their subject area GHSGT increases by 25% over the previous year.

Paraprofessionals assigned to these teachers who are awarded bonuses will earn corresponding bonuses of \$250 or \$500.

All high school teachers will receive a bonus of \$500 if the number of graduating students receiving regular high school diplomas increases by at least 10% compared to the previous year.

Teachers of special needs, pre-k and kindergarten students exclusively will receive a bonus of \$1500 each year that at least 80% of their students meet 100% of their IEP goals and objectives by the end of the school year.

Teachers of students who participate in the Georgia Alternative Assessment (GAA) program will receive a bonus of \$1000 each year that 100% of their students meet or exceed expectations across all GAA subject areas.

The teacher evaluation system (i.e. CLASS Keys) will annually identify teachers who have not improved their professional practice, have not increased student achievement, and have not responded to professional development. At the end of the first year (i.e. 2011-12) of the implementation of this model, any and all such teachers will be required to meet the expectations of a written, individualized professional development plan (PDP) during the following year (2012-13). These teachers will again be evaluated at the end of the 2012-13 school year and will be dismissed if they have not met the expectations of their PDP.

Transformation Model

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

A4. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.

Actions:

In order to establish a transformational bilingual instructional program at GSD, we have chosen to narrow our professional development focus to support two instructional programs: 1) establishing the foundations of the bilingual culture by implementing the ASL/English Bilingual Professional Development (AEBPD) program, providing appropriate, research-based curriculum and intervention programs (the Failure Free Reading Program, the Fairview Learning Program for the Deaf, Writer’s Workshop and their corresponding professional development, and 2) implementing Standards-based instruction (GPS planning, delivery, assessment, and monitoring) professional development through study of the CLASS Keys, and supporting it by providing appropriate, research based curriculum programs (Writers Workshop and Shurley English and their corresponding professional development.

1. Bilingual Education

A. To implement ASL/Bilingual strategies in every classroom at the GSD, we have chosen to engage in an intensive, 2-year professional development package designed specifically to train teachers of deaf and hard of hearing students in the development of a bilingual culture. The Center for ASL/Bilingual Education and Research (CAEBER) has developed this professional learning package and maintenance plan: ASL/English Bilingual Professional Development (AEBPD) [**budget item #20**]. The plan utilizes current knowledge, research findings, and recommended language teaching and learning strategies, and translates these into a format for teachers to read about, discuss, experiment with in their classrooms, and report on their effectiveness. Currently, twenty schools for the deaf are participating in AEBPD. Implementation of the program has demonstrated improved achievement in all academic areas including mathematics.

Two “mentors”, one deaf and one hearing, fluent in both ASL and English, and having five or more years of classroom experience participate in the Summer Intensive Bilingual Mentor Training. They then redeliver this training in 12 two-hour seminars per semester for two consecutive years. The seminars are conducted in

Year 1 Initial implementation
Mentors first summer training at Gallaudet University, redelivery of twenty-four, 2-hour sessions. Fall and Winter mentor meetings, also at Gallaudet. Monitoring of the implementation and its impact on teacher practice and student learning will be completed by the two mentors, the ASL/Bilingual specialist, Dr. Garate, and school administration.

Year 2 Continued implementation
Mentors second summer session, redelivery of twenty-four, 2-hour sessions. Fall and Winter mentor meetings, also at Gallaudet. Monitoring of the implementation and its impact on teacher practice and student learning will be completed by the two mentors, the ASL/Bilingual specialist, Dr. Garate, and school administration. New staff trained in first-year implementation by ASL/Bilingual Specialist.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

ASL and written English. The purpose of the seminars is to equip the school's staff to provide a bilingual culture that ensures that all deaf and hard of hearing students normally acquire, develop, and enhance bilingual proficiency and literacy skills in order to achieve academically. Students will have the opportunity to reach their full potential in, access, and participate in both deaf and hearing worlds.

The curriculum content is made rich in both languages, with language acquisition, language learning, and language use opportunities interwoven with content instruction in multiple disciplines. Fall and winter mentor meetings are used to review progress, and to support the mentors in their delivery and dissemination in the knowledge and skills in ASL/English bilingual teaching theories and practices.

Since the training, mentor stipends, redelivery, and monitoring system will all be in place before the end of the grant period, our ASL/English bilingual program will be fully sustainable beyond the 3-year grant period.

B. The Failure Free Reading Program The Failure Free Reading Program (FFRP) [**budget item #22**] is a K-12 reading intervention program specifically designed to give nonreaders and lowest literacy students the opportunity to have an immediate and successful reading experience with age appropriate materials. Key to the program is its reliance on the three elements found crucial for reading success for our unique population: adequate repetition, appropriate sentence structure and meaningful story content. Students receive repeated exposure to text, predictable sentence structures, and story concepts that require minimum prior knowledge. The program combines systematic, scripted teacher instruction, software, workbook exercises, and independent reading activities. The FFRP requires minimum staff training time and can be administrated by teachers or paraprofessionals (Algozzine, Lockavich & Audette, 1997).

Statistically significant increases in reading grade equivalent scores, on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and Woodcock Johnson Reading Competency Subtests; Reading Level in Metropolitan Ach Test (MAT), Average percentile Score-Reading on Standard Achievement Test, and the Wide-Range Achievement Test 3 (WRAT3) sustained growth in reading grade-level equivalency at a statistically significant level has been shown on the ITBS (Algozzine, 1998; Algozzine, Lockvich & Audette,

Year 3 Full Implementation
Monitoring of the implementation and its impact on teacher practice and student learning will be completed by the two mentors, the ASL/Bilingual specialist, Dr. Garate, and school administration. New staff trained in second-year implementation by ASL/Bilingual Specialist.

Year 1 Initial implementation
Dr. Lockavich delivers professional development to full faculty. Reading Specialist/ Coach and Literacy Coach continue professional development in weekly one-hour segments. GSD will be part of a study program designed to monitor success of the FFRP in the deaf school environment. Our pre- and posttest scores will be entered into a database, and student progress will be tracked utilizing an online system. The Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach will have responsibility for monitoring implementation.

Year 2 Full implementation
Monitoring of student progress continues through study program, monitoring of implementation continued by the reading specialist/coach. New staff trained in first-year implementation by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach.

Year 3 Full implementation
Monitoring of student progress continues through study program, monitoring of implementation continued by the reading specialist/coach. New staff trained in

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

1997; Bergquist, Richardson, Bigbie, Castine, Hancock, Largent, et al., 2001; Blount, 2003).

The FFRP was implemented in 2007 at the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind (FSDB) with their deaf and hard of hearing high school students with additional disabilities. Reading achievement gains for this population were notable, and the program was subsequently implemented schoolwide for all students scoring below grade level in reading. Brenda Alberry, High School Reading Content Specialist at FSDB, reports similar, significant gains in this population as well (Alberry, 2010).

At Maryland School for the Deaf, the FFRP was so successful in improving student scores in reading comprehension that the program was adopted state wide by Maryland public school for all special education and significantly at risk students.

Additional instructional time (1 hour per day, M-Th) **[budget item #1]** will be dedicated to the FFRP. In grades K-5, this hour will be incorporated into the regular schedules, and delivered by their regular teachers in groups of 5 or fewer. In grades 6-12, instruction will be delivered from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. by teachers or paraprofessionals in groups of 5 or fewer. This delivery across all grade levels will provide consistency for students as they progress through their educational program. Small group settings will allow for focused attention, one-on-one instruction and facilitated monitoring of progress.

GSD will be part of a study program designed to monitor success of the FFRP in the deaf school environment. Our pre- and posttest scores will be entered into a database, and student progress will be tracked utilizing an online system.

Professional development for the FFRP **[budget item #22]**, will be delivered by the program's developer, Dr. Lockavich on August 4 and August 5, 2010, from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM. This training will include all certified staff, our Speech-Language pathologist, and all instructional paraprofessionals. The staff will also receive weekly one hour training sessions with GSD's reading specialist/coach.

first-year implementation by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach.

