# School Improvement Grants Application

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

> Fiscal Year 2010 CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Georgia





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



OMB Number: 1810-0682 Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

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.

## **Contents**

Cover Page	3
Section A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED	4
Section B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	7
Section B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:	23
Section C. BUDGET	24
Section D. ASSURANCES	25
Section E. WAIVERS	25
Attachment 1c - High School Profile	26
Attachment 2d - Transformation Model	38
Attachment 3 - Tier III Schools	69
Attachment 4 - Budget Detail	71
Attachment 4a - Budget Template	80
Attachment 5 - Checklist	81
Attachment 6 - Rubric	85
Attachment 7a - Capacity Factor Chart	90
Attachment 7b - Restructuring Team Checklist	92
Attachment 7c - Selecting Turnaround Leaders	93
Attachment 8 - School Improvement Services	94
APPENDIX A: SEA Allocations to LEAs and LEA Budgets	98
APPENDIX B: Persistently Lowest –Achieving Schools Guidance	103
APPENDIX C: Job Descriptions	105
APPENDIX D: Board Meeting Minutes	111

# Part II: LEA Application 2011 <u>Cover Page</u>

LEA Name:	LEA Mailing Address:
	3236 Atlanta Highway
Paulding County School District	Dallas, Ga 30132
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant	
Name: Yvette Hill	
Position and Office: Assistant Superintendent for So	chool Improvement, Central Office
Contact's Mailing Address: 3236 Atlanta Highway,	Dallas, Ga 30132
Telephone: 770-443-8003 ext. 10104	
Fax: 7 <b>9</b> 0-443-8089	
Email Address: yhill@paulding.k12.ga.us	
Superintendent (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Cliff Cole	770-443-8000
Signature of Superintendent:	Date:
x Oio Con	4114/11

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.

LEA Name: Paulding County School District

**Section A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED:** An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the 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 those schools.

School Name	NCES ID#	Tier	Tier	Tier	Intervention (Tier I and Tier II Only)			
School Name	NCES ID#	I	II	Ш	Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Paulding County								
High School	01471		X					X

## Paulding County High School Executive Summary

As the vision of the Paulding County School District is "to prepare all students for success in the 21<sup>st</sup> century;" our schools also share the desire to make that happen for their students. An opportunity for Paulding County High School (PCHS) to apply for a School Improvement Grant (SIG) will assist the school in implementing change for student improvement.

Information has been shared with parents, the building leadership team, and student leadership at Paulding County High School. Feedback has been solicited from the stakeholders and student performance reviewed. Based on the feedback and performance results, the district leadership team selected the following programs and activities to support the school with the implementation of the transformation model.

The instructional model selected for PCHS is the Small School Concept or Magnet School. The district, working closely with the Chamber's Economic Development group investigated ways to promote community growth and build the work force in Paulding County, while supporting the schools. Through many discussions and research the district leadership selected Science, Research, and Medicine as the career path to use for the Small School/Magnet School program. With the building of a new hospital, this career pathway will support community growth and provide our students with an opportunity for hands-on work experiences.

In addition to the development of the Small School/Magnet School, the following programs and activities will also be developed and implemented to support the transformation of the school:

- Mentor Program for "at-risk" students. This will be developed by the Family Community Outreach Coordinator who will work collaboratively with the counselors and community.
- Parent workshops and the development of a Parent Resource Center to provide families with the necessary skills to support student achievement.
- Extended learning time for students for academic and life skills instruction.
- College and career opportunities.
- Extensive professional learning for all teachers on best practices.
- Two academic coaches, ELA and math, to support teacher learning through training, modeling, and the implementation of best practices.

- Frequent assessment and monitoring of student growth with follow-up from the building leadership team, a School Improvement Specialist, and the district office staff.
- The development of an evaluation system for teachers and leaders based on student performance.
- Incentives for increasing student achievement and graduation rate.
- Additional resources, such as equipment, materials and technology, to support the work of the school.

All of the above programs, activities, and training will be aligned with the district priorities to:

- Increase student achievement in mathematics
- Increase achievement for students in subgroups for all subjects
- Increase student achievement trends across K-12

The district leadership team will work closely with and support the work of the school as we "prepare all students for success in the 21st century."

LEA Name:	Paulding County School District
School Name:	Paulding County High School

Sections B, B-1, and C must be completed for each Tier I and Tier II school applying for this grant. Section B, number 6, Section B-1, and Section C must be completed for each Tier III school applying for this grant.

**Section B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:** An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- 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).

See pages 26-37

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.

A GAPPS review was not conducted.

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

Paulding County High School (PCHS) is one of five high schools in the Paulding County School District. It houses grades 9-12, and the current enrollment is approximately 1378 students. The following is Paulding County High School's demographic data from the 2009-2010 school year:

#### • Ethnicity

- o 28% African-American
- o 7% Hispanic
- o 60% White
- o 4% Multiracial

#### • Subgroups

- o 11% Students with Disabilities
- o 1% Limited English Proficient

#### • Eligible for Free/Reduced Meals

o 50% Free/Reduced

#### **AYP**

PCHS has struggled and not made Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) over the last few years. The graduation rate has increased, but the school has not met the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for the last three years. As a result, Paulding County High School (PCHS) has been classified as a NI-3 school. PCHS last met Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2006-2007. PCHS has been inconsistent with meeting the AMO in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics for various subgroups. There has been a slow decline in ELA student achievement and a drastic decline in math.

The Average Daily Attendance (ADA) for the students at PCHS was 90.12% in 2009-2010 and is currently 90.01% for 2010-2011. However, the number of students with ten days or more absent was 342 during the 2009-2010 school year, which is 25% of their population, and is currently 223 for the 2010-2011school year, which is 16% of their population.

## **Student Achievement Data**

#### **English Language Arts**

#### 2007-2008 AMO for ELA on the GHSGT was 87.7%. PCHS' scores are:

- 90.5% of All Students
- 87.3% of Black Students
- 66.7% of Hispanic Students
- 92.5% of White Students
- 58.3% of Students with Disabilities
- 84.8% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

#### 2008-2009 AMO for ELA on the GHSGT was 87.7%. PCHS' scores are:

- 90.7% of All Students
- 89.4% of Black Students
- 77.3% of Hispanic Students
- 91.9% of White Students
- 100% of Multi-Racial Students
- 42.4% of Students with Disabilities
- 86.7% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

#### 2009-2010 AMO for ELA on the GHSGT was 87.7%. PCHS' scores are:

- 85.7% of All Students
- 82.5% of Black Students
- 88.2% of Hispanic Students
- 87.7% of White Students
- 75.0% of Multi-Racial Students
- 51.1% of Students with Disabilities
- 80.9% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

#### **Mathematics**

#### 2007-2008 AMO for Math on the GHSGT was 74.9%. PCHS' scores are:

- 76.4% of All Students
- 50.8% of Black Students
- 50.0% of Hispanic Students
- 85.9% of White Students
- 38.2% of Students with Disabilities
- 63.2% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

#### 2008-2009 AMO for Math on the GHSGT was 74.9%. PCHS' scores are:

- 73.4% of All Students
- 60.5% of Black Students
- 54.5% of Hispanic Students
- 78.8% of White Students
- 83.3% of Multi-Racial Students
- 24.2% of Students with Disabilities
- 63.9% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

2009-2010 AMO for Math on the GHSGT was 87.7%. PCHS' scores are:

- 55.7% of All Students
- 44.3% of Black Students
- 52.9% of Hispanic Students
- 64.3% of White Students
- 30.8% of Multi-Racial Students
- 14.6% of Students with Disabilities
- 44.8% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

#### **Graduation Rate**

Graduation Rate (GR) data reveals a school commitment to graduating students. The graduation rate has increased by 9 percentage points over the past three years. Although there has been an increase, PCHS has not met the AMO during any of these years.

## **Paulding County Graduation Rate**

#### SY 2008 to SY 2010

Name of School	SY 2008 Graduation Rate AMO – 70%	SY 2009 Graduation Rate AMO – 75%	SY 2010 Graduation Rate AMO – 80%	Difference +/-
Paulding County High School	66.4%	70.9%	75.4%	+9%
District	75.5%	78.4%	82.1%	+6.6%

PCHS Post-Secondary Data									
2009-2010									
Graduates	Entering (	Public Colleges	tering Georgia s and Requiring upport (LS)						
		Number	% of Graduating Class	Number Requiring LS	% of Those Attending Georgia Public Colleges				
2009 Graduates	School	76	25.5%	13	17.1%				
Entering in	System	494	35.0%	85	17.2%				
2009-2010	State	41,028	43.7%	9,768	23.8%				
2008 Graduates	School	89	27.0%	10	11.2%				
Entering in	System	436	34.1%	70	16.1%				
2008-2009	State	39,190	43.2%	9,115	23.3%				

Graduates Entering Georgia Technical Colleges							
		<b>Entering C</b>	ollege FY 2009	Entering Col	llege FY 2008		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
2009 Graduates	School	51	18.2%				
Graduates	System	224	16.6%				
	State	9,984	11.3%				
2008 Graduates	School			53	17.7%		
Gradates	System			192	15.8%		
	State			8,745	10.5%		

#### Other Measures of Academic Performance

#### **English Language Arts**

End of Course Test (EOCT) – ELA data shows an increase in achievement on the 9<sup>th</sup> grade Literature and Composition Test, but a slight decrease in American Literature and Composition Test from 2007-2008 to 2009-2010.

- 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Literature and Composition EOCT
  - o 2007-2008 56% passing
  - o 2008-2009 74% passing
  - o 2009-2010 78% passing
- American Literature and Composition EOCT
  - o 2007-2008 85% passing
  - $\circ$  2008-2009 87% passing
  - o 2009-2010 81% passing

<u>Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT)</u> - This is consistent with the scores for all students on the GHSGT over the same time span dropping from 90.5% in 2008 to 85.7% in 2010.

#### **Mathematics**

End of Course Test (EOCT) - Math courses tested over the last three years has changed. During the 2007-2008 and the 2008-2009 school years, tests were given in Algebra and Geometry with very few students in either subject. Beginning 2008-2009 Mathematics I EOCT was administered but scores were not received. In 2009-2010 fifty-nine percent passed Mathematics I and thirty-four percent passed Mathematics II. Because of the change in assessment, achievement trends are difficult to identify.

<u>Georgia High School Graduation Test</u> (GHSGT) - The scores on the GHSGT showed a drastic drop from 2008 to 2010, however this test assessed the QCCs. We will analyze the 2011 GHSGT results and compare it to the Mathematics I and II EOCT score once received.

#### Science

<u>End of Course Test (EOCT)</u> – The Biology scores have been steady over the last three years. The scores appear to be decreasing, but the number of Pass Plus has increased. However, we will need to decrease the number of students that failed the test. Our Physical Science scores have fluctuated over time.

- Biology EOCT
  - o 2007-2008 55% passing (43% Pass, 12% Pass Plus)
  - o 2008-2009 54% passing (39% Pass, 15% Pass Plus)
  - o 2009-2010 53% passing (38% Pass, 15% Pass Plus)

- Physical Science EOCT
  - o 2007-2008 40% passing
  - o 2008-2009 54% passing
  - $\circ$  2009-2010 42% passing

<u>Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT)</u> – The Science scores stayed within a five percentage points over time, however the decrease in the number of Pass Plus is an area that needs addressing.

- 2007-2008 86% passing (33% Pass, 53% Pass Plus)
- 2008-2009 87% passing (48% Pass, 39% Pass Plus)
- 2009-2010 82% passing (47% Pass, 35% Pass Plus)

#### **Social Studies**

<u>End of Course Test (EOCT)</u> - Both United States History and Economics scores have dropped over the last three years.

- US History EOCT
  - o 2007-2008 54% passing
  - o 2008-2009 29% passing
  - o 2009-2010 33% passing
- Economics EOCT
  - o 2007-2008 65% passing
  - $\circ$  2008-2009 67% passing
  - o 2009-2010 58% passing

<u>Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT)</u> – The Social Studies percentage of scores were much higher than the EOCT scores which may indicate the implementation of remediation prior to the test.

- 2007-2008 86% passing
- 2008-2009 87% passing
- 2009-2010 82% passing

#### **Paulding County High School**

#### **Advance Placement Exams**

School Year	Number of Students Enrolled in AP Courses	Number of Students Completing AP Courses	Number of Test Taken	Number of Test Scores 3 or Higher
2006-2007	127	126	140	58
2007-2008	149	148	125	34
2008-2009	189	183	123	36
2009-2010	166	166	117	29

Over the past four years, an average of 10% of Paulding County High School's student population enrolled in AP courses, but only about 25% of those enrolled scored 3 or higher on the AP Exams. Monitoring the rigor within the AP courses will be a focus.

#### **Observation Data**

During the 2010-2011 school year PCHS was identified as a NI-3 school, and, therefore is in Corrective Action. As a part of their Corrective Action Plan, the school implemented a 20-day monitoring cycle. Each administrator was assigned a department. The administrator met with the teachers during planning and informally observed instruction based on the professional learning plan. In addition to the informal observations, the administrators, in collaboration with RESA, conducts instructional audits to monitor standards based instruction and the rigor based on the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels of questions and activities. The observation tool incorporated standards from the **CL**assroom **A**nalysis of **S**chool **S**tandards Keys (CLASS Keys) Evaluation Instrument. The following are the results of the first two audits. There has been an increase in DOK levels, but the work needs to continue. A third audit will be conducted on April 26, 2011. Data from that audit will be used to compare growth and determine next steps.

## PCHS Instructional Audit Results

Paulding County High School	40 Observations
	4 Core Content Areas
Demonstrates a clear understanding of the	August, 2010:
GPS for what students are expected to know, understand and do in the grade level and the	NE-66% E-28% PR-5% Ex-0%
content area. (CP1.2)	January, 2011:
	NE-13% E-68% PR-13% Ex-3%
Communicates clearly the learning	August, 2010:
expectations (targets) aligned to GPS. (SBI	NE-75% E-21% PR-4% Ex-0%
2.2)	January, 2011:
	NE-28% E-60% PR-10% Ex-3%
Uses an organizing framework to plan	August, 2010:
instruction. (CP 2.2)	NE-52% E-45% PR-3% Ex-0%
	January, 2011:
	NE-12% E-38% PR-42% Ex-8%
Engages students in higher order thinking	August, 2010:
through the level of work they are asked to do. (SBI 1.2)	NE-69% E-30% PR-1% Ex-0%
uo. (SDI 1.2)	January, 2011:
	NE-10% E-67% PR-20% Ex-3%
Demonstrates research-based practices for	August, 2010:
student engagement. (SBI 1.1)	NE-64% E-34% PR-2% Ex-0%
	January, 2011:
	NE-20% E-53% PR-23% Ex-5%
Uses formative assessment strategies to adjust	August, 2010:
instruction and provide feedback to students (A 1.2)	NE-81% E-19% PR-0% Ex-0%
(11.2)	January, 2011:
	NE-28% E-55% PR-15% Ex-0%
NE-Not Evident E-Emerging	PR-Proficient Ex – Exemplary

Through the review of Paulding County High School's (PCHS) data, several things stand out as needs. Paulding County High School has been identified as a NI-3 school. It has not made AYP for the last three years, and it has regressed in student achievement in the areas of ELA and Math. During the 2009-2010 school year PCHS had a subgroup in the area of Students with Disabilities (SWD). Over a three year span, SWD achievement dropped from 38.2% meeting and exceeding in 2007-2008 to 14.6% meeting and exceeding in 2009-2010. The declining academic progress of this group is an area of concern.

Graduation rate has increased over time, which is an indicator of successful remediation practices. Graduation rate increased from 66.4% in 2007-2008 to 75.4% in 2009-2010. However, only 25.5% of our 2009 graduates entered a public post secondary school and 18.2% entered a technical college. This shows a need to focus on post-secondary options for the students of PCHS.

The Georgia High School Graduation Test has shown consistent trends with the EOCTs. Decreases were observed in all four core subjects with some less than others.

