



FOCUSED MONITORING REPORT

November 18, 2009

**Georgia Cyber Academy (GCA) State Charter School
Serving the State of Georgia
Mr. Matt Arkin, Head of School**

November 19, 2009

**Odyssey State Charter School
Serving Coweta County
Mr. Andrew Geeter, Principal**

Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports
1870 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
404-656-3963
Fax: 404-651-6457

Introduction and Statutory Authority

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) guarantees a free and appropriate public education to students with disabilities. The IDEA provides federal funds to assist states in carrying out this responsibility and to comply with the associated regulations. 34 CFR Section 300.600 of the IDEA requires that states ensure that local systems comply with federal regulations and meet the state's educational standards as they provide educational programs for students with disabilities. The Divisions for Special Education Services and Supports of the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) provide this general supervision and monitoring of local systems through a variety of activities identified as Georgia's Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (GCIMP).

GCIMP is composed of multiple means for monitoring the local systems' provision of a compliant and quality education for students with disabilities. These include, but are not limited to, evaluation of timelines for entry into special education, student record review, special education budget review, dispute resolution, LEA improvement plans, data profiles, and Focused Monitoring.

The State Advisory Panel for Special Education serves as the stakeholder committee for the GaDOE and advises the state on the development and implementation of the GCIMP including Focused Monitoring. For Focused Monitoring, the stakeholders reviewed the state data on the Performance Goals and Indicators for Students with Disabilities and determined that the state priority indicator for FY10 (2009-2010 school year) would be increasing the performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments when given appropriate accommodations. Once the priority was identified, the 2009 assessment data for all programs were reviewed and ranked in quartiles. Those programs with the lowest performance of students with disabilities in either reading and/or mathematics were selected for Focused Monitoring.

Focused Monitoring

In the Odyssey State Charter, the Georgia Cyber Academy (GCA) is referred to as "a program of the Odyssey Charter School". These schools use the same Full Time Equivalency (FTE) code for data reporting and budget IDEA funds jointly and is a system for all GaDOE purposes; therefore, both schools were selected for Focused Monitoring. The purpose of the Focused Monitoring site visits to Odyssey and GCA was to review their policies and procedures, instructional programs, and student achievement in reading and math.

While Odyssey and GCA are considered one for purposes of data reporting and budgeting; they differ markedly in scope and in the number of students served; as well as the number and location of staff employed. Therefore, each school is discussed separately in this report. GCA results are reported first, followed by Odyssey results.

As part of the Focused Monitoring activities, the GCA and Odyssey LEA Implementation Plan for FY 2010 was reviewed. The Implementation Plan does not have a goal that targets improved reading and math performance for students with disabilities at Odyssey; nor does it include a goal that addresses improved math performance for students with disabilities at Odyssey. The schools will be required to develop goals and activities using the findings contained in this report in their efforts to improve the reading and math achievement of students with disabilities. Refer to the section "Required Evidence of Improvement" for specific information. LEAs that fail to

meet compliance criteria within one year, and fail to make AYP within two years, may be subject to sanctions from the GaDOE.

GEORGIA CYBER ACADEMY (GCA) STATE CHARTER SCHOOL

Monitoring Team

The GaDOE authorized the following team to conduct on-site monitoring at GCA on November 18, 2009.

Dr. Margo L. Habiger, Team Leader, Division for Special Education Services, GaDOE
Kachelle White, Division for Special Education Services, GaDOE
Julie Moilanen, Division for Special Education Services, GaDOE
Harry Repsher, Division for Special Education Services, GaDOE
Jason Martin, Charter Schools GaDOE

Data Related to Focused Monitoring

The Spring, 2009 assessment data was used to identify student performance in reading and/or math. GCA currently serves grades K-8.

Percent of Students with Disabilities Who Met or Exceeded Standards

CRCT GRADES 1-8	2009
Math	29%
English Language Arts	59%
Reading	67%

A review of the GCA assessment data indicates that, when compared to the twelve other systems in the same size group, the percent of students with disabilities meeting standards in reading and math is exceptionally low.

ODYSSEY STATE CHARTER SCHOOL

Monitoring Team

The GaDOE authorized the following team to conduct on-site monitoring at Odyssey on November 19, 2009.