Year 1 Initial implementation
Initial training provided, follow-up

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

C. The Fairview Learning Program for the Deaf [budget item #19] is a reading program that embodies this bilingual approach to deaf education. This program is for use in core academic classes as opposed to FFRP which is strictly an intervention program. It is a five component program, targeting reading access for deaf and hard of hearing students. It provides tools for literacy that work quickly and effectively to enhance deaf students' reading skills. The program provides direct access to ASL and opens a window for students to begin to think and communicate bilingually. The five components of the program are as follows (taken directly from the Fairview Learning website: www.fairviewlearning.net):

1. Adapted Dolch Words

The Dolch Words are commonly used words found in the majority of basal readers. Deaf children and hearing children do not learn the Dolch words the same way. For example, *made* is a Dolch word which has multiple meanings – I *made* a present for you; I *made* my bed; I *made* money; My brother *made* me do that; The rain *made* the grass green. Most hearing children acquire the various meanings effortlessly through their sense of hearing. Deaf children, on the other hand, must see the different meanings in context in order to acquire them.

2. The Bridge Lists & The Bridging Process

The Bridge Lists are English phrases requiring American Sign Language (ASL) translation for understanding. For example, *down the street* requires multiple sign concepts, depending upon the context. "A ball hit *down the street*," is signed differently from, "A man walked *down the street*." If *down the street* is signed the same way in both sentences, meaning is lost. Bridging also allows the conceptual signing of phrases, rather than the word for word signing required by most sign codes. For example, if one signs, *put out the fire*, word by word, one is literally signing, *pick up the fire and put it outside*. Bridging provides the visual translation of the phrase's true meaning, *extinguish the fire*.

3. Phonemic Awareness

Even though skilled deaf readers make use of phonological information, just how they utilize the code to figure out a word or passage remains a mystery. Therefore, our shortcut to basic phonemic awareness and teaching strategies allows a basic structure to decode the printed word for all readers.

training/monitoring provided. Monitoring of students progress by classroom teachers, monitoring of program implementation and effect on teacher behavior by training specialists on follow-up dates, and by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach.

Year 2 Full implementation
Monitoring of students progress by classroom teachers, monitoring of program implementation and effect on teacher behavior by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach. New staff trained in first-year implementation by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach.

Year 3 Full implementation
Monitoring of students progress by classroom teachers, monitoring of program implementation and effect on teacher behavior by reading specialist/coach. New staff trained in first-year implementation by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

4. Reading Comprehension & Bridging

Structured reading exercises are used to teach children better comprehension, decoding skills, and how to use contextual clues. Bridging, as well as other interactive techniques, allow Deaf children to steadily progress in their reading skills.

5. ASL Development/Spontaneous Written English

Language experience stories facilitate the development of reading skills with Deaf students. Two kinds of interactive situations are utilized. The first situation involves students telling personal stories to the ASL instructor who then retells the stories modeling proper ASL. Students then sign their stories again, implementing proper ASL structures. The second situation occurs during other class times when students translate their ASL stories into written English or dictate spontaneous and personal short stories to their teachers. These stories are edited into proper English by the teachers, and copied and illustrated by the students.

These components, tailored specifically to meet the unique needs of our deaf and hard of hearing students, were developed using best practices from deaf, children of deaf adults (CODA), and hearing paradigms. Progress is constantly monitored, by analyzing both individual and grade-level data. Teachers will be trained on how to accurately assess and document student progress, how to implement the individual program while managing an entire class, how to effectively integrate program components, how to become a reflective communicator, and how to make reading fun for deaf students.

Published research reveals notable gains in students' reading levels and academic behavior, teachers' growth in reflective sign skills, and students' and teachers' overall growth in ASL skills due to use of a more organized, consistent approach to linguistic input and usage (Schimmel, Edwards & Prickett, 1999; Schimmel & Edwards, 2003).

Initial professional development for the Fairview Learning Program for the Deaf (described in detail in section 1c) **[budget item #19]** will be delivered on August 23, 2010 from 8:30 AM - 4:00 PM to all elementary teachers, the middle school ELA teacher, and the high school ELA teachers. Training includes implementation of all components of the program, how to implement the individual program while managing an entire class, how to effectively integrate program components, how to become a reflective communicator, and how to make reading fun for deaf students. Progress is constantly monitored, by analyzing both individual and grade-level data. Teachers will be trained on how to

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

accurately assess and document student progress. Follow-up dates to monitor implementation and provide needed support are October 25-26, 2010, and January 19, 2011.

Since all training, purchase of training materials, student workbooks, teacher/SMARTBoard technology, and monitoring visits will be completed before the 3-year grant period expires, Fairview Learning is sustainable beyond this period.

D. ASL Classes will continue to be offered to our staff.

2. Standards Based Instruction

A. Professional development on planning, delivery, assessment, and monitoring of GPS in a standards-based classroom will be delivered through an ongoing study of the CLASS Keys. Each teacher has a copy of the CLASS Keys and has been encouraged to read and study it. Every professional development session delivered in any area (SIP, SIG, grade-level planning meetings, Reading Specialist/Coach's trainings, etc.) will be tied to one or more of the CLASS Key standards/elements. Sessions focused on particular standards/elements or strands to become part of next year's evaluation system will be scheduled throughout the year. Lesson plan and observation evaluations will be linked to CLASS Key standards. Implementing standards based instruction will support student achievement in all academic areas including mathematics.

This job-embedded training will be delivered "in house", no purchase necessary, so it is fully sustainable beyond the three year grant period.

B. Initial professional development for implementation for Writer's Workshop (described in detail in section 1c) [**budget item #30**], will be delivered to all elementary teachers, the middle school ELA teacher, and the high school ELA teachers in the fall of 2010. Training will include all materials, information, and

Year 1 Full Implementation
Year 2 Full Implementation
Year 3 Full Implementation

Year 1 Initial implementation
Study of CLASS Keys in several professional development arenas. Impact on teacher behavior and student achievement to be monitored by coaches, IDT, and administration.

Year 2 Continue implementation
Each professional learning activity linked to CLASS Keys, CLASS Key Evaluation system utilized. New staff trained by coaching team. Impact on teacher behavior and student achievement to be monitored by coaches, IDT, and administration.

Year 3 Continue implementation
Each professional learning activity linked to CLASS Keys, CLASS Key Evaluation system utilized. New staff trained by coaching team. Impact on teacher behavior and student achievement to be monitored by coaches, IDT, and administration.

Year 1 Initial implementation
Delivery of professional development, monitoring of students progress by classroom teachers, monitoring of program implementation and effect on teacher behavior by Reading Specialist/Coach and Literacy Coach.

Year 2 Full implementation

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

strategies are deliberately designed to support our staff's development and acquisition of the instructional skills necessary to meet the needs of students in our unique school that are identified in the Georgia Teacher Evaluation System known as CLASS (Classroom Analysis of State Standards) Keys.

Financial incentives

- For recruiting staff

Marzano and Waters (2009) have emphasized the importance of recruiting effective teachers and have recommended providing the necessary incentives do so (Robert J. Marzano, 2010). The unique instructional and communication skills required of our teachers, along with our school's rural location in a small community, require us to develop creative approaches to recruiting that represent what Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) have identified as second-order change, i.e. being perceived as a break with the past, lying outside existing paradigms, and conflicting with values and norms. Incentives such as paying the long-distance moving expenses of teachers we have recruited to join our faculty and the provision for free on-campus housing for up to one year will remain as integral components of our teacher recruiting program and will be financed with other funding sources available to the school.