The rigor of the instruction at PCHS was analyzed through the review of the Advanced Placement (AP) and the observation data. The AP data indicate an average of 10% of all of the PCHS student population enroll in AP courses. Out of that 10% only about 25% score 3 or higher on the AP exams. Which means only about 39 students out of an average of 156 students pass the AP exams with a 3 of higher. This is an indication that our students are not prepared for the test. The observation data also supports this notion of the need to increase the rigor of instruction. The indicators on the observation instrument were taken from the standards and elements of the CLASS Keys. They specifically relate to standards-based instruction, classroom planning, and assessment. More than half of the staff observed, scored at the "Not Evident" or "Emerging" level. Administrators through the use of the elements on the instrument, observed instruction in the areas of "identifying and communicating expectations", "engaging students in higher order activities and questioning"; and "the use of formative assessment". The level of rigor of instruction was low, over 70% in the "Not Evident" or "Emerging" level, which means most of the questions and activities were at the Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) level 1. This is another indication for the need to work with teacher to increase the rigor in the classroom. In addition to instructional practices, the lack of or infrequent use of technology to support instruction was also noted. Growth was observed from the first to the second observation, but continued support is still needed.

Based on the analysis of student achievement, observation data and demographic information, it is evident that PCHS is in need of an intervention.

d) Provide rationale for the intervention model selected.

From the data analysis review, the School Improvement Grant Team identified several areas of

concern. To ensure continued school improvement for Paulding County High School, literacy, math, rigor during instruction, and exposure to careers beyond high school will be the areas of focus through this grant.

All four models were reviewed and analyzed to determine which model was appropriate for the school. The Turnaround Model was not a good fit because of the requirement to only hire back 50% of the staff, which would put the district in a bind because of the lack of positions available in the district to place the remaining teachers. Restart Model would not be appropriate for the school due to the lack of support for an outside management organization. The Closure Model was not one that we could consider because all of our other high schools are at capacity and could not sustain additional students. Paulding County High School is also the first high school built in the county and considered "The High School" by the community. Therefore, the Transformation Model is the only model appropriate for PCHS.

Being offered the chance to apply for a School Improvement Grant (SIG) to implement changes through the Transformation Model will provide the school an opportunity to address the needs and improve student achievement at PCHS. This model will also allow the faculty and new administration to think "outside the box" and implement the necessary interventions to recreate the "flagship school" of Paulding County.

The instructional model we seek to implement is the creation of a Small School within a School or Magnet School. Implementing a Magnet program will address the need to increase the student achievement from the "meets" category to the "exceeds" category. This will be done by raising the rigor of instruction in all classrooms. This is an area of concern based on the percentage of Webb's DOK level 1 activities observed in the classroom. This small school, Academy of Science, Research and Medicine, will provide a specialized program to allow students an opportunity to achieve in areas not currently offered. In addition to new opportunities, the Magnet program will help with meeting academic goals and assist with addressing school cultural concerns from the community, parents and teachers as noted in the focus group meeting discussions. The program will have high academic achievement expectations and will progress in teaching methodologies. It will also address the need to provide opportunities for students to learn about the top careers in the United States.

As we made the decision to implement a Magnet program, we searched for an organization that could help us develops the skills and knowledge to put together a quality program, but also help support the school in general. We received information from two organizations. Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB) and The HOPE Foundation. SREB was very specific with the services they offered. The plan presented would help us develop the Magnet program as well as provide support for all teachers to increase the rigor of instruction. The school is also familiar with the "High Schools That Works" concept. The services offered by SREB would include coaching of the leadership team from a School Improvement Coach with Magnet School experience to help with building the program and rebuilding the culture of the school. It will also include literacy and numeracy coaching across the curriculum as well as coaching on the development of the Magnet program. The school is familiar with SREB and the suggested plan

fits our needs, therefore their plan was selected to support the intervention for the school.

The SREB plan will provide support personnel a couple of days per month to coach the leadership and staff in the areas of building the Magnet program, increasing rigor in the classroom and developing teacher leaders. In addition to this the SREB plan, two academic coaches, a School Improvement Specialist, and a Family and Community Outreach Coordinator will be hired to provide ongoing professional learning and daily support. They will work closely with the SREB personnel to continue the work between visits. They will also work in tandem to develop the leadership team and teachers leaders to continue the work once the grant funding has ended. The focus will be on increasing the academic rigor and provide opportunities for students to excel in areas that address the needs of the school and the community.

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 Paulding County School District and the Board of Education are committed to the above mentioned intervention to transform the Paulding County High School's culture and increase student achievement through the implementation of the School Improvement Grant.

District-level initiatives designed to support the high school through the Small School/Magnet School intervention include:

- Administrative support from the district level for the principal and his administrative staff.
- Professional learning opportunities that address meeting the needs of diverse learners, math content knowledge, instructional pedagogy, and vertical collaboration of the school with-in a feeder pattern.
- Support the school principal by allowing him the flexibility to hire, retain, and/or remove staff as specified in the transformation model, if approved.
- Support the implementation of a new evaluation process to ensure the rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation of all teachers. This process will promote the rewarding of teachers who have increased student achievement, identify those who are in need of improvement, and remove those who after being provided ample opportunities to improve their professional practices, have failed to do so.
- The District's Executive Director of Secondary Schools and Assistant Superintendent for School Improvement will serve as liaisons between the school and the district. Collaboration with the school principal and School Improvement Specialist will occur on a regular basis in order to monitor, assess, and modify, if necessary, the intervention plan to ensure successful implementation.

- The monitoring of all professional learning activities associated with the intervention, providing follow-up and feedback. The use of two academic coaches will provide training and model expected instructional practices. The availability of PD360 will also assist in the implementation of differentiated, job-embedded professional learning.
- The establishment of a partnership with parents, local businesses, post-secondary institutions, and service organizations. With the help of the Family and Community Outreach Coordinator, the district and Board of Education will work to strengthen the commitment and engagement of all stakeholders at PCHS.
- If funded, the District and Board of Education have agreed to work to sustain the successfully implemented transformational initiatives of the School Improvement Grant through the alignment of future local, State and Federal funds.

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.

Paulding County School District has no Tier I schools.

- 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.

#### See pages 38-66

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.

#### See pages 38-66

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.

See pages 67-68

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.

The Paulding County School District does not have any identified Tier III schools.

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.), as appropriate, regarding the LEA's application and plans for implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Paulding County School District, while working with PCHS on its Corrective Action Plan, realized the need to identify an intervention that will turn the school around. During the 2010-2011 school year, the Executive Director of Secondary Schools researched the possibility of creating a Small School/Magnet School at PCHS. The director serves on the education committee of the Chamber of Commerce and has worked closely with the group to identify the area of study that would best meet the needs of the school and the community. The area identified was Science, Research and Medicine fields.

On March 11, 2011, district leaders and a board member attended an informational meeting about the School Improvement Grant. The group contacted other districts, gather researched, and shared the information with the district leadership team. The district leadership team recommended moving forward with the application.

During the March 29, 2011Board of Education meeting, the Assistant Superintendent for School Improvement presented the application option and requested feedback. The Board encouraged us to complete the application. In an effort to seek additional feedback, the Assistant Superintendent for School Improvement shared the information with a parent group from PCHS on the evening of March 29, 2011. She also met with the building leadership team on March 30, 2011, and the student leadership team on March 31, 2011. Feedback was received at all meetings.

The feedback received from the groups indicated the need to rebuild the culture of the school, identify ways to provide additional support to the students, increase the rigor of instruction in the classroom, and create a program that would prepare students for life and a career after high school that will support the community. This fell in line with the original plans to create a magnet program for PCHS in the areas of Science, Research and Medicine.

The Board of Education approved the application submission on April 12, 2011, allowing us to move forward with the plans to develop the Magnet School. Additional information meetings will be held throughout the rest of the school year and at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year.

**Section B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:** In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

The LEA must describe preliminary activities that will be carried out during the preimplementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year, including a proposed budget to support these activities. (For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to Section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)

- 1. The LEA activities and proposed budget should include the following elements:
  - The first year budget includes funds to cover preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period. (See budget templates Attachments 4 and 4a)
  - The funds for the first year cover full and effective implementation through the duration of the 2011-2012 school year, in addition to preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period
  - The pre-implementation activities:
    - o Are reasonable and necessary.
    - o Are allowable
    - o Directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA.
    - o Address the needs identified by the LEA.
    - o Advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.
    - o Adequately prepare the school and district leaders to effectively and fully implement the selected model.

There are no pre-implementation activities associated with this project.

**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 (Attachments 4, Budget Detail, and 4a, Budget Template) –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 activities, including pre-implementation activities, designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools.
  - c. Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation 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. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

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 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

## 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.

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.
"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.

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

LEA Name:	<b>Paulding</b>	County	School	<b>District</b>
-----------	-----------------	--------	--------	-----------------

School Name: Paulding County High School

**Grades: 9-12** 

**School Enrollment Total: 1378 students** 

NOTES: EDFacts data that is housed at the Georgia Department of Education will be provided in noted areas. Enter "NA" for any fields for which you do not have data.

SCHOOL DATA								
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	
AYP status	N	N	N					
AYP targets the school met	ELA	ELA						
AYP targets the school missed	Math, SI	Math, SI	ELA. Math, SI					
School improvement status	NI	NI-2	NI-3					
Number of days within the school year	180	180	176					
Number of minutes within the school day (Instructional Minutes)	350	350	350					
Number of minutes within the school year	63,000	63,000	61,600					

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA									
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	12.5%	25%	60%						
Graduation rate (percentage)	66.4%	70.9%	75.4%						
Dropout rate (percentage)	5.3%	6.0%	5.0%						
Student Absent Over 15 Days Rate (percentage)	32.3%	23.8	26.4%						
Number of students completing advanced coursework (AP)	148	183	166						
Percentage of students completing advanced coursework (AP)	99%	97%	100%						
Number of students completing advanced coursework (IB)	0	0	0						
Percentage of students completing advanced coursework (IB)	0	0	0						
Number of students completing advanced coursework (early-college high schools)	0	0	0						
Percentage of students completing advanced coursework (early-college high schools)	0	0	0						

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA									
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014		
Number of students completing advanced coursework (dual enrollment classes)	4	17	1						
Percentage of students completing advanced coursework (dual enrollment classes)  (# of Duel Enrollment students/# of 11 <sup>th</sup> & 12 <sup>th</sup> grade students)	.61%	2.5%	.15%						
College enrollment rate	42.0%	44.7%	43.2%						
Number of discipline incidents coded as 900 as reported to state	1	22	0						
Number of truants	501	336	342						
Teacher attendance rate	94.5%	94.6%	94.1%						

Distribution of Certified Staff by Performance Level as Designated on the LEA's Certified Staff Evaluation System											
2007-2008         2008-2009         2009-2010         2010-2011         2011-2012         2012-2013         2013-2014											
Number of certified staff	126	114	102	93							
Number of teachers evaluated	101	99	92	86							
Certified Staff Evaluated at Each Performance Level											
Percentage rated Satisfactory	100%	100%	100%	99%							
Percentage rated Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	1%							
Percentage non-renewed	0%	0%	0%	0%							

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

#### **GHSGT Spring First-time 11th Grade Test-Takers English Language Arts Percent of Students Who Met or Exceeded** N 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 Subgroups **FAY Students** 285 355 286 with Test Scores Percentage Black 87.3% 89.4% 82.5% Percentage White 92.5% 91.9% 87.7% Percentage Hispanic 66.7% 77.3% 88.2% Percentage Asian N/A N/A N/A Percentage American Indian N/A N/A N/A Percentage Multiracial 100% 75.0% N/A **Percentage Students** 58.3% 42.4% 51.1% with Disabilities Percentage Economically 84.8% 80.9% 86.7% Disadvantaged

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

#### **GHSGT Spring First-time 11th Grade Test-Takers English Language Arts Student Participation Rate** 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 Subgroups Percentage Black 97.3% 98.9% 95.7% Percentage White 98.1% 99.2% 98.6% Percentage Hispanic 100% 100% 100% Percentage Asian N/A N/A N/A Percentage American Indian N/A N/A N/A Percentage Multiracial 100% 93.0% N/A Percentage Students 100% 97.1% 97.6% with Disabilities Percentage Economically 99.3% 98.3 100% Disadvantaged

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

#### GHSGT Spring First-time 11<sup>th</sup> Grade Test-Takers English Language Arts **Average Scale Score** 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 2<sup>nd</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> $2^{nd}$ 3<sup>rd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> **Achievement Quartiles** 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> $3^{rd}$ 4<sup>th</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 1 st 2<sup>nd</sup> $3^{rd}$ 4<sup>th</sup> FAY students with test scores Black White Hispanic Asian American Indian Multiracial Students with Disabilities **Economically Disadvantaged**

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

#### **GHSGT Spring First-time 11th Grade Test-Takers Mathematics Percent of Students Who Met or Exceeded** N 2010-2011 2011-2012 Subgroups 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2012-2013 2013-2014 \*\*\* **FAY Students** 284 350 289 with Test Scores Percentage Black 50.8% 60.5% 44.3% Percentage White 85.9% 79.8% 64.3% Percentage Hispanic 50.0% 54.5% 52.9% Percentage Asian N/A N/A N/A Percentage American Indian N/A N/A N/A Percentage Multiracial 83.3% 30.8% N/A **Percentage Students** 38.2% 24.2% 14.6% with Disabilities Percentage Economically 63.2% 63.9% 44.8% Disadvantaged

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>State assessment changed to align with the new curriculum implementation. (Georgia Performance Standards)

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

#### **GHSGT Spring First-time 11<sup>th</sup> Grade Test-Takers Mathematics Student Participation Rate** 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 Subgroups Percentage Black 97.4% 100% 95.7% Percentage White 98.1% 96.7% 98.6% Percentage Hispanic 100% 100% 100% Percentage Asian N/A N/A N/A Percentage American Indian N/A N/A N/A Percentage Multiracial 100% 100% N/A Percentage Students 97.4% 97.1% 100% with Disabilities Percentage Economically 100% 99.2% 98.6% Disadvantaged

**Attachment 1c - High School Profile** 

#### **GHSGT Spring First-time 11<sup>th</sup> Grade Test-Takers Mathematics Average Scale Score** 2010-2011 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 \*\*\* 3<sup>rd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> **Achievement Quartiles** $2^{nd}$ 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> $2^{nd}$ 2<sup>nd</sup> $3^{rd}$ 4<sup>th</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> FAY students with test scores Black White Hispanic Asian American Indian Multiracial Students with Disabilities Economically Disadvantaged

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>State assessment changed to align with the new curriculum implementation. (Georgia Performance Standards)

Mathematics I: Algebra/Geometry/Statistics								
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	
Percentage passed course	N/A	89.0%	74.0%					
Percentage passed EOCT	N/A	N/A	59.0%					

Mathematics II: Geometry/Algebra II/Statistics								
2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-20								
Percentage passed course	N/A	N/A	83.0%					
Percentage passed EOCT	N/A	N/A	34.0%					

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>This data will not be available for Mathematics I and Mathematics II until 2010.

### **Attachment 1c - High School Profile**

English Language Arts: Ninth Grade Literature and Composition							
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Percentage passed course	94.0%	98.0%	98.0%				
Percentage passed EOCT	56.0%	74.0%	78.0%				

English Language Arts: American Literature and Composition							
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Percentage passed course	99.0%	98.0%	97.0%				
Percentage passed EOCT	85.0%	87.0%	81.0%				

#### Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 2d - Transformation Model

LEA Name: Paulding County School District		Transformation Wiodei		
School Name: Paulding County High School				
The LEA must:				
A1. Replace the principal who led the school model.	prior to commencement of	the transformation		
Actions: February 2011 the current	Timeline:	Budget: \$0		
principal resigned his position.	February 2011			
March 2011, the Human Resource Department interview candidates for the position using a panel interview model. Teachers, parents and district personnel were on the panel.	March 2011	\$0		
March 22, 2011, the Board of Education	March 22, 2011	\$0		
approved the recommendation for the new principal. The new principal will take the position July, 2011.	July 1, 2011	<b>4</b> 0		
A2. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable (1) Take into account data on student gractor as well as other factors such as m performance and ongoing collections of achievement and increased high school (2) Are designed and developed with te	rowth (as defined in this not ultiple observation-based as: professional practice reflect graduations rates; and	ice) as a significant sessments of cive of student		
Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:		
On March 30, 2011, the district leadership team met with Deputy Superintendent for School Turnaround to discuss the options for an evaluation system. Information about the suspension of the training for a year was shared. The district will continue to use the current evaluation system and supplement it with elements from the	March 30, 2011	\$0		

CLASS Keys.