Dr. Margo L. Habiger, Team Leader, Division for Special Education Services, GaDOE
Julie Moilanen, Division for Special Education Services, GaDOE

Data Related to Focused Monitoring

The Spring, 2009 assessment data was used to identify student performance in reading and/or math. Odyssey currently serves grades K-7.

Percent of Students with Disabilities Who Met or Exceeded Standards

CRCT GRADES 1-8	2009
Math	53%
English Language Arts	80%
Reading	87%

A review of the Odyssey assessment data indicates that, when compared to the 57 other systems in the same size group, the percent of students with disabilities meeting standards in math is lower than expected.

GEORGIA CYBER ACADEMY (GCA) STATE CHARTER

Activities Prior to the On-site Visit

The following data were reviewed and considered:

- GCA Student Enrollment data
- GCA Student Achievement Data in Reading and Math
- GCA Survey Responses from 71 Professionals
- GCA Survey Responses from 152 Parents
- GCA Teacher Schedules
- GCA and Odyssey IDEA Budget and Expenditures
- GCA and Odyssey FTE Data Reporting

On-Site Process and Activities

The on-site activities of Focused Monitoring occurred on November 18, 2009. During that time the following activities took place:

- Reviewed 16 student special education records
- Conducted 8 classroom observations
- Interviewed 1 Head of School
- Interviewed 9 Special Education Teachers
- Interviewed 1 General Education Teacher
- Interviewed 1 Special Education Director
- Interviewed 1 Elementary Curriculum Director
- Interviewed 1 Middle School Curriculum Director
- Interviewed 1 Reading Coach
- Interviewed 2 Math Coaches
- Interviewed 1 Psychologist
- Interviewed 1 Response to Intervention Coordinator
- Interviewed 1 Related Services Coordinator

Program Strengths Related to the Performance of Students with Disabilities:

- The Special Education Director has implemented many positive organizational, procedural, and staff changes. The organizational and procedural changes have resulted in more efficient processing of parent requests so that delays are reduced to a minimum. The staff changes have resulted in hiring reading and math coaches so that students with disabilities have access to teachers with expertise in these areas.
- The Reading and Math Coaches are readily available to both teachers and students.
- Parent Survey results are generally positive with many comments that their children are successful learners for the first time.

ODYSSEY STATE CHARTER

Activities Prior to the On-site Visit

The following data were reviewed and considered:

- Odyssey Student Enrollment data
- Odyssey Student Achievement Data in Reading and Math
- Odyssey Survey Responses from 4 Professionals
- Odyssey Survey Responses from 7 Parents
- Odyssey Teacher Schedules
- Odyssey and GCA IDEA Budget and Expenditures
- Odyssey and GCA FTE Data Reporting

On-Site Process and Activities

The on-site activities of Focused Monitoring occurred on November 19, 2009. During that time the following activities took place:

- Reviewed 8 student special education records
- Conducted 4 classroom observations
- Interviewed 1 Principal
- Interviewed 1 Special Education Teacher/Special Education Coordinator
- Interviewed 2 General Education Teachers
- Interviewed 1 Response to Intervention Coordinator
- Interviewed 1 Speech-Language Pathologist

Program Strengths Related to the Performance of Students with Disabilities:

- Odyssey has an exceptionally well organized and implemented RTI component that includes extensive data collection and analysis with instructional adjustments based on the data analysis.
- General Education and Special Education staff work well together in providing seamless instruction and services for students with disabilities.

GEORGIA CYBER ACADEMY (GCA) STATE CHARTER

Summary of On-Site Findings:

The monitoring team found noncompliance in the following areas:

Applicable Federal Regulations:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| C.F.R. 300.320- 300.324 | Individualized Education Program: Definition of the IEP |
| C.F.R. 300.106 | Free Appropriate Public Education: Extended School Year |

Supporting Evidence:

Individualized Educational Program

- 81% of the IEPs reviewed included the most recent evaluations; however, information was frequently omitted, i.e. test name was not included and scores were often omitted or not explained.
- 31% of the IEPs reviewed did not include the results of state assessments.
- 50% of the IEPs reviewed did not include a description of academic, developmental, and/or functional strengths.
- 31% of the IEPs reviewed did not include specific reading and/or math deficits in the Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP).
- 50% of the IEPs reviewed did not include a statement of the impact of the disability on involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.
- 31% of the IEPs reviewed included reading and/or math goals that couldn't be correlated to the reading and/or math deficits identified in the PLAAFP.
- 50% of the IEPs reviewed did not include an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with peers without disabilities.
- 25% of the IEPs reviewed did not include a statement concerning when progress toward IEP goals would be reported to parents.
- 67% of the teachers interviewed reported that assistive technology was used by one or more of their students.
- 32% of the IEPs did not include specific reading and/or math accommodations for statewide testing correlated to reading and/or math deficits in the PLAAFP.
- 89% of teachers and 80% of the administrators interviewed reported that supplementary instruction was available; however, when probed further, it became apparent they were referring to offerings of generic assistance, i.e. open office time and tutoring; along with end of class breakout rooms. Moreover, students were allowed to self-select concerning whether or not they needed assistance. There was no evidence of systematic, clearly delineated needs based supplementary instruction.

Free Appropriate Public Education: Extended School Year

- 92% of the IEPs reviewed considered Extended School Year (ESY) services; however, no ESY services were agreed upon:
 - One IEP did include a recommendation for ESY; however, no ESY services were actually provided.
 - One IEP included the following statement: "Services are only rendered during the school year. During summer months, services will not be provided."
 - In addition, several IEPs included statements indicating that all instruction is provided during the school year and the online curriculum is available during the summer months.
- 100% of the teachers interviewed reported that ESY services either weren't offered at GCA or weren't needed.

Required Evidence of Correction by February 24, 2011

Documentation that FAPE is provided based on review of IEPs to include:

- Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) that include:
 - Results of most recent evaluation/s with specific information, i.e. test name, scores and an explanation of the meaning of the scores
 - Results of state assessments
 - Specific reading and/or math deficits using results of current statewide testing
 - Description of academic, developmental, and/or functional strengths
 - Statement of the impact of the disability on involvement and progress in the general education curriculum
- Individualized reading and/or math goals that address specific reading and/or math deficits identified in the PLAAFP
- Statement concerning when progress toward IEP goals will be reported to the parents.
- Specific reading and/or math accommodations for statewide testing correlated to both classroom accommodations and reading and/or math deficits identified in the PLAAFP
- Explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with peers without disabilities in the regular class and/or non academic and extracurricular activities
- Compensatory services must be provided for the student who had an IEP that recommended ESY services, but no ESY services were actually provided. The kind of ESY services provided must correlate with the services recommended in the IEP.
- A list, where applicable, of students receiving ESY services to include disability area, goals and objectives to be extended or modified; hours per week of service; beginning and ending dates of service; location of service; and title of the service provider
- Documentation of supplementary reading and/or math instruction, based on individual needs, in the service delivery portion of the IEP in order to document a full continuum of services

OTHER PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

The GaDOE strongly urges GCA to examine the following concerns and take steps to resolve issues as appropriate.

GEORGIA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Concern

- 100% of the teachers interviewed reported receiving training in the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). However, 80% reported receiving training from the school system where they were previously employed; they have not received any GPS training since coming to GCA.
- 60% of the administrators interviewed reported that teachers had been trained in the GPS.

- 100% of teachers interviewed and 86% of teachers surveyed reported providing instruction in grade level Georgia Performance Standards; however, classroom observations revealed only minimal evidence of standards based classrooms:
 - 88% of the observations posted GPS on the initial slide of the PowerPoint.
 - 100% of observations, conducted at the beginning of the lesson, included an introduction with clearly defined goals and connections to prior learning.
 - 0% of observations, conducted at the end of the lesson, included a summary activity that reinforced learning.
 - In only 25% of the observations was the teacher speaking the language of the standard.
 - 0% of the observations included specific grouping/differentiation strategies. Teachers frequently sent students to the “help room” if they were having difficulty, but there was no evidence of clearly delineated needs-based groups.
 - 57% of the work during lessons was connected to the standards.
 - 63% of the observations included only basic level questioning (“Remembering or Understanding” from the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy) as a means of formative assessment.
 - Only 13% of the observations included in-depth/reflective questioning (“Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, or Creating” from the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy) in a ticket-out-the-door format.