Incentives such as signing bonuses for new teacher recruits are fairly commonplace and have been utilized in several states and in some local school systems in Georgia for years, especially those in pursuit of highly qualified and skilled math and science teachers. Providing additional compensation to attract teachers and staff with the skills (e.g. ASL, language learning, literacy instruction) necessary to meet the unique needs of our students is permissible as part of a transformation model (Guidance on SIGs, USDOE, p. 24). Compounding our challenge of attracting skilled teachers is the well-documented dearth of available prospects (including recent college graduates) possessing the aforementioned skills. As part of our ongoing teacher recruitment efforts, we propose signing bonuses of \$1500 [**budget item #8**] to be paid to teachers new to our school after they have completed a full year of teaching service and have had a positive impact on student learning and academic achievement (CLASS Keys SA 1.1 & 1.2) as determined in their end-of-year evaluation conference included in the CLASS Keys Process.

Year 1 Develop criteria for documenting student academic progress as part of the CLASS Keys evaluation process.

Year 2 Promote signing bonuses during recruitment and hiring process. Pay bonuses to teachers at the end of the year (i.e. 2011-12) who have met the criteria for the bonuses (i.e. one full year of teaching at the GSD and a summative evaluation that includes documentation of student academic progress).

Year 3 Continue promoting signing bonuses and refine CLASS Keys documentation of student academic progress based on previous year's data analysis.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

- For retaining staff

The profound effect of individual teachers on student achievement has been well documented by researchers (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997)). Because of the unique communication needs of our students (as documented in every student's IEP) and the unique culture that characterizes the state's only residential school for deaf and hard of hearing students, our teachers' abilities to effectively use ASL is of singular importance to their delivery of instruction. This skill is essential to every teacher's establishment of a culturally responsive classroom (CLASS Keys P 1.3) and their ability to present content effectively so that our students can learn (CLASS Keys CP 1.1).

The Sign Language Proficiency Interview (SLPI) is a nationally standardized assessment rubric that uses a 10-level rating scale (ranging from "Novice" to "Superior Plus") to identify a person's ability to use ASL. We will pay a one-time bonus of \$1000 **[budget item #10]** to each highly qualified teacher and all other staff members (e.g. paraprofessionals, residential staff, nurses) who earn a rating of "Advanced" or higher on the SLPI. All other staff members are included in this incentive in order to facilitate the collaboration with teachers that is critical to helping our students make connections across content areas and to topics outside of the classroom (CLASS Keys CP 1.3). The residential program at our school (that includes field trips, sports, recreation, off-campus experiential learning, life skills development, and interactions with hearing peers and adults) enables our students to make these connections between what students are learning and the real world (CLASS Keys CP 1.3) primarily because of the ASL abilities of residential staff who have responsibility for leading and supervising students when they are not receiving classroom instruction during the regular school day. The de facto interdisciplinary nature of these essential collaborations between teachers and other staff members underscores the importance of the acquisition and possession of advanced skill in ASL by all staff who interact regularly with our students.

Increased opportunities for promotion and career growth

- For recruiting and placing staff

A peer mentoring program will be implemented that matches carefully selected veteran teachers with new and beginning teachers in a nonevaluative mentoring capacity, modeling lessons, co-teaching (when feasible), and giving one-on-one support. A program committee will be established to provide oversight, schedule meetings, and evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The three major components of the program are regularly

Year 1 Schedule and assess all staff members using the SLPI and pay one-time \$1000 bonus at the end of the year to those who meet criteria.

Year 2 Schedule and assess new staff on the SLPI and any staff members requesting a re-evaluation of their sign language proficiency. Pay bonuses as earned.

Year 3 Continue SLPI assessments as needed. Schedule and assess all new staff and any staff who have not earned a rating of "Advanced" or higher and request a re-evaluation of their sign language proficiency.

Year 1 Initial Implementation
Establish the program committee to develop the program and identify teachers to serve as mentors. Match new teachers with mentors. Pay stipends to teacher mentors.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

scheduled meetings (both whole group and one-on-one), coaching, and peer observation. To compensate teacher mentors for their time and additional responsibilities associated with this program, we propose to use SIG funds to provide an annual stipend of \$1000 [**budget item #11**].

- For retaining staff

Career growth is promoted by a strong professional learning environment that supports collaboration between and among teachers both within and outside of their schools (King & Newmann, 2000). Time for teachers to observe each other teaching is a necessary resource that is essential to the development of expert teachers (Robert J. Marzano, 2010). It is also critical component for promoting teachers' professional growth through job-embedded learning (CLASS Keys P 3.1). An annual schedule will be developed that enables all classroom teachers to visit and observe other teachers demonstrating exemplary performance on one or more of the five strands of the CLASS Keys. Substitute teachers [**budget item #13a**] and transportation [**budget items #49**] will be made available by the school's leadership to provide up to one full school day (i.e. seven hours total) annually for each classroom teacher to observe other teachers at GSD and at other schools (e.g. AASD).

Utilizing SIG funds to pay registration fees and travel costs for teachers to participate in content area workshops and conferences [**budget items #13a, #29, & #49**] not only supports the enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill (CLASS Keys P 3.2), but lays the important groundwork for instilling within teachers the norms, values, standards, and practices that characterize professionals who are committed to ensuring student achievement and school productivity long after SIG funds are exhausted. Teachers will be expected to implement strategies and practices learned at these conferences and afforded the opportunity to share these strategies with their peers.

Year 2 Adapt implementation to accommodate feedback from Year 1 participants. Identify additional teachers to serve as mentors. Pay stipends to teacher mentors.

Year 3 Full Implementation.

Year 1 Identify CLASS Keys exemplary performances by faculty. Develop observation schedule for all teachers. Principal will monitor implementation of the schedule beginning in September.

Year 2 Identify exemplary teachers in other schools to be observed. Develop observation schedule and secure transportation and substitute teachers.

Year 3 Continued Implementation. Utilize CLASS Keys performance evaluation process to determine improved instructional effectiveness among faculty.

Year 1 Identify content area workshops and conferences appropriate for teacher participation. Survey teachers to determine interest and preferences. Schedule at least one-third of the faculty to participate in at least one content area workshop or conference.

Year 2 Continue implementation and require participation by at least one-third of faculty who have not previously attended a content area workshop or conference off campus.

Year 3 Continue implementation and require participation by remaining or new faculty who have

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p><u>More flexible work conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For retaining staff <p>Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) remind us that Edward Deming’s principles of total quality management continue to have a strong influence on leadership practices in education. Included within the five basic factors that define the actions of an effective leader is the concept of trust building. Covey (1991) notes that this involves creating a climate which is perceived by both employers and employees as a “win-win” environment. In order to do this, our school’s leadership must know teachers’ concerns, what motivates teachers, and the necessary conditions for them to operate at levels of maximum(Robert J. Marzano, et al., 2005). Teacher members of our Leadership Team have noted that ideal working conditions include maximum access to classrooms after work hours, unfettered by time and supervisory constraints. This access enables teachers to create and maintain a positive learning environment (CLASS Keys P 1.1) and maximize instructional time (CLASS Keys P 1.2). To this end, all restrictions to building and campus access including late night, holidays and weekends during the school year will be lifted for teachers.</p> <p>A crosswalk of the reward and incentive plans (<i>attachment #12</i>) is available.</p>	<p>not previously attended a content area workshop or conference off campus in the last two years.</p> <p>Year 1 Inform teachers of expanded accessibility to classrooms and buildings. Modify electronic card key access program to enable teachers to enter classrooms and buildings as needed</p> <p>Years 2 and 3 Continued Implementation</p>
---	--

A6. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards.	
<p>Actions:</p> <p>The transformational instructional program for the Georgia School for the Deaf will be comprised two overarching components: adoption of an ASL/English bilingual learning environment and full implementation of standards based education.</p> <p>A review of the student achievement data identifies a substantial weakness in the area of reading. School wide data on reading achievement using STAR Reading, Basic Reading Inventory, and CBM in reading indicate that no student at GSD is reading at or above grade level. Out of 30 12th grade GSD students without</p>	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Initial Implementation Redelivery of 48 hours of AEBPD by teacher mentors to instructional staff. Monitor and evaluation provided by teacher mentors,</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

additional disabilities, six achieved a GE score at or above 3.0. It has been documented through observations and teacher conferences that during daily instruction throughout classrooms, students struggle with basic communicative competence and experiential knowledge. A review of the schools documented (published) language policies, staff interview and observation indicates that GSD has sustained a total communication (TC) philosophy.