•	t 1003(g) - LEA Applicatio	11 2011
During the 2011-2012 school year, PCHS will continue to utilize the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP) while deepening our understanding of the Standards-based Instructional Strand and the Assessment Strand of the CLassroom Analysis of State Standards Keys (CLASS)	2011-2012 School Year	\$11,960.00 – Substitute cost for 2 days training
Keys). Teachers and leaders will work together to develop an observation tool that will compliment the GTEP instrument and document the implementation of the Standards-based Instruction (SBI) elements and the Assessment elements. Teacher leaders will be used to provide input during this process. Substitutes will be provided.		
Observation 360, an electronic observation program, will be used by the administration to document teacher performance and student engagement during formal and informal observations. The program also includes the possibility of linking the performance to professional learning resources in PD 360 to support areas of weaknesses. This part of the program will be used for specific individual needs. The district currently subscribes to PD 360. An electronic device will also be purchased to support the observation instrument. (8 Tablets/IPads)	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year	\$1,695.00-Annual subscription cost for program \$3,200.00 for 8 Tablets/IPads \$1,695.00 - Annual subscription cost for program. \$1,695.00 - Annual subscription cost for program.
Teacher training will be phased in during the first year. Teacher leaders will meet with teams to share information, collect feedback, and train teachers on each of the SBI and assessment elements. Team meetings will occur during planning times or on professional learning days provided by the grant. Expectations for implementation will also be identified and discussed during teacher training.  A review of student achievement and		

	11	
observation data will be used to reflect the effectiveness of professional practices. Student achievement growth will be measured through the following assessments:		
• EOCTs		
• GHSGT		
• GHSWT		
<ul> <li>District Benchmarks</li> </ul>		
Improved instructional practices will also be measured through formal and informal observations utilizing the CLASS Keys elements on the observation tool.		
District and building administrators will continue to utilize the current leadership evaluation system and study elements from the Leaders Keys that support classroom instruction and assessment. An evaluation protocol will be developed in collaboration with district personnel and school administration to identify performance areas reflective of student growth and compliment the current evaluation system. Data collected will include student achievement and increased high school graduation rate.		
	2012-2013 School Year	\$11,960.00 – Substitute cost for 2
During the 2012-2013 school year, PCHS will transition to the revised CLASS Key and Leader Keys evaluation system. The		days training
observation tools and evaluation protocol will also transition to comply with the requirements of the CLASS Keys and Leader Keys.	2013-2014 School Year	\$11,960.00 – Substitute cost for 2 days training

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.

Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
A reward and incentive plan will be used to	2011-2012 School Year	
recruit, hire, retain and reward teachers for improved student achievement and	2012-2013 School Year	
increased graduation rates.	2013-2014 School Year	
The evaluation system associated with each area will be one of the tools used to monitor the progress of professional practices of certified staff members. Rewards for teachers and leaders will be awarded based on student achievement goals. This achievement goal will be at least a 5% increase over the previous year.	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year	
Certified Staff		
Certified classroom teachers will receive an annual financial reward for increasing student achievement measured by a 5% gain in student performance. This reward is for classroom instructors using district established benchmark assessments as the achievement measure. A satisfactory annual evaluation will also be a requirement to receive this reward.  Non-classroom based certified staff, such as Media Specialist and Academic Coaches, will establish goals for their specific areas and will be rewarded for meeting those goals.	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 20131-2014 School Year	\$45,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-91 teachers) \$45,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-91 teachers) \$45,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-91 teachers)
The School Improvement Specialist, Administrators, Counselors, and Family Community Outreach Coordinator and ISS teacher will be rewarded based on an		

School Improvement Gran	t 1003(g) - LEA Applicatio	11 2011
increase in the graduation rate.		
District pre/post benchmarks results will be will be used to monitor student growth in addition to state assessments. The state assessments will include GHSWT, GHSGT, and EOCTs. High school graduation rates will also be used to assess growth.		
All Staff Members		
All staff members, certified and classified, will receive annual financial rewards for achieving established goals toward meeting AMO's and AYP. Year 1 reward will be based upon school meeting AYP in all students categories, as well as 3 of the five sub-group categories. Year 2 reward will be based upon school meeting AYP in the all students categories, as well as 4 of the	Certified 2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year	\$48,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/certified staff) \$48,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/certified staff)
five sub-group categories. Year 3 rewards will be based upon school meeting AYP in the all students categories, as well as all sub-group categories. Below is a description of classified staff members.	20131-2014 School Year	\$48,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/certified staff)
Classified	Classified	
Classified staff includes paraprofessionals, food and nutrition workers, custodians, office staff, parking lot guard, School Resource Officer, and bus drivers.	2011-2012 School Year	\$15,000.00 bonus (\$250.00/classified staff)
A satisfactory evaluation will be required of both certified and classified groups to	2012-2013 School Year	\$15,000.00 bonus (\$250.00/classified staff)
qualify for any rewards or incentives.	20131-2014 School Year	\$15,000.00 bonus (\$250.00/classified staff)
Certified staff members who do not increase student achievement will be given ample time to improve their professional practice. Upon their negligence not to meet the required duties and responsibilities using GTEP the first year and the revised CLASS Keys in years 2 and 3, a removal process	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year	

School Improvement Gran	t 1005(g) EE/1 rippiicatio	11 2011
will begin based on the Paulding County School District's Board Policy.  Staff members who leave the school will only receive rewards and incentives related to the progress made according to the reward and incentive plan.  Documentation of rewards and incentives will be maintained at the school level. Staff members will continue to be recognized with local incentives once funding has ended. This may include certificates,	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year 2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year	See A5 for additional budget details
will be maintained at the school level. Staff members will continue to be recognized with local incentives once funding has	2012-2013 School Year	

**Attachment 2d - Transformation Model** 

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:	Timeline:	Budget:
The Paulding County School District will continue to provide high quality professional learning for all schools in the district. The district-wide training will continue to support teacher development. These initiatives are in year two implementation in the 2011-2012 school year and are specific to the District Improvement Plan to meet District AYP goals. These are specific teachers involved in these initiatives and not all teachers.	2011-2012 School Year and continue as the district continues	Sub money from local professional learning budgets
The Workshop Model-select     Math I and Math II teachers to     refine strategies from year one		
Meeting the Needs of Diverse     Learners-Diversity contacts will be     trained to support teachers with     identifying the needs of diverse     learners and providing strategies to     support those needs		
Co-Teaching Support for co- teaching partners		
Common Core GPS Training-the State will redeliver the training to teachers via webinars and some face-to-face		
Advanced Mathematical Decision     Making (AMDM) - 4 <sup>th</sup> year math     option – Redelivery of State training     to AMDM teacher		
MSP Content Training-select Biology teachers will attend		

-		
In addition to district-wide training. PCHS participate in training specific to the SIG model. This includes, but not limited to:		
<ul> <li>Partial Class Keys training. The staff will be trained in the Standards Based Instruction and Assessment pieces of the CLASS Keys during the 2011-2012 school year. This training will be delivered by local district and state representatives.</li> </ul>	2011-2012 School Year	See A2 for Budget Details
Revised of CLASS Keys Training implementation will occur after the revised model is released. This will occur during the 2012-2013 school year. The training will be delivered by state School Improvement Department.	2012-2013 School Year	See A2 for Budget Details
• Final implementation of CLASS Keys will occur during the second year.	2013-2014 School Year	See A2 for Budget Details
The administrative team and the Executive Director of Secondary Schools will study the Standards-based Instruction and Assessment Strands of the Leader Keys during the first year.	2011-2012 School Year	
The Administrative team and Executive Director of Secondary Schools will be trained on the Revised Leader Keys and implement during second year.	2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year	
The Leader Keys will be utilized for evaluation and establishing professional growth goals for administrative staff.		
• Select staff members will be training on Thinking Maps. They will	Summer 2012	\$40,000.00 for training materials

•	t 1003(g) - LEA Applicatio	11 2011
redeliver the training to each of their team members. The initial training will be delivered by State School Improvement Department during the summer of 2012.		
<ul> <li>Select staff members will be trained in implementation of the Small Schools/Magnet Schools Model. This will be part of a three year</li> </ul>	Summer 2012	\$1,500.00 stipend for extended learning day for teachers (10 teachers)
agreement with the Southern Regional Education Board who will provide a School Improvement	2012-2013 School Year	\$2,600.00 – Substitute cost for 4 days of training (10 teachers)
Coach (SIC) to conduct training and assistance to the leadership team during implementation.	2013-20114 School Year	\$2,600.00-Substitute cost for 4 days of training (10 teachers)
SREB will provide a Literacy, Math, and Science Coach to work with the school level academic coaches and	2011-2012 School Year	\$12,900.00 stipend for extended day for teachers (86 teachers)
selected teachers through a professional learning communities. The SREB Literacy Coach will focus on reading and writing across	2012-2013 School Year	\$22,360.00-Substitute cost for 4 days of training (86 teachers)
the curriculum. The SREB Math Coach will work with the school math coach and math teachers. The		\$12,900.00 stipend for extended day for teachers (86 teachers)
SREB Science Coach will work with science teachers. The two coaches will focus on numeracy across the curriculum. Each coach		\$22,360.00-Substitute cost for 4 days of training (86 teachers)
will train, model, and coach teachers.	2013-2014 School Year	\$12,900.00 stipend for extended day for teachers (86 teachers)
The SREB agreement will also include a coach to assist with rigor development and training for the	2011-2012 School Year	\$22,360.00-Substitute cost for 4 days of training (86 teachers)
staff of the Magnet program. In addition to coaching, they will work with the Family and Community	2012-2012 School Year	
Outreach Coordinator and the counseling department to develop an effective transition program for middle-to-high and high-to-postsecondary.	2013-2014 School Year	

Implementing a Magnet prog	ram 2011-2012 School Year-	2011-2012
will address the need to incre student achievement from the to the exceeds category as we address the number of Webb' 1 level activities occurring in classrooms. In addition to macademic goals, the Magnet S is assist with addressing scho cultural concerns from the community, parents, and teac well.	Planning Year  Planning Year  Planning Year  2012-2013 School Year- First Year of Implementation	\$479,741.00 for Science, Research and Medical Equipment- Items may include Baby-9 month, Blood Pressure cuffs, Stethoscope, Hemoscentrifuge, Burners, Balances, Scales, Incubator, Wheel Chair, Microscopes, Thermometers, and various medical and scientific equipment.
		2012-2013
		\$250,000.00 Medical and Science Supplies
		\$250,000.00 Medical and Scientific Equipment
		2012-2013
		\$250,000.00 Medical and Science Supplies
		\$250,000.00 Medical and Scientific Equipment
Staff members will be support with receiving gifted training certification and AP updated training, or reading endorsem sponsored by NWGARESA and training are sponsored by NWGARESA and training are sponsored by NWGARESA.	AP 2011-2012 School Year ent	\$8,000.00 for registration and travel cost
College Board. As the Magn Program is implemented it was an additional grade level of to each year – beginning the first	et 2012-2013 School Year achers	\$8,000.00 for registration and travel cost
with approximately five teach AP training and five for Endorsements. We will add teachers each year.	2013-2014 School Year	\$8,000.00 for registration and travel cost

School improvement Gran		1
<ul> <li>Selected staff members will attend Summer Leadership Academy to assist the leadership team with</li> </ul>	2011-2012 School Year	\$18,500 for registration and travel cost
implementation of school improvement grant goals. This conference will include review of	2012-2013 School Year	\$5,400 Stipend for teachers
data, assessment of root causes, and establishing plan-do-check-act cycles of improvement planning.	2012 2014 Salaral Warn	\$18,500 for registration and travel cost
	2013-2014 School Year	\$5,400 Stipend for teachers
		\$18,500 for registration and travel cost
		\$5,400 Stipend for teachers
The SREB annual conferences will be attended by selected members	Summer 2012	\$11,000.00 for travel cost
from the school and district personnel to support the magnet program. This conference will provide opportunities to network,	Summer 2013	\$11,000.00 for travel cost
and learn from schools and districts with similar programs.	Summer 2014	\$11,000.00 for travel cost
Both the leadership team and the SREB conference team will redeliver the content to whole school where appropriate.		
<ul> <li>Teachers will be provided technology training which includes initial implementation and follow-up sharing of lessons and activities.</li> <li>This training will be in the use of</li> </ul>	2011-2012 SMART Board and Response System Training	\$0.00 – District trainers will provide the training
SMART boards and response systems for checkpoint assessments.  Document Camera training will occur during the second year of the	2012-2013 Document Camera Training	See section C for cost of equipment
grant. This will be a phase in process beginning with the science teachers.	2013-2014 Full Implementation	

A5. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
PCHS will implement an incentive program that will allow the principal to recruit, place, and retain staff with skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school. The incentives	Incentives will be awarded at the end of each school year, beginning 2011-2012 school year	
<ul> <li>will include:</li> <li>Magnet School teachers will be recruited throughout and outside the</li> </ul>	2011-2012 School Year	\$2,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-5 teachers/year)
district. A signing bonus will be offered to any teacher agreeing teach in the Magnet Program if they meet all certification requirements	2012-2013 School Year	\$2,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-5 teachers/year)
prior to the beginning of the school year in which they sign their contract.	20131-2014 School Year	\$2,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-5 teachers/year)
Teachers will need additional certifications to teach honors and advanced placement courses. Any teacher who is currently employed by the school who completes a	2011-2012 School Year	\$7,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-15 teachers/year)
certification program to instruct honors and advanced placement courses will receive an incentive at	2012-2013 School Year	\$7,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-15 teachers/year)
the completion of the program. Students who are not in honors and advanced placement courses may also benefit from the increased rigor in their classrooms, therefore the incentive will be provided to any teacher who completes the program whether or not they teach honors and advanced placement.	20131-2014 School Year	\$7,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teacher-15 teachers/year)
Teachers will be asked to complete a variety of professional learning	2011-2012 School Year	\$45,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teachers/year)
opportunities throughout the term of the grant as outlined above in section A4. Each teacher will be asked to attend training, but also to	2012-2013 School Year	\$45,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teachers/year)

implement strategies in their classrooms. At the conclusion of	20131-2014 School Year	¢45,500,001
each professional learning opportunity, an implementation contract will be developed for teachers. Each teacher completing their implementation plan will receive an incentive.	20131-2014 SCHOOL Teal	\$45,500.00 bonus (\$500.00/teachers/year)

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.

Timeline:	Budget:
2011-2012 School Year	\$115,292.00 – SREB Contract
2012-2013 School Year	\$93,555.00 – SREB Contract
20131-2014 School Year	\$72,267.00-SREB
	Contract
	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year

School Improvement Gran	t 1003(g) - LEA Application	n 2011
science field. Students design and		
implement research projects throughout the		
program. Areas of research include, but are		
not limited to, life sciences, physics,		
chemistry, technology, and biotechnology.		
The capstone of the Magnet program is a		
medical science research project that is		
formally presented to faculty, students,		
parents and mentors during the senior year.  Resources will be purchased to support the		
development and implementation of the		
program.		
program.		
SREB will work with the school in its		
implementation of the Small Schools		
concept through providing a School Improvement Coach and a Rigor Coach.		
The two coaches will work closely with the		
school leadership team, the School		
Improvement Specialist and the selected		
Magnet program teachers.		
The Magnet will have high academic	2011-2012	
achievement expectations, therefore, will	2011-2012	
meet the schools need to increase rigor,		
increase meet schools to exceed scores.		
The program will work to increase		
engagement of students in a meaningful		
program.		
A Magnet Advisory Board will be		
established to work together to guide the		
direction and provide coordination with		
professionals and higher institutions. The district Chamber office, as well as, local		
medical facilities and businesses will		
become partners.		
Parameter.		
Each year, the Magnet School will accept		
approximately 100 new freshmen.		
Magnet students will be required to		
maintain a B average in science and math		

classes.

School improvement Gran	t 1003(g) - LEA Applicatio	11 2011
What makes a Magnet program different than other specialized programs? The acceleration, depth, and breadth of the curriculum and the integration of technology help set apart the Magnet from other specialized programs. Moreover, the student's senior year research and related internship go far beyond the normal scope of traditional and specialized programs. Students have the opportunity to become involved in nationally recognized competitions such as the Siemens-Westinghouse, Intel Talent Search, BEST Robotics and FIRST Robotics competitions. The fact that students are also able to participate in all other facets of a traditional high school education is an added bonus.  AP exams PSAT and SAT exams will be a measure for success of the Magnet Program. Therefore students will be provided exam fees for the cost of one AP exam per year as well as provided SAT Preparation Materials and Courses.	2011-2012 School Year 2012-2013 School Year 2013-2014 School Year	\$20,795.00 for tests and materials \$20,000.00 for test and materials \$20,000.00 for test and materials
Increased Rigor for All Students  All students will be encouraged to enroll in courses with increased rigor. This will help to increase overall performance and prepare students for a career after high school. The SREB Literacy, Math and Science coaches will work with the two school academic coaches to provide support for teachers to increase the rigor of all classroom instruction. Supplemental classroom resources will be purchased to support that instruction.	2013-2014 School Year	

#### **RTI**

In addition to the coaches working with teachers to improving classroom instruction, the Paulding County School District has also put into place a mechanism to support students that may struggle. The RTI process has been established and utilizes the state 4 Tier model of Intervention.

- Tier 1: Performance Based Instruction for ALL Students will be supported by the SREB coaches and the school academic coaches. All students will be tested on the district benchmarks. The analysis of the benchmarks and state assessments will be used to determine the next step of intervention if needed.
- Tier 2: Targeted Intervention If a student is not successful in Tier 1 a targeted intervention will be discussed. This intervention could occur during extended learning time as well as classroom interventions. Students will be assessed formally and informally for progress monitoring and teams will meet to problem solve to tailor interventions to the needs of the student. Teacher will complete a student profile and the Eight Ares of Learning Checklist. Parents must also be contacted to share concerns. The team will assess progress after 9 weeks and determine next steps. Student progress is tracked through an electronic system called EdPlan.
- Tier 3: Intensive Interventions SST. If a student is not successful in Tier 2, the School Based Intervention Team (SBIT) will meet to identify an intensive intervention to meet the needs of the student. Documentation will be kept for 12 weeks and progress will be charted. This will be included in the SST file. Parents must be contacted and invited to

Ongoing

School Improvement Gran	t 1005(g) - LEA Applicatio	11 2011
the meeting. The SBIT will review data and determine next steps.		
Tier 4: Special Education Services –     Individual Education Plan (IEP) – If a     student has not had success in any of the     tiers, SBIT can recommend a referral to     Special Education.		
Family & Community Support		\$2,000.00 – Video
The Counseling Department and the Family and Community Outreach Coordinator will work with each feeder pattern school to introduce the concepts and provide guidance for their high school career. A video will be produced and shown to students in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade describing the Magnet program and process for enrollment. Students will be provided an advisement night for Q & A. A planning guide and handbook for students will be provided for choices in course selection. A summer camp will be provided to ensure a smooth transition between middle school and the Magnet Program as well as the transition into high school.	Begin in 2011- 2012 and continue	S2,000.00 – Video Contract

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.

Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
PCHS will continue to analyze state assessments and district benchmark results to measure progress of students and compare growth of student to other students in the district and state. The staff will use a	Begin in the 2011-2012 school year and continue	\$22,360.00-4 Substitute days for 86 teacher
data analysis process to monitor student growth and plan for instruction. That process would consist of the following steps:	2012-2013	\$22,360.00-4 Substitute days for 86 teacher

	2011001 1111 <b>P</b> 10 (0110110 01 <b>1</b> 011	• 1000 (8) = 111 11 pp. 100010	11 - 0 - 1
•	Standardized assessments are evaluated for development of school improvement goals.	2013-2014	\$22,360.00-4 Substitute days for 86 teachers
•	District Benchmark Exams are given twice per year. First to determine what students know entering the courses so that adjustments can be made to instructional plans. Secondly, to measure where students are in meeting standard prior to standardized assessments.		
•	Checkpoints created by subject area teachers to be used as measures of meeting standards throughout a unit. The information is used to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each student. Checkpoints will be administered on response systems as well as a paper/pencil test. This will give teachers instant access to disaggregated data.		
•	Common lessons will be created with assignments to address what students should know, understand and be able to do.		
•	Monitor individual and collective results through data analysis of assessments and student work.		

A8. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice).			
Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:	
Due to recent budgetary constraints,			
Paulding County School District has			
operated with a reduced calendar for			
students and a reduced contract for teachers.			
Therefore, time for collaboration,			
remediation and enrichment has been			
limited. With the support of the SIG, PCHS			
will provide additional learning time for			
both students and teachers.			

Student's Extended Learning Time:  Opportunities for student learning will include a schedule that ensures maximum participation by providing a variety of opportunities to ensure that students who work or students who participate in extracurricular activities may still be afforded sessions needed:  • Beginning after the first grading period, before and after school enrichment and remediation sessions will be scheduled for two days per week. This will include all four content areas and specialized themes including GHSGT Test Prep. AP Test Prep, and SAT Test Prep. Students will be scheduled through an administrator.  • Intercessions will be held three times throughout the year – during a Fall Break (November), after the completion of first semester (December), and during a Winter Break (February). These sessions will include grade and credit recovery opportunities for specific course work in all four content areas as well as elective courses. Specialized enrichment sessions will include AP Test Prep and SAT Test Prep.  • Saturday School Sessions will be provided through-out the year and will be again scheduled for remediation opportunities as well as enrichment conportunities.			
include a schedule that ensures maximum participation by providing a variety of opportunities to ensure that students who work or students who participate in extracurricular activities may still be afforded sessions needed:  • Beginning after the first grading period, before and after school enrichment and remediation sessions will be scheduled for two days per week. This will include all four content areas and specialized themes including GHSGT Test Prep. AP Test Prep, and SAT Test Prep. Students will be scheduled through an administrator.  • Intercessions will be held three times throughout the year – during a Fall Break (November), after the completion of first semester (December), and during a Winter Break (February). These sessions will include grade and credit recovery opportunities for specific course work in all four content areas as well as elective courses. Specialized enrichment sessions will include AP Test Prep and SAT Test Prep.  • Saturday School Sessions will be provided through-out the year and will be again scheduled for remediation opportunities as well as	Student's Extended Learning Time:	2011-2012 School Year	
Beginning after the first grading period, before and after school enrichment and remediation sessions will be scheduled for two days per week. This will include all four content areas and specialized themes including GHSGT Test Prep, AP Test Prep, and SAT Test Prep. Students will be scheduled through an administrator.  Intercessions will be held three times throughout the year – during a Fall Break (November), after the completion of first semester (December), and during a Winter Break (February). These sessions will include grade and credit recovery opportunities for specific course work in all four content areas as well as elective courses. Specialized enrichment sessions will include AP Test Prep and SAT Test Prep.  Saturday School Sessions will be provided through-out the year and will be again scheduled for remediation opportunities as well as	include a schedule that ensures maximum participation by providing a variety of opportunities to ensure that students who work or students who participate in extracurricular activities may still be afforded	2012-2013 School Year	\$58,810.00 Tutorial
Because of the low Socio-Economic Status of the community at PCHS, transportation is an issue. Therefore, busses will run service to arterial stops for all extended learning sessions in order to maximize the number of students attending. Instruction in	<ul> <li>Beginning after the first grading period, before and after school enrichment and remediation sessions will be scheduled for two days per week. This will include all four content areas and specialized themes including GHSGT Test Prep, AP Test Prep, and SAT Test Prep. Students will be scheduled through an administrator.</li> <li>Intercessions will be held three times throughout the year – during a Fall Break (November), after the completion of first semester (December), and during a Winter Break (February). These sessions will include grade and credit recovery opportunities for specific course work in all four content areas as well as elective courses. Specialized enrichment sessions will include AP Test Prep and SAT Test Prep.</li> <li>Saturday School Sessions will be provided through-out the year and will be again scheduled for remediation opportunities as well as enrichment opportunities.</li> <li>Because of the low Socio-Economic Status of the community at PCHS, transportation is an issue. Therefore, busses will run service to arterial stops for all extended learning sessions in order to maximize the</li> </ul>	20131-2014 School Year	

Teacher Extended Learning Time: Opportunities for teacher learning will include:  • The equivalent of five additional days will be scheduled before pre-		
planning; after post-planning; and during the school year. This time will be utilized for delivery of professional learning. Because of the reduced contract time for	2011-2012 School Year	\$57,600.00 Stipends for staff members
teachers, there has not been professional learning days within the calendar. This will allow during the school day planning time to be	2012-2013 School Year	\$57,600.00 Stipends for staff members
The professional learning to be delivered will include collaborative work with SREB as outlined above; delivery of Webb's Depth of Knowledge and work within teams to review student work and students assessments to ensure rigor; delivery	20131-2014 School Year	\$57,600.00 Stipends for staff members
of Class Keys training; as well as the delivery of district initiatives.  Implementation contracts will be developed to ensure that		
professional learning is translated into changed practices in the classrooms. Administrators and coaches will conduct walk-throughs to observe practices in classrooms.		

### Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 2d - Transformation Model

A9. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.		t.
Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
PCHS will actively work with families and the community to support the needs of the students and school. PCHS will hire a Family and Community Outreach Coordinator. This person will work closely	2011-2012 Hire Family Community Coordinator once grant has been approved	\$80,000.00-annual salary cost for F/C Coordinator
with the counseling department to develop a program. The program will include the following activities:	2012-2013	\$80,000.00-annual salary cost for F/C Coordinator
Develop a mentor program. The Family and Community Outreach Coordinator (FCOC) with the help of the counselors will identify students that are considered "at risk" based on the state checklist. Once	2013-2014	\$80,000.00-annual salary cost for F/C Coordinator
the students have been identified, the FCOC will recruit community members to serve as mentors. The mentors will then be trained and assigned to selected students. The	Develop the program during the fall of 2011- 2012 school year	\$10,000.000 for training kits per year
FCOC will follow-up with students and mentors monthly to ensure a good matching. The FCOC will also track student progress through	Begin implementation during the second semester of the 2011- 2012 school year	
grades and test scores. At the end of the year, the FCOC will survey both mentor and student and compare that to the student achievement data	2012-2013	\$10,000.00 for training materials
to determine the effectiveness of the program	2013-2014	\$10,000.00 for training materials
Create a Parent Resource Center that will proved materials for families to support academic and family needs. This resource center will give	2011-2012	\$5,000.00 for materials
parents access to a computer and the internet to research information to address family needs. It will also	2012-2013	\$5,000.00 for materials
include information from various organizations that can support the family. The resource center will	2013-2014	\$5,000.00 for materials

•	
2011-2012	\$5,000.00 for speakers
2012-2013	\$5,000.00 for speakers
2013-2014	\$5,000.00 for speakers
2011-2012	\$5,000.00 for transition materials
	\$10,400.00 Supplemental salary for Advisory meeting
2012-2013	\$5,000.00 for transition materials
2013-2014	\$10,400.00 Supplemental salary for Advisory meeting \$5,000.00 for transition materials
	2012-2013 2013-2014 2011-2012 2012-2013

The assignment of student	======================================	\$10,400.00
o The assignment of student		, and the second
buddies.		Supplemental salary
Work closely with the community		for Advisory meeting
through an advisory board. A		
community advisory board will be		
developed to support the		
development of the Magnet program		
and support the school. The		
advisory board will consist of		
members from the Chamber of		
Commerce, WellStar Medical		
Group, Post Secondary Schools, the		
school, and the school district. The		
function of the advisory board is to		
provide coordination with		
professionals and higher institutions.		
They will also, provide feedback on		
areas to address within the program.		
areas to address within the program.		
<ul> <li>Work with post-secondary entities to</li> </ul>		
provide opportunities for students to	2011-2012	
seek career options. The FCOC will		\$860 transportation
work collaboratively with the		cost for college field
counseling department to host career		trips (2)
fairs and college fairs. The FCOC		
will also work with. The FCOC and		
counselors will also work with		
parents to help them with the	2012 2012	\$1,720 transportation
application process or other options	2012-2013	cost for college field
		_
for their students. The FCOC will		trips (4)
also develop as transition program		
from high school to college. This		
will include college campus visits;		
opportunities to meet with an		
admissions officer; and	2013-2014	Φ2.500
opportunities to hear from former	2013-2014	\$2,580 transportation
high school students currently in		cost for college field
college.		trips (6)
The Family and Community Coordinator		
will work closely with the counseling		
department to continue the program once		
the SIG funding is complete. PCHS will		
also work with the community to develop		
continued support for college/career fairs		
and field trips.		
_		

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.

Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
The Paulding County School District will provide necessary support to the school leadership allowing sufficient operational	2011-2012	
flexibility to implement the transformation model of the small school concept to	2012-2013	
improve student achievement and increasing graduation rate.	2013-2014	
This flexibility will include five extra days for staff to train, plan and prepare for instruction.		See A4 for Extended Learning Days for Teachers
It will also include the opportunity to provide transportation for students to attend the extended learning opportunities.		See A8 for Extended Learning Days for Students
An application process will be established to staff the Magnet program. PCHS and other local and outside staff will have to apply for the positions in the program. This will eliminate the random request for transfers to PCHS.		
The current District's RIF Policy takes into consideration the following:		
<ul> <li>The person's expertise, effectiveness, and overall job performance of individual employees reflected in annual evaluations.</li> </ul>		
The Superintendent's own observation and knowledge of the employee.		
Only where demonstrated		

competence and expertise are equal	
among employees shall other factors	
such as tenure status, level of	
certification, and length of	
continuous service with the District	
be considered in order to make	
recommendations for the	
termination or downgrading of an	
employee's position.	

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).

Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
The Paulding County School District will hire a School Improvement Specialist (SIS) to monitor and support the work of the instructional program. Must have 10	2011-2012 - Hire SIS once grant has been approved.	\$85,000 annual salary cost for SIS
successful years as an educator and administrative experience is requested. This person will work closely with the	2012-2013	\$85,000 annual salary cost for SIS
SREB coach, PCHS's leadership team and the district leadership to ensure the integrity of the work is done.	2013-2014	\$85,000 annual salary cost for SIS
SREB will provide training and support for the SIS and the school leadership team. This training will include leadership skills, establishing professional learning communities, and the development of the Magnet program. The SREB coach, SIS, building leadership and district leadership will meet monthly to monitor the work. This person will also be responsible for maintaining data and completing report required for the grant. This person will also support the development of the building leadership team so the work can continue once the grant is complete.		See A6 for Budget Details

Street market street	(8) === <b>F</b> F	
B. Conduct a rigorous review process to recruit, screen, and select an external provider to ensure quality.		
Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
Do not complete this section. This item does not apply to the transformation model.		
B-1. Describe proposed activities to be carried including a proposed budget.	d out during the pre-implem	entation period,
There are no pre-implementation activities.	Timeline:	Budget
C. Align additional resources with the interve	entions.	
Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
PCHS will use the SIG funds to provide the following additional resources to support the initiative.  Hire two academic coaches to work with the teachers. The coaches will have content knowledge and a success record with student achievement. One coach will focus on English/ Language Arts and ELA teachers, but will work with all teachers on literacy. The other	2011-2012 Hire two academic coaches 2012-2013	\$85,000.00/per coach- (\$170,000.00 annual salary cost of two academic coaches) \$85,000.00/per coach- (\$170,000.00 annual
will focus on mathematic and work closely with math teachers, but will work with the all teachers on numeracy		salary cost of two academic coaches)
across the curriculum. The District has Curriculum Coordinators for all subject areas. These coordinators will continue to work with all teachers in conjunction with the two academic coaches to ensure the alignment of the activities with the district goals and priorities and the school's initiatives. The coach will be responsible for training, coaching, and modeling best practices for all teachers at PCHS. The coaches will also be responsible for developing department chairs to sustain the support	2013-2014	\$85,000.00/per coach- (\$170,000.00 annual salary cost of two academic coaches)

	t 1003(g) - LEA Applicatio	
after the grant is complete.		
Observation data and focus group feedback indicated a lack of technology in the classroom. In odder to increase the use of technology, additional SMART technology will be purchased to increase student engagement. The infusion of technology will phase in over time. The initial purchase will be additional SMART boards and three sets of response systems per team to be shared. Additional sets will be purchased in years two and three.	2011-2012 school year 2011-2012 – Training	\$203,290 Total cost of SMART Boards and 30 Response Systems \$75,000.00 Waters Boxes, Wireless Access Points, and other infrastructural
Document cameras will also be purchased in year two and used in the science classes. Additional Document Cameras will be purchased for use in other subject areas. Training on the use will occur for teachers as outlined in section A4. Funds will also be for infrastructural changes that need to be made to support the technology.	2012-2013 – Implementation 2013-2014	s60,000.00 Document Cameras and Response Systems  \$60,000.00 Document Cameras and Response Systems
The school has limited general computer labs to use for instruction. Purchase mobile labs to provide additional opportunities for students to use technology within the classroom to demonstrate learning. One lab per	2011-2012 2012-2013	\$202,100.00-Cost of 10 Mobile Labs and wireless access points, one for each department \$20,000.00 additional
hallway will be purchased and checked out for use.	2013-2014	Laptops \$20,000.00 additional Laptops
Supplemental materials will be purchased to use within the classroom to support the increased rigor. These items may include novel sets, calculators, software, manipulatives for all subject areas, and teacher resources.	2011-2012	\$50,000.00 resource materials for Subject area teams (\$5,000/team-10 teams)
	2012-2013	\$50,000.00 resource materials for Subject area teams

<u> </u>	\ <b>O</b> /	
		(\$5,000/team-10 teams)
	2013-2014	\$50,000.00 resource materials for Subject area teams (\$5,000/team-10 teams)

### **Attachment 2d - Transformation Model**

D. Modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable the school to implement the interventions fully and effectively.		
Actions: Modify policies to allow application and transportation for students to attend Magnet Program. We currently have a school choice policy that will need to be amended.	Timeline: Fall of 2011	Budget: \$0 – The district will pick up the transportation cost.

E. Sustain the reform after the funding period ends.		
Actions:	Timeline:	Budget:
The Paulding County High School Transformation School Improvement Plan is to build capacity within the staff and create a culture of high performance and pride. The activities described in this plan will provide intense professional learning with implementation support during the grant period. The grant supported positions will be eliminated once the grant funding has ended, therefore the work to develop the leadership team and department chairs will sustain the support and continue the monitoring once the grant supported positions are gone. The district leadership will also continue to	Beginning during the 2011-2012 school year and continue	\$0

School improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011		11 2011
provide support and monitoring of the school's progress. This will be a change in		
the culture of the school developing a		
distributive leadership attitude toward		
accomplishing the school's goals.		
The counseling department will maintain		
the work of the Family and Community		
Outreach Coordinator with community		
support created through the development of		
the program. The Magnet Advisory Board		
developed to provide guidance and support		
for the Magnet school will continue to function as an outside entity to help monitor		
the progress of the program. The school,		
district leadership along with the counseling		
department will continue to work with this		
group as the program continues to grow.		
All resources, equipment and materials		
purchased will be the property of the school		
and replaced as needed.		
It is the desire and the commitment of the		
Paulding County School District to ensure		
the success of the school and will provide		
support even after the completion of the		
grant.		

**Attachment 2d - Transformation Model** 

LEA Name: Paulding County School District

\_\_\_\_\_\_

School Name: Paulding County High School

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 GHSGT

2011-2012 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the percentage passing rate of all first time test takers on the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Literature EOCT or American Literature EOCT by 5%, over the 2010-2011 base line data.

2012-2013 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the percentage passing rate of all first time test takers on the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Literature EOCT or American Literature EOCT by 5%, over the 2011-2012 results.

2013-2014 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the percentage passing rate of all first time test takers on the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Literature EOCT or American Literature EOCT by 5%, over the 2012-2013 results.

#### **Mathematics GHSGT**

2011-2012 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the percentage passing of all first time test takers on the Mathematics I EOCT or the Mathematics II EOCT by 5%, over the 2010-2011 base line data.

2012-2013 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the percentage passing of all first time test takers on the Mathematics I EOCT or the Mathematics II EOCT by 5%, over the 2011-2012 results.

2013-2014 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the percentage passing of all first time test takers on the Mathematics I EOCT or the Mathematics II EOCT by 5%, over the 2012-2013 results.

#### **Graduation Rate**

2011-2012 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the graduation rate by 5%, over the 2010-2011 base

line data.

2012-2013 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the graduation rate by 5%, over the 2011-2012 results.

2013-2014 School Year

Paulding County High School will increase the graduation rate by 5%, over the 2012-2013 results.

### Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 3 - Tier III Schools

LEA Name:
School Name:
Describe the services the school will receive and/or the strategies the Tier III school will implement.
Paulding County School District does not have any Tier III schools.
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 III schools. Write the annual goals below.
Reading/English Language Arts
2010-2011 School Year
2011-2012 School Year
2012-2013 School Year
Mathematics
2010-2011 School Year
2011-2012 School Year
2012-2013 School Year

**Attachment 3 - Tier III Schools** 

Graduation Rate
2010-2011 School Year
2011-2012 School Year
2012-2013 School Year

**Attachment 4 - Budget Detail** 

LEA Name: Paulding County School District
School Served: Paulding County High School

Intervention Model: Transformation Model Tier Level: Tier II

Fiscal Year: July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012

<u>Instructions</u>: Please provide a comprehensive three-year budget for each school to be served with SIG funds. Each fiscal year should be represented by a separate budget detail page. Please provide an accurate description of the services, personnel, instructional strategies, professional learning activities, extended learning opportunities, contracted services, and any other costs associated with the implementation of the chosen intervention model. Please reference Appendix A.

0	bject Class	Item Description	Costs	
100	Personal	School Improvement Specialist Salary	61,200	
	Services	Family & Community Outreach Coordinator	57,600	
	(Salaries)	Math Coach	61,200	
		Literacy Coach	61,200	
		Substitutes for SREB training, teacher and		
		leader evaluation training, analyzing student		
		work (10 days per teacher)	55,200	
		Stipends for 5 days of Extended Learning Time		
		for teachers (96 teachers)	72,000	
		Stipend for Leadership Academy teachers	5,400	
		Bus Driver salary for tutoring days	21,200	
		Bus Driver salary for college field trips (2 trips)	240	
		Salaries for Tutors for Extended Learning Time		
		for Students	14,800	
		Incentive and Reward Pay for Certified and		
		Classified Staff (See A5)	164,500	
		Salaries for Teachers and Counselors working		
		8 <sup>th</sup> Advisement Night (See A6)	8,125	Object Total
				\$ 582,665
200	Benefits	School Improvement Specialist Salary	23,800	
		Family & Community Outreach Coordinator	22,400	
		Math Coach	23,800	
		Literacy Coach	23,800	
		Substitutes for SREB training, teacher and		
		leader evaluation training, analyzing student		
		work (10 days per teacher)	4,600	
		Stipends for 5 days of Extended Learning Time		
		for teachers (96 teachers)	20,160	
		Stipend for Leadership Academy teachers	1,512	
		Bus Driver salary for tutoring days	2,650	

•	Sc	hool Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Applica	1	•
		Bus Driver salary for college field trips	120	
		Salaries for Tutors for Extended Learning Time		
		for the Students	4,144	
		Incentive and Reward Pay for Certified and		
		Classified Staff (See A5)	46,060	
		Salaries for Teachers and Counselors working		
		8 <sup>th</sup> Advisement Night (See A6)	2,275	Object Total
				\$ 175,321
300	Purchased	SREB consultant contract	115,292	,
		Contract to create a Transition video to be used	,	
	<b>Professional</b>	at 8 <sup>th</sup> grade advisement	2,000	
	& Technical	Speakers for Parent Workshops	5,000	Object Total
			- ,	\$ 122,292
		Travel cost for Leadership Academy and SREB		Ψ 122,272
500	Other	Conferences	12,000	
200	Purchased	Transportation mileage for tutoring buses	901	
	Turchascu	Transportation mileage for college field trip	701	
	Services	buses	500	
	Services	Travel cost for AP training and Endorsement	300	
		classes for 10 teachers	3,000	Object Total
		classes for To teachers	3,000	Object Total
				\$ 16,401
600	Supplies	Observation Software	1,695	
		Training materials	10,000	
		Supplemental Resources for each subject area		
		(\$5,000/team, 10 teams)	50,000	
		Parent Resource Center – Books, pamphlets,		
		school tools to check out	5,000	
		Parent workshop materials- Booklets and		
		support materials	5,000	
		Mentor materials – Training Kits	10,000	
		Assessment materials such as common	,	
		assessments, AP exams, PSAT Exams, and SAT		
		Prep materials	20,795	
		Student support materials for transition activities	5,000	
		Student support materials for tutoring	5,000	Object Total
		Student support inmerius for tweeting	.,	\$ 117,490
700	Property	SMART Boards (65)	153,790	¥ 111,170
, , , ,	(Capitalized	SMART Response System (30 sets)	49,500	
	Equipment)	Observational Tool – (8) Tablets	3,200	
	Equipment)	Mobile Labs (10 laptop carts)	202,100	
		Wireless Access Ports, Drop Boxes, and Waters	202,100	
		Boxes to support the technology	75,000	
		Science, Research, and Medicals Equipment	75,000	
		1 2 2	470 741	Object Total
		(See A4)	479,741	<b>Object Total</b> \$ 963,331

800	Other	Leadership Academy registration(10 people)	17,500	
	<b>Objects</b>	AP training and Endorsement Training	5,000	
				Object Total
				\$ 22,500
900	Other			Object Total
	Uses			\$ -

**School Total** \$ 2,000,000

**Attachment 4 - Budget Detail** 

LEA Name: Paulding County School District
School Served: Paulding County High School

Intervention Model: Transformation Model

Tier Level: Tier II

Fiscal Year: July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013

<u>Instructions</u>: Please provide a comprehensive three-year budget for each school to be served with SIG funds. Each fiscal year should be represented by a separate budget detail page. Please provide an accurate description of the services, personnel, instructional strategies, professional learning activities, extended learning opportunities, contracted services, and any other costs associated with the implementation of the chosen intervention model. Please reference Appendix A.

Ol	bject Class	Item Description	Costs	
100	Personal	School Improvement Specialist Salary	61,200	
	Services	Family & Community Outreach Coordinator	57,600	
	(Salaries)	Math Coach	61,200	
		Literacy Coach	61,200	
		Substitutes for SREB training, teacher and		
		leader evaluation training, analyzing student		
		work (10 days per teacher)	55,200	
		Stipends for 5 days of Extended Learning Time		
		for teachers (96 teachers)	72,000	
		Stipend for Leadership Academy teachers	5,400	
		Bus Driver salary for tutoring days	21,200	
		Bus Driver salary for college field trips (4 trips)	480	
		Salaries for Tutors for Extended Learning Time		
		for Students	14,800	
		Incentive and Reward Pay for Certified and		
		Classified Staff (See A5)	164,500	
		Salaries for Teachers and Counselors working		
		8 <sup>th</sup> Advisement Night (See A6)	8,125	Object Total
				\$ 582,905
200	<b>Benefits</b>	School Improvement Specialist Salary	23,800	
		Family & Community Outreach Coordinator	22,400	
		Math Coach	23,800	
		Literacy Coach	23,800	
		Substitutes for SREB training, teacher and		
		leader evaluation training, analyzing student		
		work	4,600	
		Stipends for 5 days of Extended Learning Time		
		for teachers	18,060	
		Stipend for Leadership Academy teachers	1,512	

	50	hool Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Applica	1	I
		Bus Driver salary for tutoring days	2,650	-
		Bus Driver salary for college field trips	240	<u> </u>
		Salaries for Tutors	4,144	<u> </u>
		Incentive and Reward Pay for Certified and Classified Staff (See A5)	46,060	
			40,000	-
		Salaries for Teachers and Counselors working 8 <sup>th</sup> Advisement Night (See A6)	2,275	Object Total
		o ravisement right (Sec 110)	2,273	\$ 125,246
300	Purchased	SREB consultant contract	93,555	\$ 123,240
500	Professional	Speakers for Parent Workshops	5,000	Object Total
	& Technical	Speakers for raient workshops	3,000	\$ 98,555
	& Technical	Travel cost for Leadership Academy and SREB		φ 90,333
500	Other	Conferences	12,000	
300	Purchased		901	-
	i urchaseu	Transportation mileage for tutoring buses  Transportation mileage for college field trip	701	1
	Services	buses	1.000	Object Total
	SCI VICES	Travel Cost for AP Training and Endorsements	1,000 3,000	j Object Total
		Traver Cost for AF Training and Endorsements	3,000	¢ 12 001
(00	G I'	Observation Coffees	1.605	\$ 13,901
600	Supplies	Observation Software	1,695	-
		Training materials-Thinking Maps	40,000	
		Supplemental resources for each subject area	50,000	
		(\$5,000/team – 10 teams) (See A6)	50,000	-
		Parent Resource Center	5,000	
		Parent workshop materials	5,000	
		Mentor materials	5,000	1
		Assessment materials such as common		
		assessments, AP exams, PSAT exams, and SAT	20.000	
		Prep materials	20,000	
		Student support materials for transition activities	5,000	-
		Student support materials for tutoring	5,000	1
		Consumable materials for Science, Research &	250 000	
		Medicine Magnet program (See A4)	250,000	Object Total
-0.5			20.000	\$ 386,695
<b>700</b>	Property	Mobile Labs – add laptops to carts	20,000	
	(Capitalized	SMART Document Cameras - 15	10,500	<u> </u>
		Science, Research, and Medical Equipment (See		
	<b>Equipment</b> )	A4)	250,000	
		SMART Response System – 30 sets	49,500	
				Object Total
				\$ 330,000

	Scn	<u> 1001 Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Applicati</u>	<u>on 2011</u>	
800	Other	Leadership Academy registration(10 people)	17,500	
		Registration for AP Training and Endorsements		
	<b>Objects</b>	- 10	5,000	
	-			<b>Object Total</b>
				\$ 22,500
900	Other			
	Uses			
				<b>Object Total</b>
				\$ -
		School Total		\$ 1 262 802

**Attachment 4 - Budget Detail** 

LEA Name: Paulding County School District
School Served: Paulding County High School

Intervention Model: Transformation Model

Tier Level: Tier II

Fiscal Year: July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014

<u>Instructions</u>: Please provide a comprehensive three-year budget for each school to be served with SIG funds. Each fiscal year should be represented by a separate budget detail page. Please provide an accurate description of the services, personnel, instructional strategies, professional learning activities, extended learning opportunities, contracted services, and any other costs associated with the implementation of the chosen intervention model. Please reference Appendix A.