During the 2009-2010 school year, GSD contracted with Dr. Maribel Garate from Gallaudet University. Dr. Garate is recognized as expert in the field of bilingual education for deaf and hard of hearing students. Based on two days of classroom observations, her findings indicated that there is a major disconnect between the language of instruction and the language of the deaf students. She further explained that, in particular, when a teacher uses ASL and spoken English simultaneously to instruct in the classroom, what actually occurs is that the student neither acquires accurate ASL or English language and, in fact, the information that is being communicated to the students by the teacher is incomplete and in many cases, incomprehensible.

The challenge facing GSD is not new or unique. In the past 30 years reading achievement levels of deaf school leavers has increased by 1 grade level. For the 17-year-olds and the 18-year-olds in the deaf and hard of hearing student norming sample for the Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition, the median Reading Comprehension subtest score corresponds to about a 4.0 grade level for hearing students (Holt, Traxler, and Allen, 1997).

Although there are no assessments available to assess language functioning in American Sign Language, these observations are reflected in the literature on language acquisition for deaf students (McAnnally, Rose, & Quigley, 2007).

The term total communication (TC) consists of auditory training, speech, speech reading, finger-spelling, and the language of signs (ASL) emphasizing the importance of using all means of communication with deaf children at the earliest possible age. Theoretically, this approach offers a reasonable compromise for effective communication. In practice, TC has failed to provide students with complete access to either ASL or English. TC has not lead to expected gains in academic achievement for deaf students (Johnson, Liddell, & Erting, 1989).

Learning to read, then developing reading fluency is vital in order for individuals to adequately participate in society. Yet, Marschark and Harris (1996) note that the deaf high school graduate reads, on average, at the same level as an 8-year old hearing child. Although small gains seem to have been made

ASL/English Bilingual Specialist and instructional administration. 10 (monthly) consults provided by Dr. Maribel Garate.

Year 2 Continued Implementation Redelivery of 48 hours of AEBPD by teacher mentors to instructional staff. Monitor and evaluation provided by teacher mentors, ASL/English Bilingual Specialist and instructional administration. 5 (bi-monthly) consults provided by Dr. Maribel Garate.

Year 3 Full Implementation Monitor and evaluation provided by teacher mentors, ASL/English Bilingual Specialist and instructional administration.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

through the implementation of Total Communication programs, overall achievement remains considerably lower for deaf students than for their hearing peers. Deaf children of deaf parents, however, consistently outperform deaf children of hearing parents in reading skills and academic achievement (Kusche, Greenberg & Garfield,(1983); (Strong & Prinz, 1997). This observation has triggered the development of bilingual programs which seek to develop American Sign Language (ASL) as a child's first language, so that the acquisition of a second language (i.e. English) is made more efficient and effective (Israelite et al., 1992; Mason & Ewoldt, 1996). The empirical data show a strong positive relationship between signing and reading skills (Hoffmeister , 2000; Mann, 2006; Padden & Ramsey, 2000; Parisot, Dubuisson, Lelievre, Vercaingne-Menard & Villeneuve, 2005; Strong & Prinz, 1997, 1998). Since more than 90 percent of children who are deaf have hearing parents, this acquisition of ASL as a first language is often delayed or neglected.

“Bilingual-bicultural programs differ from other programs most notably by their approach to first language acquisition. While bilingual-bicultural programs have respect for both ASL and English, these programs advocate for ASL to be the first language of children who are deaf. ‘Research has shown that effective language has to be fast and clear. ASL is an efficient language for visual learning and is easier for Deaf children to acquire as a first language than any form of English’ (Finnegan, 1992, p. 7). Johnson, Liddell, Erting (1989) stated that ASL is the language choice of adults who are deaf, and it offers access to the school curriculum and other world knowledge. A solid foundation in a first language leads to better English performance over time, and skills transfer from one language to another.

“Teaching ASL as the first language for Deaf children has additional benefits. ASL is the language of Deaf people throughout the United States. Proficiency in ASL automatically allows membership in the Deaf community and in cultural events that occur in communities where Deaf people live. This membership is vital to Deaf children because it promotes a healthy view of who they are as human beings and increases self-esteem and confidence in their abilities to interact in a wide array of situations.

“There are several benefits of bilingual-

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>bicultural education. Early access to comprehensible language fosters early cognitive development which, in turn, promotes increased literacy and greater academic achievement. Students who attend bilingual-bicultural programs develop functional skills in two languages. The emphasis on early language acquisition and establishing a first language (ASL) provides a base upon which English is subsequently taught. Students in bilingual-bicultural programs have increased self-esteem and confidence due to the healthy view of Deaf children, acceptance of who they are as human beings, and increased confidence to function in bilingual-bicultural environments.” (Baker & Baker, 1997)</p> <p>It is evident that in order to bring about improved student achievement, GSD must undergo a fundamental change in the way it addresses the language deficits of the students. The instructional program must undergo a major shift to what would be considered a bilingual educational approach. That is, there must be consistent and pervasive use of teacher instruction that is delivered via ASL and English in a manner that gives students complete and comprehensible access to both languages.</p> <p>The establishment of an ASL/English bilingual learning environment represents the most progressive and promising reform in the education of deaf learners. The national movement toward standards-based instruction in public schools is equally transformational. At the GSD these two overarching components of our instructional program will be aligned to ensure consistency and rigor between grade levels and within the residential program as well.</p> <p>Standards-based education is the foundation of planning, delivery and assessment of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) for our students. These research-based, data driven strategies have proven to increase student achievement. As we develop the capacity in our teachers to use the CLASS Keys standards as they teacher the GPS in our bilingual learning environment, student growth will results.</p> <p>Full implementation of standards based education in the following four areas (as defined in the class keys) is necessary for maximum benefit for our students.</p>	<p>Year 1 Initial Implementation</p> <p>Year 2 Continued Implementation</p> <p>Year 3 Full Implementation</p>
---	--

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum and Planning-Includes planning with knowledge of content and delivery, understanding of the curriculum, planning interdisciplinary instruction, using curriculum to plan instruction and assessment, using an organizing framework, and planning assessment for mastery • Standards Based Instruction-Includes using research based strategies, engaging higher order thinking skills, using differentiation, using flexible grouping, using technology, demonstrating high expectations, communicating learning expectations, providing effective feedback • Assessment of Student Learning-Includes using diagnostic, formative and summative assessment strategies and using data to design interventions • Professionalism-Includes maintaining a positive learning environment, maximizing instructional time, fostering a sense of community and belonging, helping students take responsibility for behavior and learning, establishing relationships with family and community, growing professionally through job embedded learning, enhancing knowledge and skills through professional learning and actively supporting the School Improvement Plan <p>This implementation will lead to success in the fifth area of the CLASS Keys; Student Achievement on GPS and non-GPS curriculum.</p> <p>As the GSD grows into full implementation of standards based education through professional development related to the CLASS Keys training on specific elements of the Keys and modeling, monitoring, and support of the implementation by instructional coaches, the instructional design team, teacher leaders and administrators, our students will reap the benefits. These benefits will be evidenced by increased student achievement across all content areas and grade levels.</p>	
--	--

<p>A7. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</p>	
<p>Rationale/Research:</p> <p>Regular and frequent monitoring of student progress is a critical part of standards based instruction. Historically, for students with disabilities, acceptable goals and appropriate rates of progress were determined by teachers, parents and school personnel rather than an external criterion. In order to meet higher expectations an</p>	

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

assessment system must include assessments that will project how students are doing against grade-level standards and provide immediate and ongoing feedback to modify instruction. The National Center on Educational Outcomes recommends the use of multiple measures including the use of classroom (formative) assessments, curriculum based measurements (CBM), adaptive assessments and large-scale assessments (Quenemoen, Thurlow, Moen, Thompson, & Morse, 2004). Each type of measure has unique attributes that, depending on when they are administered in the teaching/learning cycle, may be used as diagnostic, interim and summative assessments.