$\mathbf{O}$	bject Class	Item Description	Costs	
100	Personal	School Improvement Specialist Salary	61,200	
	Services	Family & Community Outreach Coordinator	57,600	
	(Salaries)	Math Coach	61,200	
		Literacy Coach	61,200	
		Substitutes for SREB training, teacher and		
		leader evaluation training, analyzing student		
		work (10 days per teacher)	55,200	
		Stipends for 5 days of Extended Learning Time		
		for teachers (96 teachers)	72,000	
		Stipend for Leadership Academy teachers	5,400	
		Bus Driver salary for tutoring days	21,200	
		Bus Driver salary for college field trips (6 trips)	720	
		Salaries for Tutors for Extended Learning Time		
		for Students	14,800	
		Incentive and Reward Pay for Certified and		
		Classified Staff (See A5)	164,500	
		Salaries for Teachers and Counselors working		
		8 <sup>th</sup> Advisement Night (See A6)	8,125	Object Total
				\$ 583,145
200	<b>Benefits</b>	School Improvement Specialist Salary	23,800	
		Family & Community Outreach Coordinator	22,400	
		Math Coach	23,800	
		Literacy Coach	23,800	
		Substitutes for SREB training, teacher and		
		leader evaluation training, analyzing student		
		work	4,600	
		Stipends for 5 days of Extended Learning Time		
		for teachers	18,060	
		Stipend for Leadership Academy teachers	1,512	
		Bus Driver salary for tutoring days	2,650	

	Be	Bus Driver salary for college field trips	360	1
		Salaries for Tutors	4,144	
		Incentive and Reward Pay for Certified and	1,111	
		Classified Staff (See A5)	46,060	
		Salaries for Teachers and Counselors working	10,000	1
		8 <sup>th</sup> Advisement Night (See A6)	2,275	Object Total
		o ravisement rught (see 110)	2,273	\$ 125,366
300	Purchased	SREB consultant contract	72,267	Ψ 123,300
500	Professional	Speakers for Parent Workshops	5,000	
	& Technical	Speakers for raient workshops	3,000	Object Total
	& Teenmean			\$ 77,267
		Travel cost for Leadership Academy and SREB		\$ 77,207
500	Other	Conferences	12,000	
500	Purchased	Transportation mileage for tutoring buses	901	1
	Furchaseu	Transportation mileage for college field trip	901	1
	Services	buses	1500	Object Total
	Set vices	Travel for AP Training and Endorsements	3,000	j Object Total
		Traver for AP Training and Endorsements	3,000	¢ 17 401
<b>600</b>	G 1		1.607	\$ 17,401
600	<b>Supplies</b>	Observation Software	1,695	
		Training materials – to complete programs		
		_Thinking Maps, CLASS Keys, Leader Keys,	20,000	
		Magnet Program	30,000	
		Supplemental Resources for each subject area	50.000	
		(\$5,000/team – 10 teams)	50,000	
		Parent Resource Center	5,000	_
		Parent workshop materials	5,000	_
		Mentor materials	5,000	
		Assessment materials such as common		
		assessments, AP exams, PSAT exams, and SAT		
		Prep materials	20,000	
		Student support materials for transition activities	5,000	
		Student support materials for tutoring	5,000	
		Consumable materials for Science, Research &		
		Medicine Magnet Program (See A4)	150,000	Object Total
				\$ 276,695
<b>700</b>	<b>Property</b>	Mobile Labs – add laptops to carts	20,000	
	(Capitalized	SMART Document Cameras – 15	10,500	
		Science, Research, and Medical Equipment (See		
	<b>Equipment</b> )	A4)	100,000	
		SMART Response Systems – 30 sets	49,500	]
				Object Total
				\$ 180,000

800	Other	Leadership Academy registration(10 people)	17,500	
	<b>Objects</b>	Registration for AP Training and Endorsements	5,000	
				Object Total
				\$ 22,500
900	Other			
	Uses			
				Object Total
				\$ -

**School Total** \$ 1,120,374

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 4 - Budget Template

		LEA	BUDGET		
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre- Implementation	Year 1 – Full Implementation			
School Name: Paulding County High School	\$0	\$2,000,000.00  To development of the program	\$1,262,802 First year of implementation of the program	\$1,120,374  Full implementation of the program	
Name School					
Name					
LEA- level Activities	\$0. Support the scl	.00 nool leadership	\$0.00  Monitor and support the program	\$0.00  Monitor and support the program	
Total Budget	\$2,000	,000.00	\$1,262,802	\$1,120,374	\$4,383,176

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 5 - Checklist

Section A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED	
The chart is complete:	
✓ All Tier I, II, and III schools are identified.	
✓ Intervention models are selected for each Tier I and Tier II school.	
✓ If more than nine schools will be served, only 50 percent or less has selected the transformation model.	
✓ An explanation for the Tier I schools that the LEA is not applying to serve has been provided.	

Section B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	
<ol> <li>Data Sources and Narrative</li> <li>✓ All sections of the School Profile are complete (Attachment 1a: Elementary School Profile, Attachment 1b: Middle School Profile, Attachment 1c: High School Profile). Minimum requirement</li> <li>✓ The narrative reflects the analysis of multiple sources of data to determine school needs. If the narrative reflects the analysis of additional sources of data, such as process, demographic and/or</li> </ol>	
<ul> <li>perception data, summary reports for the data must be attached to the application.</li> <li>✓ A rationale for selection of intervention model is provided.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Capacity</li> <li>✓ Description identifies multiple resources (e.g., human, material, technical, etc.) and related support (e.g., commitment of school board to remove barriers, credentials of staff, recruitment process, area technical colleges and universities, job-embedded professional learning, etc.).</li> <li>✓ Complete all parts of Section B. 2.</li> </ul>	
✓ Attachment 7a: Capacity Factor Chart, Attachment 7b: Restructuring Team Checklist, and Attachment 7c: Selecting Turnaround Leaders are tools that you may use to assist in determining the LEA's capacity to provide adequate resources and related support.	
<ul> <li>✓ To ensure the quality of an external provider chosen by the LEA, the SEA will look for specific examples of the following actions for:         <ul> <li>Demonstrating capacity to devote staff, facilities, funding, services, and other resources exclusively to the management contracting function.</li> <li>Demonstrating flexibility in removing barriers for the contract schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Ensuring that the LEA's central office staff will support successful implementation of the contract.</li> </ul>	

**Attachment 5 – Checklist** 

<ul> <li>To ensure that the LEA will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively, the SEA will look for specific examples of the following actions for:</li> <li>Reviewing local board policies which would restrict a school's ability to implement requirements of the intervention models for Tier I and Tier II schools.</li> <li>Ensuring that the LEA's central office staff will support successful implementation of the interventions and school improvement strategies.</li> <li>Demonstrating flexibility in removing barriers that will interfere with the intervention models selected.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Description</li> <li>✓ The appropriate portion of Attachment 2 (2a: Turnaround Model, 2b: School Closure Model, 2c: Restart Model, 2d: Transformation Model) is complete and provides specific examples of actions that the LEA has taken or will take to implement the selected model for each Tier I and Tier II school applying for this grant.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>To ensure the quality of an external provider chosen by the LEA, the SEA will look for specific examples of the following actions for:</li> <li>Developing a written policy and procedure for selecting external providers and utilizing the process.</li> <li>Demonstrating that it has used a rigorous selection process to choose contract school providers, which will include: <ul> <li>A Public Notice of Intent process.</li> <li>An assessment of the applicant provider's knowledge of, skill with, and success rate related to the intervention model selected.</li> <li>A thorough review of each applicant's administrative, organizational structure, legal, and financial perspectives.</li> <li>Documentation that references have been contacted to verify prior successful implementation of the selected intervention model.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ensuring that the providers know how to choose and manage school leaders who have the competencies to work effectively in a reform environment.</li> <li>Clarifying the roles for the school provider and LEA that will be a part of the contract.</li> <li>Defining a process for cancelling the contract and restructuring when a contract provider is not successful.</li> <li>Including stakeholders such as parents and community groups throughout the entire process.</li> <li>Establishing clear goals and closely monitoring school performance.</li> <li>Establishing a clear timeframe for measuring gains in student achievement.</li> </ul>	

**Attachment 5 - Checklist** 

<ul> <li>To ensure alignment of other resources with the interventions, the SEA will look for specific examples of actions the LEA has taken or will take for:</li> <li>Developing a plan complete with strategies that focus on the individual school's student achievement needs.</li> <li>Ensuring Title I schoolwide schools are consolidating ESEA funds to upgrade the entire educational system of the school.</li> <li>Providing job-embedded professional learning for teachers.</li> <li>Ensuring that each school has developed the intervention model that aligns all funding available to the school to implement specific strategies.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>To ensure that reforms are sustained after the funding period ends, the SEA will review the LEA process for:</li> <li>Developing a plan with a timeline for continued implementation of the intervention strategies.</li> <li>Measuring progress and adjusting strategies that have not proven to be effective.</li> <li>Aligning funds to continue supporting successful intervention efforts and progress.</li> <li>Providing continued professional learning opportunities that link to</li> </ul>	
the intervention strategies and annual goals for student achievement.  4. Timeline  ✓ Found in Attachment 2 (2a: Turnaround Model, 2b: School Closure Model, 2c: Restart Model, 2d: Transformation Model), the timeline addresses implementation of the basic elements of the selected intervention model and ensures that the basic elements of the intervention model will be initiated by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year. The timeline provides a clear picture of implementation of the intervention model throughout the duration of the grant.	
<ul> <li>5. Annual Goals</li> <li>✓ Annual goals are written for student achievement on the State's assessments in Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. (LEAs applying for Tier I and Tier II schools have completed the portion of Attachment 2 that pertains to annual goals and LEAs applying for Tier III schools have completed Attachment 3.)</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Attachment 3.)</li> <li>✓ Annual goals are written for the graduation rate for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III high schools.</li> <li>✓ Annual goals are written for three years.</li> <li>✓ The annual goals are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time bound.</li> </ul>	_ 

**Attachment 5 - Checklist** 

<ul> <li>Tier III Schools</li> <li>✓ The services the school will receive and/or the activities the school will implement are clearly described in Attachment 3.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>7. Stakeholder Representation</li> <li>✓ Relevant stakeholders have been consulted regarding the LEA's application and plans for implementation of school improvement models selected for its Tier I and Tier II schools.</li> </ul>	
✓ Evidence is provided addressing stakeholder notification and involvement (e.g., agendas and minutes from school council meetings, web postings, newsletters, etc.).	
B-1. Pre-Implementation Activities and Budget	
✓ Pre-implementation activities are described.	
✓ A proposed budget is included.	
Section C. DEVELOP A BUDGET	
✓ The LEA has completed a budget on Attachments 4 and 4a for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school.	
Section D. ASSURANCES	
✓ The superintendent agrees to the assurances for the School Improvement Grant.	
Section E. WAIVERS	
✓ The superintendent agrees to the waivers included in the School Improvement Grant.	

### **Attachment 6 - Rubric**

			Attachment 6 - Rubric
CONCEPT	NOT EVIDENT	NEEDS REVISION	MEETS
Rationale	There is no evidence to support that data was analyzed to determine school needs and select the most appropriate intervention model.	Data has been collected; however, there is limited evidence that the data collected has been sufficiently analyzed to determine school needs resulting in the selection of an appropriate intervention model.	Sufficient data, including student achievement, process, demographic, and perception data, has been collected and analyzed to support the selection of the intervention model. The rationale clearly justifies the selection of the intervention model based on data analysis and school needs.
Capacity	There is no evidence in the application that indicates the LEA has the capacity to provide adequate resources and support too fully and effectively implement the intervention model selected.	Actions described in the application lack the detail necessary to ensure the LEA is prepared and committed to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model. More specific information regarding resources, support, and commitment is needed.	Actions described in the application indicate that the LEA is prepared and committed to provide the necessary resources and support to implement the selected intervention model fully and effectively. In addition, the application indicates the LEA is prepared and committed to provide the school sufficient operational flexibility to fully implement a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes.  To ensure the quality of an external provider chosen by the LEA, the SEA will look for specific examples of the following actions for:  • Demonstrating capacity to devote staff, facilities, funding, services, and other resources exclusively to the management contracting function.  • Demonstrating flexibility in removing barriers for the contract schools.  • Ensuring that the LEA's central office staff will support successful implementation of the contract.

CONCEPT	NOT EVIDENT	NEEDS REVISION	MEETS
Capacity			To ensure that the LEA will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively, the SEA will look for specific examples of the following actions for:  • Reviewing local board policies which would restrict a school's ability to implement requirements of the intervention models for Tier I and Tier II schools.  • Ensuring that the LEA's central office staff will support successful implementation of the interventions and school improvement strategies.  • Demonstrating flexibility in removing barriers that will interfere with the intervention models selected.

CONCEPT	NOT EVIDENT	NEEDS REVISION	MEETS
	There is no evidence in the	Actions described in the application	Actions described in the application reflect
	application that indicates	are not fully aligned with the final	comprehensive and strategic planning to
	implementation of the	requirements of the intervention	ensure implementation of the intervention
	intervention model has been	model selected. Actions lack	model. The actions described include specific
	thoroughly planned.	innovation and do not reflect a	processes and strategies that are aligned with
		strong focus on improving student	the final requirements of the intervention
		achievement.	model selected. The actions are innovative,
			comprehensive, and focus on improving
			student achievement.
			To ensure the quality of an external provider
			chosen by the LEA, the SEA will look for
			specific examples of the following actions
			for:
			Developing a written policy and
T 1			procedure for selecting external providers
Implementation			and utilizing the process.
			Demonstrating that it has used a rigorous  selection process to change contract.
			selection process to choose contract school providers, which will include:
			o A Public Notice of Intent process.
			o An assessment of the applicant
			provider's knowledge of, skill with,
			and success rate related to the
			intervention model selected.
			o A thorough review of each applicant's
			administrative, organizational
			structure, legal, and financial
			perspectives.
			<ul> <li>Documentation that references have</li> </ul>
			been contacted to verify prior
			successful implementation of the
			selected intervention model.

CONCEPT	NOT EVIDENT	NEEDS REVISION	MEETS
Implementation	NOT EVIDENT	NEEDS REVISION	<ul> <li>Ensuring that the providers know how to choose and manage school leaders who have the competencies to work effectively in a reform environment.</li> <li>Clarifying the roles for the school provider and LEA that will be a part of the contract.</li> <li>Defining a process for cancelling the contract and restructuring when a contract provider is not successful.</li> <li>Including stakeholders such as parents and community groups throughout the entire process.</li> <li>Establishing clear goals and closely monitoring school performance.</li> <li>Establishing a clear timeframe for measuring gains in student achievement.</li> <li>To ensure alignment of other resources with the interventions, the SEA will look for specific examples of actions the LEA has taken or will take for:</li> <li>Developing a plan complete with strategies that focus on the individual school's student achievement needs.</li> <li>Ensuring Title I schoolwide schools are consolidating ESEA funds to upgrade the entire educational system of the school.</li> <li>Providing job-embedded professional learning for teachers.</li> <li>Ensuring that each school has developed the intervention model that aligns all funding available to the school to implement specific strategies.</li> </ul>

CONCEPT	NOT EVIDENT	NEEDS REVISION	MEETS
Allocation of Funds	There is no evidence that sufficient funds are allocated to support implementation of the intervention model, and the actions and strategies funded do not align with the final requirements of the intervention model selected.	Funds are allocated to support the implementation of the intervention model; however, the actions and strategies funded are not consistently aligned to improving student achievement and/or the final requirements of the intervention model.	The actions and strategies funded directly support improving student achievement and are aligned to the final requirements of the intervention model. Funds allocated are sufficient to support implementation of the intervention model selected.
Sustainability	There is no evidence in the application that indicates actions will be taken to maintain implementation of the processes and strategies that positively impact student achievement.	An initial plan describes actions the LEA will take to maintain implementation of the processes and strategies required for the intervention model selected; however, the plan does not describe the specific actions the LEA will take after the funding period ends.	An initial plan describes actions the LEA will take to maintain implementation of the processes and strategies that positively impact student achievement. The plan identifies preliminary steps that will be taken to retain human, material, and financial resources after the funding period ends. In addition, the plan addresses LEA support (e.g., policies, professional learning opportunities, protected time, etc.) for the actions and strategies that positively impact student achievement.  To ensure that reforms are sustained after the funding period ends, the SEA will review the LEA process for:  Developing a plan with a timeline for continued implementation of the intervention strategies.  Measuring progress and adjusting strategies that have not proven to be effective.  Aligning funds to continue supporting successful intervention efforts and progress.  Providing continued professional learning opportunities that link to the intervention strategies and annual goals for student achievement.

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 7a - Capacity Factor Chart

Factor:	Strength: We have this or already do this:	Weakness: This is a weakness; but we could	Opportunity: If these external changes occur, this could be	Threat: If these external changes occur, this could be a weakness:
Team Staff:	The Paulding	improve if:	a strength:	a weakness:
Our LEA has staff	County School			
qualified for a	District has a			
restructuring team.	district leadership			
*Complete the	team that is			
Restructuring Team	willing and able			
Checklist	to support the			
	work of the			
	school. We have			
	on staff a			
	coordinator for			
	each of the core			
	content areas, a			
	Director of			
	Secondary			
	Schools, a			
	Director of			
	Counselors and			
	an Assistant			
	Superintendent			
	for School			
	Improvement to provide any			
	support the school			
	may need.			
Will:	The			
Our LEA is willing	Superintendent,			
to take extreme	along with the			
action in failing	district leadership			
schools.	is willing to do			
	what ever it takes			
	to support the			
	efforts of the			
	school to change.			
Outsiders:	The Paulding			
Our LEA is willing	County School			
to bring in external	District has			
support if needed	contacted SREB			
for student learning.	to help us with			

	_	\0/	<u> </u>	
	the work.			
<b>Insiders:</b>	The Paulding			
Our LEA is willing	County School			
to require central	District			
staff to make many	understands and			
changes to support	is willing to make			
restructured	the necessary			
schools.	changes to make			
	the program			
	work.			
Flexibility:	The Paulding			
Our LEA is willing	County School			
to give capable	District is will to			
leaders	give the new			
unprecedented	leadership the			
freedom to change,	flexibility to do			
even if this creates	what ever it takes			
inconsistency and	to turn the school			
inconvenience.	around.			

Note: This table was adapted from The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement publication, *School Restructuring Under No child Left Behind: What Works When? A Guide for Education Leaders*, 2006.

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 7b - Restructuring Team Checklist

**Team Members:** Who should be on your team to organize restructuring throughout the LEA? Readiness and willingness to drive major change are important, but credibility and LEA knowledge are also important.

**Lead Organizer:** In a smaller LEA, the superintendent may lead the team. In a larger LEA, this might be a deputy or assistant superintendent or other senior person who is ready and able to organize a major change process. In some cases, a credible outsider who is familiar with the LEA schools may be best. Strong team leadership skills are essential to keep the team motivated, informed, and productive through a challenging change process.

Qualifications to consider for your total working team include people with:

#### • A Drive for Results

A record of implementing change despite political and practical barriers.

An unyielding belief that all children-no matter how disadvantaged-can learn.

Organizing and planning skills to keep the decision process and implementation for each failing school on track.

### • Relationship and Influence Skills

Good relationships with a wide range of district staff, parents, and community organizations. Willingness and ability to disagree with others politely; a "thick skin." Teamwork skills to complete tasks responsibly and support team members. Strong influence skills.

#### • Readiness for Change

An open mind about ways to improve student learning. Willingness to learn about what kinds of big changes work under differing circumstances.

Willingness to try new restructuring strategies.

No political agenda that may interfere with student learning-centered decisions.

#### • **Knowledge to do What Works** (or willingness to acquire it quickly)

Knowledge of the formal and informal decision-making processes in your district.

Knowledge of past efforts to change and improve schools in your LEA.

Knowledge of education management, effective schools research with a focus on what has been proven to produce student learning results with disadvantaged children.

Note: This table was adapted from The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement publication, *School Restructuring Under No child Left Behind: What Works When? A Guide for Education Leaders*, 2006.

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 7c - Selecting Turnaround Leaders

**Instructions:** Assess leaders available to this school. Does the school's current principal or other available leader in the LEA have these competencies? Have they demonstrated these behaviors? Can you recruit for these competencies and behaviors?

Summarize your findings here:	
We $\square$ do $\square$ do not have a turnaround leader available to this school	ol.
We $\square$ can $\square$ cannot recruit additional turnaround leaders.	

Possible turnaround candidates within the LEA:

Competencies	Current Principal	Other Available District Principals	Can Recruit for This	Do not Have and Cannot Recruit for This
<b>Driving for results:</b> setting high				
goals, taking initiative, being				
relentlessly persistent to succeed.				
<b>Solving problems:</b> using				
performance data to identify and solve				
immediate problems.				
<b>Showing confidence:</b> exhibiting				
confidence, using failure to initiate				
problem solving, not excusing failure.				
<b>Influence:</b> influencing immediate				
action toward the school's goals.				
<b>Teamwork and cooperation:</b> getting				
input and keeping others informed.				
<b>Conceptual thinking:</b> connecting the				
mission, learning standards, and				
curriculum to clarify for all.				
<b>Team leadership:</b> assuming the role				
as leader and motivating staff to				
perform despite challenges.				
Organizational commitment:				
making personal sacrifices needed for				
school success.				
Communicating a compelling vision:				
rousing staff to commit energy to the				
change.				

Note: This table was adapted from The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement publication, *School Restructuring Under No child Left Behind: What Works When? A Guide for Education Leaders*, 2006.

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Attachment 8 - School Improvement Services

### **Division of School Improvement - Services**

The Division of School Improvement provides a range of services to districts and schools in Georgia. The goal of the services is to assist district and school staff with the continuous improvement process so that teaching and learning positively impacts students in Georgia.

GAPSS Analysis – The GAPSS Analysis: *Closing the Gap* process provides detailed information for a school on the progress towards full implementation of the School Keys: *Unlocking Excellence through the Georgia School Standards*. Any school in Georgia can request a school review from the Division of School Improvement of the Georgia Department of Education. The review consists of classroom observations, staff surveys, interviews, and document reviews. The review process involves the following steps.

- Team members introduce themselves at a faculty meeting prior to the beginning of Day 1. They will ease concerns of the staff and convey an understanding of the team's agenda.
- The principal should plan to do a 15-20 minute presentation of the data to the review team using Guiding Questions as provided by the team leader.
- Interviews of various school stakeholders are conducted during the review process.
- Classroom observations using the observation instrument are completed in all classrooms, with all teachers.
- The review team meets to compile, discuss, chart and share the collected data from the review sorted by the eight strands of the School Keys.
- Using the shared data, the team determines the school's implementation level for each element/row in the GAPSS Summary Report.
- The team may include clarifying comments relative to elements as needed.
- The team identifies next steps for identified areas of need to support the school leadership in the school improvement effort.
- The team leader and designated members of the review team meet with the principal and school leadership team, and, if applicable, the system contact person, to discuss the summary.

**Instructional Coach Training** – This training is offered to school-based instructional coaches. The training is designed to provide participants with tools and resources to enhance the impact school-based instructional coaches have on teacher practice and student achievement. The training helps to clarify and explicitly define expectations of instructional coaches and ensures that coaches have the knowledge and skills to facilitate high quality, job-embedded professional learning that improves teacher practice and student achievement. Instructional coaches learn to engage teachers in the following job-embedded learning strategies.

- Explicit instruction
- Modeling
- Facilitation of collaborative learning and planning
- Observations with feedback
- Analysis of student work

**Summer Leadership Academy** – Each summer, the Division of School Improvement provides an intensive, weeklong professional learning opportunity for school-based leadership teams Schools may send a team of ten to participate in the academy. Schools may send additional staff members as space permits. The purpose of the academy is to strengthen the school improvement planning process. School teams are engaged in the school improvement planning process throughout the academy. Sessions provide support to school teams with the following actions.

- Engaging leadership teams in the right work
- Collecting and analyzing the four types of data (student achievement data, process data, demographic data, and perception data)
- Developing SMART goals
- Selecting appropriate strategies, actions, and interventions to meet school improvement goals
- Identifying artifacts and evidence of implementation
- Creating a professional learning plan to support implementation
- Designing a plan for monitoring implementation of the school improvement plan

Leadership teams complete the academy with a product, a systematically and deliberately developed school improvement plan that is ready to be refined, implemented, and monitored immediately.

**Data Teams Training** – The Division of School Improvement provides a one-day training to teams of teachers that focuses on building the capacity of teacher teams to engage in a cycle of data analysis to improve teaching and learning. The data team process engages collaborative teacher teams in results-driven, job-embedded professional learning. Teams of teachers learn the following steps in the data team cycle.

- Collect and chart data
- Analyze strengths and obstacles
- Establish goals
- Select instructional strategies to help them meet the goals
- Determine what is expected when the strategy is implemented

**Formative Assessment Training** – The Division of School Improvement offers a series of three formative assessment professional learning opportunities. The first session provides an overview of effective formative assessment strategies and practices. The second session addresses the development of common assessments and actions educators may take to analyze the results from common assessments. The third and final session is focused on the development of effective test items that serve as a foundation for lessons.

**School Improvement Specialists** – The Division of School Improvement employs field-based school improvement specialists who provide on-site support and guidance to school staff as they engage in the continuous improvement process. School improvement specialists provide support by engaging in the following actions.

- Guiding leaders in developing and sustaining a leadership team that is focused on continuous improvement in order to increase student achievement
- Guiding leaders, the leadership team, and collaborative learning teams with the
  development of structures and processes that support standards-based, job-embedded,
  results-driven professional learning and brokering professional learning resources as
  needed with emphasis on Thinking Maps®, Data Teams, formative assessment, and
  Active Literacy
- Assisting the leadership team in maximizing the use of Title I School Improvement Grant funds, if applicable
- Guiding school leaders in creating and sustaining a culture of data-driven decision making
- Guiding the leadership team and collaborative learning teams in creating school improvement plans that are action plans with measurable goals
- Guiding the leadership team and collaborative learning teams with:
  - o Implementing the GPS within standards-based classrooms
  - o Monitoring the implementation of the GPS within standards-based classrooms
- Facilitating the leadership team and collaborative learning teams' development, implementation, and continuous monitoring of a formalized system of data-driven intervention(s)
- Assisting the leadership team in continuously assessing progress toward fully-operational high impact practices
- Guiding leaders in sustaining the school improvement process through all strands of the School Keys: Unlocking Excellence through the Georgia School Standards in order to increase student achievement
- Guiding the leadership team, collaborative learning teams, and individual teachers (through observation, modeling, and feedback) in best practices that will directly lead to increased academic achievement for individual students and subgroups in relation to AYP targets
- Guiding the leadership team in interventions to monitor and improve student and teacher attendance
- Guiding the leadership team in the development of action plans

**Thinking Maps® Training** – This training is organized by the Division of School Improvement in an effort to reduce costs for schools that are interested in implementing Thinking Maps® as an instructional strategy to improve student engagement and student achievement. The Division of School Improvement staff members are trained in Thinking Maps® and can facilitate and support implementation of the instructional strategy. Thinking Maps® provides leaders, teachers, and students with a common visual language for learning within and across disciplines that supports eight cognitive thinking processes.

- Defining
- Classifying
- Describing
- Comparing/Contrasting
- Sequencing
- Analyzing cause and effect
- Identifying part to whole relationships
- Seeing analogies

**Active Literacy Training** – This training is offered to teachers and leaders. The training shows teachers – at every grade level and in every subject area – how to integrate the teaching of literacy skills into their daily curriculum. With an emphasis on schoolwide collaborative planning, the training shows how curriculum mapping sustains literacy between grade levels and subjects. The training offers teaching strategies to help students in primary through high school do the following.

- Learn, retain, and use vocabulary
- Take better notes in class
- Edit and revise their writing
- Speak and listen more effectively

**Graduation Coach Support** – The Division of School Improvement offers support to districts and schools with the implementation of Graduation Coach programs and other best practices and strategies to support increasing the graduation rate in Georgia. The Graduation Coach Work Management System (WMS) was designed not only to improve the quality of data available to the state program office, but also to serve as a tool to enable graduation coaches to make data-driven decisions about which services to deliver and to whom. The Graduation Coach Work Management System assists in the identification of students at risk of dropping out of school or otherwise not earning a high school diploma.

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 APPENDIX A: SEA Allocations to LEAs and LEA Budgets

#### APPENDIX A

#### SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

#### Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

#### **Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations**

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

#### Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (e.g., a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

#### **LEA Budgets**

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

- The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
- The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope
  to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of
  three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time
  start-up costs.
- 3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
- 4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
- 5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
- 6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

#### **SEA Allocations to LEAs**

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

- 1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
- 2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
- 3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
- 4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
- 5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
- 6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
- 7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

### An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

- 1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
- 2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (i.e., because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

- Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools
  only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the
  State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity
  to serve.
- 4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
- 5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
- 6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 APPENDIX B: Persistently Lowest –Achieving Schools Guidance

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools." §	Title I eligible** elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" and that are:  • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or  • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years and that are:  • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or  • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.††	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II and that are:  • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or  • have not made AYP for two years.

<sup>§ &</sup>quot;Persistently lowest-achieving schools" means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater, or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and
- (2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--
  - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
  - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

<sup>\*\*</sup> For the purposes of schools that <u>may</u> be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, "Title I eligible" schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds <u>or</u> schools that are Title I participating (<u>i.e.</u>, schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>††</sup> Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

# **APPENDICIES**

C - Job Descriptions

D - Board Minutes

# **Paulding County School District**

## **Math Coach Job Description**

#### QUALIFICATIONS:

- T-5 or higher
- Minimum of 5 years of successful teaching experience teaching mathematics
- Eligible for Georgia Education Certificate in Mathematics
- Experience with leading and/or facilitating groups
- Good oral and written communication skills

CONTRACT: 190 days

#### JOB RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Research and provide information and resources to staff about learning and teaching mathematics including: teaching strategies, assessment of mathematical skills, and interpretation of test results.
- Research and prepare materials for the use of the district, departments, schools and teachers.
- Research and provide information and guidance regarding a range of innovative mathematics
  practices through various activities such as: formal and informal discussions, grade level and
  department meetings, coaching sessions, demonstration lessons, student study groups, staff
  meetings and professional development sessions.
- Work with faculty to analyze results of assessments, and collaborate with teachers to plan appropriate instruction for individual students.
- Work with students to build skill base for academic success.
- Work with high schools to facilitate vertical planning and create continuity of mathematics education through all levels with a focus on meeting the needs of at-risk learners.
- Maintain the confidentiality of schools, teachers, and students.
- Maintain paperwork and documentation consistently, appropriately, and in a timely manner.
- Meet regularly with other building leadership team, the Mathematics Coordinator, and the Principal.
- Carry out other duties for the successful operation of the school as determined by school.

**REPORTS TO:** 

Principal

## **Paulding County School District**

## **Literacy Coach Job Description**

#### QUALIFICATIONS:

- T-5 or higher
- Minimum of 5 years of successful teaching experience teaching English/Language Arts
- Eligible for Georgia Education Certificate in Reading/ELA
- Experience with leading and/or facilitating groups
- Good oral and written communication skills

CONTRACT: 190 days

#### JOB RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Research and provide information and resources to staff about learning and teaching reading and ELA including: teaching strategies, assessment of reading/ELA skills, and interpretation of test results.
- Research and prepare materials for the use of the district, departments, schools and teachers.
- Research and provide information and guidance regarding a range of innovative ELA practices
  through various activities such as: formal and informal discussions, grade level and department
  meetings, coaching sessions, demonstration lessons, student study groups, staff meetings and
  professional development sessions.
- Work with faculty to analyze results of assessments, and collaborate with teachers to plan appropriate instruction for individual students.
- Works with students to build skill base for academic success.
- Work with high schools to facilitate vertical planning and create continuity of ELA education through all levels with a focus on meeting the needs of at-risk learners.
- Maintain the confidentiality of schools, teachers, and students.
- Maintain paperwork and documentation consistently, appropriately, and in a timely manner.
- Meet regularly with building leadership team, the Reading/Language Arts Coordinator, and the Principal.
- Carry out other duties for the successful operation of the school as determined by school.