Diagnostic/ baseline assessment provides the instructional staff with an understanding of what the student is bringing to the learning task and is conducted at the beginning or the year or instructional unit. For students with IEPs, the “beginning” may be marked by the beginning of the school year, entry into the school program or at the student’s annual IEP meeting.

80 years of research indicate that deaf and hard of hearing students read significantly below that of hearing peers (McAnally, Rose, & Quigley, 1999). Analysis of our reading achievement data indicate that only 13% of high school seniors at GSD are at or above the median grade equivalency score reported for the deaf and hard of hearing sample group for the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Holt, Traxler, & Allen, 1997).

Interim assessments are used to monitor progress during the teaching/learning cycle. Measures administered during the instructional cycle may assess mastery of skills that have already been introduced (e.g. teacher created unit test, homework assignments, and framework assessments) (Black & Wiliam, 1998) consider an assessment ‘formative’ when the feedback from learning activities is actually used to adapt the teaching to meet the learner's needs. By using assessments in a formative way, teachers are permitted to make adjustments to promote greater success for their students (Stiggins, 2005).

Progress monitoring tools are also administered on a regular basis during the instructional cycle using alternative forms that either systematically sample items from the annual curriculum or represent global behavior that simultaneously requires the many skills taught in the annual curriculum (Fuchs, 2004). Progress is determined based on growth rate relative to grade level expectations, the student’s performance on baseline assessments and in comparison peers within his/her classroom. These assessments are crucial to the identification of students who require more intensive instruction and require more frequent assessment within the RTI model (Fuchs, 1994) (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, Phillips, & Bentz, 1994) and instrumental for the development of goals, benchmarks, or short-term objectives for

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

IEPs for students with disabilities (Deno, 1987).

Summative assessments occur at the end of the instructional task (school year, unit, or IEP).

Actions:

- A school wide assessment schedule will be created prior to each school year (*attachment #13*)
- Redeliver training on school wide assessments currently in use
- Subscriptions to online assessments (AIMSweb and Renaissance Learning) will be renewed yearly [**budget items #24 & #25**]
- Diagnostic/baseline assessments will be administered to determine student achievement.
- New students entering GSD at any time during the school year will be administered all pertinent baseline assessments (based on grade placement) included in the school wide assessment program prior to the 30 day placement IEP meeting
- Every student at GSD will have an individually administered an informal reading inventory (e.g. the Basic Reading Inventory) no less than once a year by the students primary reading ELA teacher
- Data from the diagnostic/baseline assessments will be use to adjust or add IEP goals
- Formative/Interim assessments will be used to monitor students mastery and to determine needs for additional instructional supports
- Ongoing support including modeling and coaching will be provided to all classroom teachers by the instructional coaches
- Assessments are integrated into the lesson plans and occurs continuously during the teaching learning process
- Teachers and instructional leadership will monitor ongoing assessments immediately following each administration
- Interventions will be developed or adjusted for students not achieving rates of progress sufficient to meet end of year goals
- Teachers and students will maintain data notebooks each student that include the results of classroom, school wide and state assessment results
- Summative assessments will be used to measure year end achievement for grade level expectations and expected rate of progress
- Teachers will use year end results to make decisions regarding promotion/retention decisions and the need to additional instructional supports/remediation for the

Timeline:

Year 1 Initial Implementation
Refine school wide assessment schedule. Increase opportunity for collaboration among teachers and instructional leadership to discuss assessment results. Incorporate discussions of assessment results between teachers and students into instructional planning. Disseminate results to parents and stakeholders in a timely fashion. Redeliver formative assessment training to teachers through staff development activities that include coaching and modeling within the classrooms.

Year 2 Progressive Implementation
Adjust assessment schedule as needed. Provide refresher training for assessment administration as needed. Incorporate differentiated assessment practices in the classroom including portfolios, performance assessments and peer reviews.

Year 3 Full Implementation
Consistent and pervasive incorporation of assessment practices in every classroom

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

following school year	
-----------------------	--

A8. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice).	
<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will add an additional hour of reading instruction/intervention (Failure Free Reading Program) daily for all students. This instruction/intervention for middle and high school students will take place from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and will be conducted utilizing maximum student/teacher ratios of 5:1. Students in self-contained and elementary classrooms will have an additional hour of reading instruction embedded into their regular class schedule. Instruction will be provided by certified teachers and paraprofessionals who will receive professional development [budget item #22] on program implementation and at least one hour of professional development weekly that focuses on effective reading strategies for deaf and hard of hearing students [budget item #23]. This additional learning time will lengthen the school day, which will start at 8:00 a.m. and end at 4:08 p.m. Monday through Thursday and every other Friday. This schedule change will add 144 hours of reading instruction to each student’s academic program over the course of the school year. The total increase of required instructional time from 2009-10 to 2010-11 is 72 hours for all students (<i>attachments #14 & #15</i>). • We will schedule 17 extended learning weekends(<i>attachment #16</i>) [budget item #2, #3, #32, #33, #47] when all students will be eligible to remain on campus (instead of going home) to participate in experiential, hands-on activities specifically designed to increase their vocabulary, develop their communication skills, improve their conceptual knowledge base, and bridge American Sign Language to standard English. Instruction will primarily be provided by deaf and hard of hearing adults, alumni, and selected school staff and will begin Saturday mornings at 8:00. Saturday afternoons, evenings and Sundays will be devoted to field trips, hands-on experiential lessons, special event participation, and extracurricular activities that are specially planned and designed to supplement regular classroom instruction. Most of these experiences will end at 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays, but it is anticipated that Saturdays will offer students who are traveling to and from events and activities additional supervised learning opportunities into the evening. Extended learning weekends will 	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Initial Implementation Year 2 Full Implementation Year 3 Full Implementation</p> <p>Year 1 Initial Implementation Year 2 Full Implementation Year 3 Full Implementation</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>provide participating students with an additional 256 hours of experiential learning time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technology in Homes to Elevate Student Achievement (THESA) [budget item #9 & #26] will provide selected students with school-issued laptop computers to use during the summer under the supervision of teachers connected via the internet. Students will be assigned academic tasks and work products designed to help them develop their vocabulary, writing, reading, and overall communication skills.	<p>Year 1 Initial Implementation Year 2 Full Implementation Year 3 Full Implementation</p>
--	---

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

LEA Application 2010

Attachment 2d

Transformation Model

A9. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	
<p>As Georgia’s only residential school for deaf and hard of hearing students, our students’ parents and their respective communities are located all over the state. Only 20% of our student population are day students who live within a reasonable daily driving distance from the school. Less than 10% of all other students live in an urban community. Consequently, we have very few opportunities for parents and families to meet at school with staff to discuss student progress and to engage in school activities, events, planning, School Council meetings, and the Parent Teacher Dorm Association (PTDA). The following mechanisms will enable us to increase the opportunities for family and community engagement.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our school website will include classroom teacher pages that convey academic expectations, assignments, homework, testing dates, projects, etc. <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>By having access to online information on our website, our students’ families will have up to date information regarding classroom expectations and descriptions of daily instructional content.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>Information posted on the school’s website will be monitored daily by the administration and the school’s Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <p>The annual parent survey (<i>attachment #17</i>) will include a question regarding the quality, accessibility, and effectiveness of the teacher web pages. A continuously accessible feedback option will be included on the website. All feedback will be reported to the School Council monthly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents will be able to use an on-demand, secure internet connection to access and remotely monitor their child’s academic progress, grades, attendance, punctuality and 	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 All classroom teachers will be given a description of expectations for the content of their web page(s) during preplanning. Parents will be informed of accessibility of their child’s teacher(s)’ web pages during registration. Teacher web pages on the school website will be fully accessible and current beginning the first week of school.</p> <p>Year 2 Continued implementation</p> <p>Year 3 Continued implementation</p> <p>Year 1 Full implementation beginning the first week of school. Collect baseline data.</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>behavior.</p> <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>Because most of our students' parents/guardians do not live within an hour's driving distance from our school, this accessibility will promote and facilitate communication between the home and school and enable parents/guardians to provide appropriate support and direction for their students in a timely manner. This accessibility to individual student data will provide parents with the necessary information about their students' progress and academic status to enhance communication with our teachers and residential staff.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>The Assistant Director for Students Services will be responsible for ensuring accuracy of student data and accessibility to this online information.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <p>The Office of Student Services will measure the frequency and number of parent log-ins. Teachers will report parent initiated communication quarterly regarding student academic progress, behavior, and/or attendance. These reports will be made to the School Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A parent involvement coordinator will be hired [budget items #7 & #17] to facilitate and strengthen communication between our students' parents/guardians and teachers, residential staff, and School Council. In addition to more traditional methods of facilitating parent involvement, the parent involvement coordinator will also schedule and facilitate six regional area parent/school meetings across the state during the course of the school year. These meetings will be designed to provide parents with face-to-face access to school representatives to discuss concerns, school initiatives, the School Improvement Plan, and resources that can help their students be more successful. <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>Unlike all other public schools in our state, our students' parents/guardians live all over Georgia. The vast majority of these parents/guardians are stymied by distance, time, and employment constraints that restrict their physical presence on campus for IEP meetings, special events, awards ceremonies, sports competitions,</p>	<p>Year 2 Continued implementation. Evaluate increased parent-initiated communication, using Year 1 baseline data.</p> <p>Year 3 Continued implementation. Evaluate increases in parent-initiated communication, using Years 1 and 2 contact data.</p> <p>Year 1 Recruit and hire a parent involvement coordinator. Establish positive and firm connections and relationships with our students' LEAs. Develop new parent involvement strategies as part of our School Improvement Plan. Implement these strategies as feasible in collaboration with the School Council and Leadership Team.</p> <p>Year 2 Use results from Year 1 evaluation and data analysis to modify parent involvement strategies and School Improvement Plan. Continue implementation and develop strategies for marketing our school to parents of deaf and hard of hearing students who are not enrolled at the GSD.</p>
---	--

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

assemblies, celebrations, field trips and the regular school day. An effective parent involvement coordinator will be able bridge this critical gap between home and school and create involvement opportunities that are currently unavailable, including regional parent/school meetings within reasonable driving distances and local parent coalitions. Additional anticipated benefits will be more meaningful involvement of LEAs in their students' progress, improved relationships with LEAs, and enhancement of perceptions of our school's effectiveness and mission.

Monitoring

We will monitor and document all home/school communications and require the parent involvement coordinator to maintain a daily log of all such communications. Sign-in sheets will be utilized at all regional parent meetings to monitor parent participation. All regional meetings will include one or more Leadership Team representatives to help monitor the quality of our face-to-face interactions with parents and LEAs and to collaboratively develop recommendations for improving this critical component of our School Improvement Plan. Teachers will be required to maintain parent/guardian contact logs that will be inspected as regularly as their lesson plans. The parent involvement coordinator will attend all School Council meetings and produce and share a report with Council members as part of the monthly agenda.

Evaluation

We will use parent surveys, including the annual parent survey (*attachment #17*), to measure the degree of parent satisfaction with the effectiveness of our school's operations and their students' academic progress. Surveys will also be utilized following regional parent and LEA meetings to determine our stakeholders' perceptions of the benefits of these meetings and the quality of our communication. Regional parent meeting attendance data, Family Learning Weekend participation, parent-initiated school contacts, student discipline data, and faculty surveys will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of our parent involvement coordinator.

- Parents will be encouraged to attend and participate in one or more Extended Learning Weekend activities. In the recent past, we have identified and planned for an annual Parent Learning Weekend that attracted a maximum participation of approximately one-third of our families. The 17 proposed Extended Learning Weekends included in the SIG application will provide significantly increased opportunities for parents/guardians to visit our campus and become involved in the experiential learning environment created for their students. Parents will also have access to

Year 3 Continue implementation using results from Year 1 and 2 evaluation data to modify, create, and/or expand parent involvement strategies and outreach.

Year 1 Full implementation will include lodging and travel coordination by the Parent Involvement Coordinator. Families will be provided with ELW schedules and related information on Registration Day. The School Council and PTDA will encourage parent participation throughout the year.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>resources during Extended Learning Weekends designed and provided to help them help their students at home.</p> <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>Parent involvement and participation in Extended Learning Weekends will substantially reinforce our instructional program and clearly demonstrate to students the collaborative spirit and collective determination between their parents/guardians and our school that support their success and progress. Parents/guardians who observe and participate first hand in these experiential learning activities will better understand and be able to provide equivalent experiences for their students at home and in their communities.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>The Parent Involvement Coordinator will monitor parent attendance and participation in one or more of the 17 scheduled Extended Learning Weekends. We will personally contact families that have not participated by the end of the first semester and encourage them to visit before the end of the school year.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <p>The Parent Involvement Coordinator will report family participation in Extended Learning Weekends at the monthly School Council meeting. Family participation will be measured against the goal of 100% participation by the end of the school year. The annual Family Learning Weekend survey results will be compared with parent satisfaction ratings from the previous year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We will regularly participate in deaf social events, conferences, parent meetings, assemblies, seminars and workshops at off-campus locales throughout the state. <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>Raising awareness of our school's mission and the progress of our students is critical to our continued success. As alumni and Georgia's deaf and hard of hearing citizenry learn about our school, their interest and support will provide us with additional resources and guidance that will positively impact our school's ability to successfully implement our School Improvement Plan. Substantially increasing our participation in these events will also promote our school and provide LEAs and the friends and families of potential students with quality information about the GSD experience. Student participation in these events outside of regular classroom schedules will enable them to learn how successful deaf</p>	<p>Year 2 Continued implementation. Evaluate parent participation using Year 1 baseline data.</p> <p>Year 3 Continued implementation. Evaluate parent participation using Year 1 and 2 baseline data, along with student achievement scores on standardized tests.</p> <p>Year 1 Initial implementation. We will actively participate in at least ten (10) such events outside the local community. We will develop a calendar or schedule of such events that occur annually or otherwise regularly throughout the state.</p> <p>Year 2 Increased implementation. We will increase our participation by 50% to at least 15 such events.</p> <p>Year 3 Increased implementation. We will increase our participation by 33.3% to at least 20 such events statewide.</p>
--	---

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

and hard of hearing adults live and work beyond the GSD. This knowledge and these experiences will reinforce the importance of academic success and the pursuit of a regular diploma.

Monitoring

We will document our participation in these events throughout the school year and maintain a log of all visitors to our exhibit table (when appropriate) and contacts made at each event.

Evaluation

We will measure increases in PTDA membership, monetary contributions, scholarship awards, volunteers, enrollment, event participation, and the graduation rate.

- The Parent Teacher Dorm Association (PTDA) will be restructured to provide for more parent and residential staff involvement in our students' academic programs and school activities. A PTDA representative will participate in all School Council and Leadership Team meetings. The PTDA will conduct at least four general assembly meetings during the school year.

Impact

Increased awareness of parent leadership and involvement in school level decision-making and school improvement planning will promote support and interest among our students' families which we anticipate will result in more frequent communication between school and home, and more participation in student activities and school events.