REP	OR	rs '	TO:

Principal

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Paulding County School District

## Family & Community Outreach Coordinator Job Description

#### QUALIFICATIONS:

- Masters Degree or higher, experience in education, social work, human services, counseling or related field.
- Minimum of 5 years of successful experience in a related field
- Demonstrated ability as a manager considered important.
- Experience with leading and/or facilitating groups
- Good oral and written communication skills

#### CONTRACT: 200 days

#### JOB RESPONSIBILITIES:

- To coordinate activities that guide Paulding County students toward the fulfillment of their potential for academic, physical, intellectual and social-emotional growth and maturation.
- Meet continuously with all staff to ensure maximum communication of information so that the support to all students is coordinated among key parties.
- Promote Perfect attendance for all students.
- Develop a program to highlight academic achievement.
- Recognize student's special accomplishments.
- Design and implement special classes, programs and extracurricular activities that involve tutors, mentors, guest speakers and other volunteers.
- Ensure that volunteers and mentors are recruited, screened, trained and supported.
- Develop printed volunteer materials as needed and coordinate correspondence with volunteers.
- Answer call from community persons interested in volunteering, find placements in fields of interest and follow up for successful placement.
- Maintain a central schedule of volunteer placements and activities and coordinate all special events and programs with Principal or designee.
- Assist in agency and volunteer recognition activities including planning and executing an agency/volunteer recognition program at least once annually.
- Coordinate non-academic and academic services to students and families.
- Communicate regularly with parents on the events and activities at the school and their student's accomplishments and needs.
- Serve as liaison for parents with the school.
- Link parents to activities in which they can be a part and contribute to the benefit of all concerned.
- Establish relationships with other service agencies to provide coordinated delivery of services to students.
- Ensure that cooperative efforts with outside resources are effectively planned, implemented and evaluated.
- Keep participating agencies and organizations informed of the school activities and invite representatives to school functions, as appropriate.

- Review and evaluate progress of each agency's participation and recommend modifications as needed.
- Maintain relationships with other professionals, including school principals, teachers, counselors, psychologists, and other service providers.
- Work with administrators and counselors to collect and compile all base line data and results data on all students.
- Act as a resource to learning facilitators when requests are made; to assist with implementation of academic service learning projects.
- Participates in staff meetings, training and other activities as determined by the school Principal.
- Carry out other duties for the successful operation of the school as determined by school.

REPORTS TO:		
Principal		

# Georgia Department of Education School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011 Paulding County School District

## **School Improvement Specialist Job Description**

#### **QUALIFICATIONS:**

- T-5 or higher
- Minimum of ten successful years as an educator required; administrative experience requested
- Experience with leading and/or facilitating groups
- Good oral and written communication skills

#### CONTRACT: 200 days

#### JOB RESPONSIBILITIES:

- To lead, manage and support district initiatives in all areas related to transforming the underperforming school.
- All efforts of the School Improvement Specialist are to be focused exclusively on meeting the needs of students and teachers.
- Working knowledge of standards-based curriculum, instruction and assessment, appropriate
  accommodations to measure achievement, and applied learning with emphasis on mathematics,
  social studies, English/language arts and science.
- Working knowledge of instruction and assessment for all student populations, including children with special needs and economically disadvantaged.
- Working knowledge of rules and regulations of federal and state education laws, with a
  demonstrated ability to understand and interpret written procedures, policies and laws with a
  focus on achieving results.
- Thorough knowledge and understanding of the principles for improving educational results for students at risk of school failure by bringing about aligned, continuously improving educational services.
- Working knowledge of systems of professional development, educational technology, school district and school operations, strategic planning, effective family and community involvement strategies, and school/business partnerships.
- Demonstrated ability to conduct, read and summarizes complex studies, analyze and evaluate data, and prepare reports.
- Demonstrated ability and desire to work collaboratively on a wide rage of topics and issues with diverse groups of people.
- Demonstrated organizational skills and knowledge of applicable research of effective practices.
- Demonstrated knowledge of the use of technology to enhance public engagement, district and school accountability and professional practices.
- Carry out other duties for the successful operation of the school as determined by school.

REPORTS TO: Assistant Superintendent for School Improvement

# Appendix – D

# **Paulding County Schools**

Regular Board Meeting 4/12/2011 6:15:00 PM

East Paulding High School/Theater 3320 East Paulding Drive Dallas, GA 30132

Meeting Minutes
Created: 4/14/2011 1:45 PM EST

#### **Attendees - voting members**

Michael Skelton
Kim Curl
Nick Chester
Kim Cobb
Theresa Lyons
Sammy McClure
Joe Watson

Chair
Vice Chair
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member

**Attendees - other** 

Cliff Cole Superintendent

Tom Cable

Brian Otott Associate Superintendent
Ms. Pamela Taylor Supt. Secretary

#### **Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Lyons arrived during the Character Education presentation, and was not present for voting prior to that time.

#### I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Skelton, Board Chair.

#### II. Invocation

The invocation was given by Mr. Rich Erdman.

#### III. Presentation of Colors

East Paulding High School's Air Force JROTC presented the colors.

#### IV. Singing of the National Anthem

Ms. Taylor Wager, student at EPHS, sang the National Anthem.

# V. Posting of Colors

EPHS Air Force JROTC posted the colors.

#### VI. Pledae

EPHS Air Force JROTC led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

#### VII. Adoption of Agenda

Nick Chester - Yes

Motion to adopt the agenda.

Motion made by: Kim Curl

Motion seconded by: Kim Cobb

Voting

Michael Skelton - Yes

Kim Curl - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes Theresa Lyons - No Vote Sammy McClure - Yes Joe Watson - Yes

### **VIII. Approval of Minutes**

a. March 22, 2011, Regular Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion made by: Nick Chester

Motion seconded by: Sammy McClure

Voting

Michael Skelton - Abstain

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - No Vote

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

b. March 22, 2011, Called Meeting/Public Hearing

Motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion made by: Nick Chester

Motion seconded by: Kim Curl

Voting

Michael Skelton - Yes

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - No Vote

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

c. March 29, 2011, Regular Meeting/Budget Work Session

Motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion made by: Nick Chester

Motion seconded by: Kim Cobb

Voting

Michael Skelton - Abstain

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - No Vote

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

d. March 31, 2011, Called Meeting/Public Hearing

Motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion made by: Nick Chester

Motion seconded by: Sammy McClure

Voting

Michael Skelton - Yes

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - No Vote

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

#### IX. Recognitions

Mr. Cole said that he would like to thank Mr. Grant Brown, teacher at EPHS, and EPHS Senior Nathan Perry for making sure the Board had everything they needed for the meeting including the lighting, sound, and PowerPoint.

a. Character Education

The following students were recognized for being excellent examples of the Character Education trait Honesty:

Allison Miller/Northside Elementary
Julia Bush/Ritch Elementary
Colton Adamczyk/McClure Middle
Stephanie Wright/Paulding County High

b. Winter Players of the Year

The Winter Sports Players of the Year, named by the Paulding Coaches Association, were recognized. Mr. Tim Mitchell of Paulding Sporting Goods sponsors the program.

Christian Browder, EPHS - Boys Basketball Ashley Jetton, SPHS - Girls Basketball Eric Badertscher, EPHS - Wrestling

#### X. Presentations

a. Explaining Public School Funding in Paulding County

Mr. Doug Eza gave a presentation on explaining public school funding in Paulding County. Mr. Eza explained how public schools receive funding from the State, the Federal government, and local tax money. He discussed QBE funds, local fair share, and the equalization grant. Mr. Eza spoke about low wealth school districts and the situation they are in with reduced funding from the State and the drop in local tax digests. He encouraged Board members, community members, and school district employees to contact their legislators regarding adequately funding public education in Paulding County and in the State.

#### XI. Action Agenda

a. Resolution for Phase-Out of P. B. Ritch Elementary

Motion to accept Superintendent's recommendation to adopt the resolution to phase-out P. B. Ritch Elementary School as a K-12 facility so that the phase-out could be included in the five-year facility plan.

Motion made by: Kim Curl

Motion seconded by: Theresa Lyons

Voting

Michael Skelton - Yes

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - No

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - Yes

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

b. School Improvement Grant/Paulding County High School

Motion to accept the Superintendent's recommendation to approve the application for a School Improvement Grant for a three year period for Paulding County High School in the amount of \$2,000,000.

Motion made by: Nick Chester Motion seconded by: Kim Cobb

Voting

### **Georgia Department of Education**

### School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011

Unanimously Approved

### c. Field Trip Requests

Motion to accept Superintendent's recommendation to approve the following field trips:

EPHS/DECA to Orlando, Florida for DECA International Career Development Conference April 30-May 4, 2011

EPHS/AFJROTC to Blue Ridge to participate in approved camping, hiking, and ropes course June 2-5, 2011

PCHS/HOSA to Anaheim, California for HOSA National Leadership Conference June 22-25, 2011

Motion made by: Kim Curl

Motion seconded by: Nick Chester

Voting

Unanimously Approved

### d. Naming of Delegate for GSBA

Motion to name Sammy McClure as Delegate for the GSBA Summer Conference to be held June 17, 2011 in Savannah.

Motion made by: Theresa Lyons Motion seconded by: Nick Chester

Voting

Michael Skelton - Yes

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - Yes

Sammy McClure - Abstain

Joe Watson - Yes

### e. Naming of Alternate for GSBA

Motion to name Michael Skelton as alternate for the GSBA Summer Conference to be held June 17, 2011 in Savannah.

Motion made by: Nick Chester Motion seconded by: Kim Curl

Votina

Michael Skelton - Abstain

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - Yes

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

#### f. Legislative Position Proposals

Mr. Skelton discussed that proposed revisions to GSBA's legislative positions had to be voted on by local Boards. Mr. Skelton said that position statements would be discussed by section. Mr. Chester said that he would like the Superintendent to comment on the sections individually as to whether there were conflicts with the local Board's legislative priorities.

i. I. A. Governance of Education/Elections and Appointments

Mr. Cole stated that there were no conflicts with this section. Motion to accept Legislative Position 1.A.1 through 1.A.4.

Motion made by: Theresa Lyons

Motion seconded by: Sammy McClure

Voting

Unanimously Approved

#### ii. I. B. Governance of Education/Local Board Authority

### **Georgia Department of Education**

### School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011

Mr. Cole said that our legislative priorities included giving local Boards authority to make decisions over local matters. He said that there were no conflicts. Motion to approve Legislative Positions 1.B.1 through 1.B.11.

Motion made by: Kim Cobb

Motion seconded by: Michael Skelton

Voting

Unanimously Approved

#### iii. I. C. Governance of Education/Capital Outlay

Mr. Cole said that there were no conflicts with this section. He said that he wanted to mention 1.C.10 Renovation and Modification of Schools, which states GSBA supports legislation, state board policy and adequate funding that would encourage the renovation and modification of structurally sound school facilities rather than the abandonment of such facilities. Mr. Cole said that he wanted to clarify that the phase-out of Ritch is not a situation where the facility is being abandoned. He said that the phase-out would possibly allow for a better use of the facility and this was the reason it was being put into the five year facility plan.

Motion to approve 1.C.1 through 1.C.11.

Motion made by: Theresa Lyons Motion seconded by: Kim Curl

Voting

Unanimously Approved

#### iv. I. D. Governance of Education/Choice

Mr. Cole said that in regard to public school choice, the District had no conflicts with GSBA's position. He said that GSBA is opposed to vouchers and using public funds for private schools. He said that our District's legislative priorities are in line with GSBA.

Motion to approve 1.D.1 through 1.D.2.

Motion made by: Kim Cobb

Motion seconded by: Sammy McClure

Voting

Unanimously Approved

#### v. I. E. Governance of Education/Contracts

Mr. Cole said that there were no conflicts with this section and that the District would benefit from 1.E.2 which would extend the time for tendering school-based administrators a new contract to May 30.

Motion to approve 1.E.1 through 1.E.3.

Motion made by: Kim Curl

Motion seconded by: Michael Skelton

Voting

Unanimously Approved

#### vi. I. F. Governance of Education/Personnel

Mr. Cole said that there were no conflicts and that the District supports this section.

Motion to approve 1.F.1 through 1.F.8

Mr. Skelton said that he didn't agree with 1.F.7, Health Coverage for Board Members. He said that the position states that Board members, their spouse, and their dependents who leave office on or after December 31, 2006, could be provided group medical insurance by a

### **Georgia Department of Education**

### School Improvement Grant 1003(g) - LEA Application 2011

local Board. He said that employees who leave are given the option to take COBRA, and that this premium is higher than what the District pays. He said that he opposed this position as strongly as he did the position a few years ago regarding providing retirement benefits for Board members.

Motion by Mr. Skelton to amend the original motion to pull position statement 1.F.7 for a separate vote. The motion died for lack of a second.

Vote was taken on the original motion.

Voting

Michael Skelton - No

Kim Curl - Yes

Nick Chester - Yes

Kim Cobb - Yes

Theresa Lyons - Yes

Sammy McClure - Yes

Joe Watson - Yes

vii. II.A.1. through V. 8 Legislative Positions

Motion to review and adopt items II.A.1. through V.8 after the Superintendent comments on each section and points out any conflicts or irregularities so that if there is no problem with the sections, they could be accepted en mass.

Mr. Cole said that there were no conflicts with Section A and that he agrees with position 2.A.7, stating that there should be a study committee on the local five mill share. Mr. Cole said that he supported Section B Personnel Funding, Section C Program Funding, and Section D Retirement. Mr. Cole said that there were no conflicts with the remaining legislative positions. He asked if there

Mr. Skelton said that he would like to see 2.C.16 - Transportation Reimbursement revised. He said that the statement currently says "GSBA urges the General Assembly to fund transportation costs for all students living one-half mile or more from the school". He said that he would like to see this revised to add "by actual travel distance and not by radius.

viii. C. Program Funding/2.C.16 Transportation Reimbursement Motion to amend the motion to approve the remaining position statements, II.A.1 through V.8, to revise 2.C.16 to - GSBA urges the General Assembly to fund transportation costs for all students living one-half mile or more from the school *by measure of actual distance* and not by radius. Mr. Cole said that he agreed to this revision.

Motion made by: Michael Skelton

Motion seconded by: Kim Curl

Votina

Unanimously Approved

ix. Re-State and Vote on Motion to Approve Remaining Legislative Positions

#### XII. Points of Information

a. Fundraiser Report

Fundraisers were presented as a point of information on behalf of EPHS, HHS, McClure, Nebo, NPHS, and SPHS.

b. GSBA Officer Nomination Process

Information was shared with the Board regarding the GSBA officer nomination process.

### **XIII. Adjourn to Executive Session**

Motion to adjourn to executive session for personnel, legal, and land matters, inviting the Board Attorney into the session.

<u>Motion made by:</u> Nick Chester <u>Motion seconded by:</u> Kim Cobb

**Voting** 

Unanimously Approved

c. (c) Land

#### XV. Reconvene

Motion to return to regular session.

Following the vote to reconvene, Mr. Skelton stated that while in executive session the Board discussed personnel and legal matters. He said that no land matters were discussed. Mr. Skelton stated that no action was taken in executive session other than the vote to reconvene.

Motion made by: Theresa Lyons Motion seconded by: Kim Curl

Voting

Unanimously Approved

## **XVI.** Superintendent's Report

a. Approval of Personnel

Motion to accept Superintendent's recommendation to approve personnel items #1 through #46.

Motion made by: Nick Chester

Motion seconded by: Kim Cobb

Voting

**Unanimously Approved** 

b. Superintendent's Comments

Mr. Cole thanked Mr. Viness and Mr. Musgrove. He said that East Paulding High School had put a lot of effort into making the Board meeting work at their location.

#### **(VII. Board Member Comments**

Mr. Chester said that he would also like to thank the people at East Paulding High. He said that it was a good thing the Board and Superintendent had done. He said that as the Board continues to do this over the next couple of years, he thinks it will have a positive impact as it leans to the transparency of the District.

Ms. Cobb said that she appreciated the staff making the calling post communication regarding the meeting location.

Mr. Skelton stated that the Board had received an invitation to the Teacher of the Year Award Celebration on May 5th at Paulding County High School at 4:30. He also discussed an invitation to the Special Olympics Track & Field event on Thursday, April 21st at 10:00 a.m. at Hiram High. Mr. Skelton shared a thank you note for thoughts and words of comfort in a time of need for a family.

Mr. Curl said that he had received a message from Drew Mirolli, a student in the

District. He said that Mr. Mirolli won the Prudential Spirit of Community National Award and was selected to represent Georgia in Washington, DC.

VIII.	Adjourn
-------	---------

Motion to adjourn.

Motion made by: Theresa Lyons

Motion seconded by: Nick Chester

Voting

Unanimously Approved

	Secretary
Chairperson	