Monitoring

Membership and attendance at PTDA meetings will be documented. Minutes will be kept of all general assembly and executive committee meetings and posted to our school's website.

Evaluation

The annual Family Learning Weekend survey results will be used to measure increased levels of parent satisfaction with the quality of our school and opportunities for participation. We will measure and report to the School Council the increase in parent and staff membership in the PTDA.

- We will develop additional and stronger relationships with

Year 1 The election of new officers and revision of the PTDA's bylaws will enable the restructuring to be completed by the end of the year. Four PTDA general assembly meetings will be scheduled, announced, and conducted.

Year 2 Continued implementation. Increase parent membership in the PTDA by 10%.

Year 3 Continued implementation.

Year 1 Implementation initiated.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>also enhance communication and social relationships at home between and among family members.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>We will document parent participation in ASL classes and families' requests for additional resources. We will document the number of ASL dictionaries and DVDs distributed to GSD families.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <p>We will measure increases in parent participation in ASL classes and requests for additional resources. Student surveys will be used at the beginning and end of the school year to assess their perceptions of their parents' ASL skills.</p>	
---	--

<p>A10. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.</p>	
<p>Actions:</p> <p>Because GSD is a State School, the Georgia Department of Education (GADOE) serves as both our LEA and our SEA. GADOE has committed to give GSD sufficient operational flexibility to fully implement the instructional program and supports outlined in this document in order to substantially improve student achievement and increase high school graduation rates.</p>	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Full implementation Year 2 Full implementation Year 3 Full implementation</p>

<p>A11. Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).</p>	
<p>Actions:</p> <p>Secure consultative services with Dr. Maribel Garate (see section 1.c. of this document) including classroom observations, teacher training sessions and schoolwide presentations.</p>	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Contract with Dr. Garate for a total of 10 (monthly) visits to GSD. Year 2 Contract with Dr. Garate</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 2009-2010, GSD was allocated \$41,868 through American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Title I Targeted Assistance Funds, used for tutoring services, professional development, and parent involvement initiatives. • For 2009-2010, GSD was allocated \$7,505 through Title II-A Improving Teacher Quality Funds, used for teacher recruitment and pursuit of Highly Qualified status. • For 2009-2010, GSD was allocated \$965 through Title II-D Enhancing Education through Technology, used for instructional software and professional development. • For 2009-2010, GSD was allocated \$125,907 through IDEA VI-B and ARRA, used for supplies, professional development, and transportation. • For 2009-2010, School Improvement funds totaled \$150,000 used for professional development travel, materials, and interpreters. • For 2009-2010, GSD was allocated \$36,173 through CTAE-Perkins for education career partnership, program improvement, State institutions, and professional development. • An application for E-Rate funding for SY 2010-2011 for approximately \$100,000 is pending approval. • For 2010-2011, GSD was allocated \$12,500 from the State Board of Education for a parent mentor. 	<p>Mentoring Funds</p> <p>Year 2 Title I-A, Title I ARRA, Title II-A, Title II-D, IDEA VI-B and ARRA, School Improvement Funds, E-Rate (pending)</p> <p>Year 3 Title I-A, Title I ARRA, Title II-A, Title II-D, IDEA VI-B and ARRA, School Improvement Funds, CTAE-Perkins, E-Rate (pending)</p>
---	--

Transformation Model

<p>D. Modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable the school to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</p>	
<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with GADOE to develop procedures for utilizing SIG funding to pay Extended Learning Weekend staff who are not State employees. • Work with GADOE to streamline contract issues for SIG 	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>Year 1 Full implementation Year 2 Full implementation Year 3 Full implementation</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

<p>approved services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide SIG funded supplemental pay for teachers and support staff to attend IEP meetings and scheduled professional development sessions during the summer in preparation for the following school year. • Transport students home every other weekend to accommodate extended learning weekends, and require parents of non-participating students to provide alternative transportation arrangements. • Provide overtime pay through SIG funds to non-exempt GSD staff to support extended learning weekends. • Reschedule SES to take place on alternating Friday afternoons from 1:00 to 4:00 PM. • Stagger daily staff work schedules to provide flexibility in addressing student needs associated with extended learning time interventions. 	
--	--

E. Sustain the reform after the funding period ends.	
<p>Actions:</p> <p>ASL/English Bilingual culture</p> <p>Since the training, mentor stipends, redelivery, and monitoring systems will all be in place before the end of the grant period, the bilingual culture will be pervasive throughout the campus, and our mentors will be available to train new staff members, our ASL/English Bilingual program will be fully sustainable beyond the 3-year grant period. The program associated with the bilingual culture (the Fairview Learning Program for the Deaf) is also fully sustainable beyond the grant period since all training, purchase of training materials, student workbooks, teacher SMARTBoard technology, and monitoring visits will be complete before the grant period expires.</p> <p>An additional program which contributes to the ASL/English bilingual culture at GSD is the availability of free ASL classes at all levels for GSD staff. These classes are not dependent on grant funding, and are therefore completely sustainable. Administration</p>	<p>Timeline:</p> <p>2013-14 and beyond</p>

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

of the Sign Language Proficiency Interviews has been funded through other sources in the past, so we would return to that avenue of funding.

Sustainability of Extended Learning Weekends is difficult to gauge. Some years ago, GSD students were kept on campus for several weeks at a time, so we know that it is possible to maintain the housing aspect. We are hopeful that the literacy activities could be supplemented with volunteer hours, community support, flexible hours for support staff, and other creative methods.

Support personnel positions for the implementation of the bilingual culture hired with grant funds (ASL/English Bilingual Specialist, Residential Learning Coordinator, Dr. Garate) will not be sustainable after the grant period without the help of the GADOE. The bilingual culture and academic expectations, however, will be consistent and pervasive by that time. The coaches, administrators, and AEBPD mentors will have to assume responsibility for these roles.

Implementation of Standards-based Instruction

Professional development on standards-based instruction (planning, delivery, assessment and monitoring of GPS) is an ongoing, “in house”, job-embedded professional learning. All other professional learning will be tied to these standards and elements. Coaches and administrators will be trained to provide support to all staff and delivery to new staff of these standards. Teachers will have completed study of the CLASS Keys, and will have been evaluated for 2 years using the CLASS Keys Evaluation System. All of these factors allow the culture and practices of standards-based instruction to be completely sustainable beyond the grant period.

The appropriate, research-based curriculum and intervention programs associated with standards-based instruction (the Failure Free Reading Program, Writer’s Workshop, Shurley English) are also completely sustainable beyond the grant period since all outside training will be complete and all materials purchased during the grant period, the monitoring systems will be in place, and the Reading Specialist/Coach will be fully trained to provide support for the programs to all staff, and deliver training to new staff. The extension of the school day will not be possible beyond the grant period, so daily schedules will have to be adjusted to allow for continued implementation of all curriculum/intervention programs.

This standards-based instruction needs to be delivered by highly qualified teachers. We will continue to use Title II-A funds and the involvement of the Principal to promote completion of

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

requirements for highly qualified status. Funding for the mentoring program will have to come from other sources. The position of Recruiting Coordinator will not be sustained, but the contacts made and relationships formed should help future recruiting endeavors.

Each student's IEP will be used to drive his/her differentiated standards-based instruction and remediation. Since professional development will be complete, the IEP software program purchased, and the Assistant Director of Student Services able to provide support for all staff and train new staff in this vital area, this program is fully sustainable beyond the grant period. Summer programs providing increased learning time for students (THESA) and support and training for parents (Summer Family Outreach) Program will not be sustainable beyond the grant period unless alternate funding is located.

Technical equipment that supports our standards-based instruction (teacher laptops, student desktop computers, updated SMARTBoards, etc.) will have been purchased prior to the conclusion of the grant period.

Rewards and incentives are not sustainable beyond the grant period.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

LEA Application 2010

Attachment 2d Transformation Model

LEA Name: Georgia School for the Deaf

School Name: Georgia School for the Deaf

Annual Goals: The LEA must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics to be used to monitor Tier I and Tier II schools. Write the annual goals below.

Reading/English Language Arts

2010-2011 School Year

We will increase the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed standards on the Reading/ELA CRCT by at least 10 percent over the 2010 passing rate.

We will increase the percentage of first time test takers passing the ELA GHS GT by at least 10 percent over the 2010 passing rate.

2011-2012 School Year

We will increase the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed standards on the Reading/ELA CRCT by 10 percent or more over the 2011 passing rate.

We will increase the percentage of first time test takers who meet or exceed standards on the ELA GHS GT by 10 percent or more over the 2011 passing rate.

2012-2013 School Year

We will increase the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed standards on the Reading/ELA CRCT by 10 percent or more over the 2012 passing rate.

We will increase the percentage of first time test takers who meet or exceed standards on the ELA GHS GT by 10 percent or more over the 2012 passing rate.

Mathematics

2010-2011 School Year

We will increase the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed standards on the Math CRCT by at least 10 percent over the 2010 passing rate.

We will increase the percentage of first time test takers passing the Math GHS GT by at least 10 percent over the 2010 passing rate.

2011-2012 School Year

We will increase the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed standards on the Math CRCT by 10 percent or more over the 2011 passing rate.

We will increase the percentage of first time test takers who meet or exceed standards on the Math GHS GT by 10 percent or more over the 2011 passing rate.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

2012-2013 School Year We will increase the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who meet or exceed standards on the Math CRCT by 10 percent or more over the 2012 passing rate. We will increase the percentage of first time test takers who meet or exceed standards on the Math GHS GT by 10 percent or more over the 2012 passing rate.
Graduation Rate
2010-11 School Year We will increase the number of graduates earning a regular high school diploma by at least 10 percent over 2010.
2011-12 School Year We will increase the number of graduates earning a regular high school diploma by at least 10 percent over 2011.
2012-13 School Year We will increase the number of graduates earning a regular high school diploma by at least 10 percent over 2012.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

References

- Alberry, B. (2010, June 1, 2010). [The Implementation of Failure Free Reading at Florida School for the Deaf].
- Algozzine, B., & Lockavitch, J. F. (1998). Effects of the Failure Free Reading Program on Students At-Risk for Reading Failure. *Special Services in the Schools, 13*(1), 95-105.
- Algozzine, B., Lockavitch, J. F., & Audette, R. (1997). Implementing Failure-Free Reading with students seriously at-risk for failure. *Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities, 2*(3), 14-17.
- Baker, S., & Baker, K. (1997). Educating Children Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing: Bilingual-Bicultural Education. ERIC Digest #E553: ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 20191-1589; toll-free telephone: 800-328-0272.
- Bergquist, C. C., Richardson, G. H., Bigbie, C. L., Castine, W. H., Hancock, W. B., & Largent, W. B. (2001). Final Report of Failure Free Reading Bridges Programs fune uner Florida's 2000 Specific Appropriation 5A: Executive summary. Tallahassee, FL: Evaluation Systems Design, Inc.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(2), 139-149
- Blount. (2003). Clay County School District comprehensive school reform grant project summary and evaluation report July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001. Green Cove Springs, FL: Clay County School District.
- Covey, S. R. (1991). The taproot of trust. *Executive Excellence, 8*, 3-4.
- Deno, S. L. (1987). Curriculum-Based Measurement, Program Development, Graphing Performance and Increasing Efficiency. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 20*(1), 41-47.
- Fuchs, L. S. (2004). The Past, Present, and Future of Curriculum-Based Measurement Research. *School Psychology Review, 33*(2), 188.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Phillips, N. B., & Bentz, J. (1994). Classwide curriculum-based measurement: Helping general educators meet the challenge of student diversity. *Exceptional Children, 60*(6), 518.
- Hoffmeister, R. J. (2000). A piece of the puzzle: ASL and reading comprehension. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 143-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Holt, J. A., Traxler, C. B., & Allen, T. E. (1997). Interpreting the Scores: A User's Guide to the 9th Edition Stanford Achievement Test for Educators of Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students. Gallaudet Research Institute Technical Report 97-1. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

- Israelite, N. K. (1988). On Readability Formulas: A Critical Analysis for Teachers of the Deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 133(1), 14-18.
- Johnson, J. R., Liddell, & Erting, C. J. (1989). *Unlocking The Curriculum*.
- King, M. B., & Newmann, F. M. (2000). Will teacher learning advance school goals? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81, 576-580.
- Kusche, C. A., & et al. (1983). Nonverbal Intelligence and Verbal Achievement in Deaf Adolescents: An Examination of Heredity and Environment. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 128(4), 458-466.
- Mann, W. (2006). *Examining German deaf children's understanding of referential distinction in written German and German Sign Language (DGS)*. University of California. Berkeley, CA.
- Marschark, M., & Harris, M. (1996). Success and Failure in Learning to Read: The Special Case (?) of Deaf Children In C. Cornoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading comprehension difficulties: processes and intervention*.
- Marzano, R. J. (2010). Developing expert teachers *On Excellence in Teaching*.
- Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, In: Solution Tree Press.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works : from research to results*. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mason, B., & Ewoldt, C. (1996). Whole Language and Deaf Bilingual-Bicultural Education-Naturally! *American Annals of the Deaf*, 141, 293-298.
- Mayer, C. (2007). What really matters in the early literacy development of deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 12(4), 411-431.
- Mayer, C., & Wells, G. (1996). Can the linguistic interdependence theory support a bilingual-bicultural model of literacy education for deaf students? *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 1, 93-107.
- McAnally, P. L., Rose, S., & Quigley, S. P. (1999). *Reading practices with deaf learners*. Austin, Tex.: Pro-Ed.
- McAnnally, P. L., Rose, S., & Quigley, S. P. (2007). *Reading Practices with Deaf Learners* (Second ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Padden, C., & Ramsey, C. (2000). American Sign Language and reading ability. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 165-189.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Parisot, A. M., Dubuisson, L., Lelievre, A., Varcaingne-Menard, A., & Villeneuve, S. (2005). *Bilingualism and deafness: Correlations between deaf students mastery of Quebec Sign*

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Language (LSQ) and thier performance in reading French. Paper presented at the 5th International Symposium on of Bilingualism, Barcelona, Spain.

Prinz, P. M., & Strong, M. (1998). ASL proficiency and English literacy within a billingual deaf education model of instruction. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18*(4), 47.

Quenemoen, R., Thurlow, T., Moen, R., Thompson, S., & Morse, A. B. (2004). Progress monitoring in an inclusive standards-based assessment and accountability system (Synthesis Report 53). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Stiggins, R. (2005). From Formative Assessment to Assessment FOR Learning: A Path to Success in Standards-Based Schools. [Article]. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(4), 324-328.

Strong, M., & Prinz, P. M. (1997). A study of the relationship between American Sign Language and English literacy. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 2*(1), 37-46.

Wright, S. P., Horn, S. P., & Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 11*, 56-67.

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

List of Attachments

ASL/English Bilingual Specialist Job Description	1
Residential Learning Coordinator Job Description	2
<i>Shurley English: Why it Works</i>	3
Recruitment Coordinator Job Description	4
Annual Parent Survey Results 2009	5
Parent Involvement Coordinator Job Description	6
Technology Itemized List	7
School Council Minutes 3/11/2010	8
Teacher Meeting Minutes 3/10/2010	9
Family Learning Weekend Parent Meeting Agenda 4/17/2010	10
Principal Job Description	11
Crosswalk of incentives/bonuses	12
Assessment Schedule 2011SY	13
Bell Schedule 2010SY	14
Bell Schedule 2011SY	15
Extended Learning Weekend Proposal	16
Annual Parent Survey	17