Recommendation

As a state charter school, GCA is not required to provide instruction using the GPS. Teachers, however, report being trained in the GPS and providing grade level standards based instruction. Since teachers report delivering grade level standards based instruction, all aspects of that instruction must be evident. There was, however, little evidence of standards based instruction during the classroom observations. It is recommended that intensive coaching support and modeling in the classrooms be the priority for implementation of standards based instruction rather than additional professional learning sessions.

PROGRESS MONITORING

Concern

- 50% of administrators surveyed indicated that teachers are expected to progress monitor weekly. The remaining 50% of administrators indicated that teachers are expected to progress monitor every nine weeks.
- 100% of the administrators interviewed indicated that teachers are required to progress monitor and referred to the Aimsweb Training just completed. Currently, however, there seems to be some inconsistency in the frequency of progress monitoring administrations, i.e. some report that teachers are required to progress monitor weekly; some every nine weeks.
- 100% of the teachers interviewed indicated that they progress monitor; however, only 40% specifically stated that they progress monitored weekly, the remaining 60% reported different kinds of progress monitoring, i.e. OLS, Aimsweb, Scranton, DIBELS, Skills Review, Beyond Speech Therapy, Post Tests from the K-12 Curriculum, as well as portfolios, but didn’t indicate how frequently they progress monitored.
- 56% of the teachers interviewed were able to provide specific examples of how they adjusted their instruction based on progress monitoring results.

Recommendation

Although progress monitoring is occurring school-wide, there is some inconsistency in the instrument/materials used and the frequency of progress monitoring administrations. In order for progress monitoring data to drive instruction for students with disabilities, it has to be carried out at short intervals, i.e. weekly. Students with disabilities are likely to practice skills incorrectly during extended instructional times of six to nine weeks. Errors need to be identified quickly and the instruction adjusted immediately. Airlines will improve significantly when progress is monitored; results analyzed; and instruction adjusted at weekly intervals.

CO-TEACHING

Concern

- 33% of the teachers interviewed described co-teaching as the General Education teacher providing instruction and the Special Education teacher providing support.
- 67% of the teachers interviewed gave the following responses concerning co-teaching: it wasn't offered; it might start in January; it was "in process"; it was offered only in eighth grade math.
- 58% of the teachers surveyed reported co-teaching to be "very effective; 28% reported co-teaching to be somewhat effective; and 13% reported that no co-teaching classes were offered.
- 100% of the administrators interviewed reported the following concerning co-teaching: co-teaching is not offered; co-teaching is offered only in Math; the co-teaching model is two teachers in one Elluminate with the General Education teacher providing instruction and the Special Education teacher providing support; co-teaching has not yet been implemented; co-teaching will roll out in third and fifth grade.

Recommendation

There is a great deal of confusion concerning the concept and implementation of co-teaching practices from administrators and teachers alike. As would be expected under such conditions, there were no specific co-teaching approaches evident during classroom observations. There are six co-teaching approaches that are driven by the instructional objectives of the teachers: One-Teach-One-Observe, One-Teach-One-Support, Team Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Station Teaching, and Alternate Teaching. **The power of co-teaching lies in the increased instructional intensity it offers, i.e. reduced student teacher ratio.** Team Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Station Teaching, and Alternate Teaching are the approaches offering the most intensive instruction. Although valid co-teaching approaches for certain instructional objectives, One-Teach-One-Observe and One-Teach-One-Support are supportive in nature and offer only minimal increases in instructional intensity. Without a clear definition of co-teaching and specific implementation strategies, the co-teaching approach will default to One-Teach-One-Observe and/or One-Teach-One Support where the General Education teacher delivers the instruction and the Special Education teacher functions as a support for students who have difficulty. Given the virtual nature of the Elluminate classrooms, it will be necessary to determine which of the co-teaching approaches can be implemented with fidelity.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Concern

- 100% of all teachers interviewed reported they were familiar with the accommodations used by their students with disabilities.
- 41% felt confident when implementing accommodations.

Recommendation

All of the teachers interviewed reported they knew which accommodations their students used. However, less than half of the teachers surveyed felt well prepared and confident when implementing accommodations. Furthermore, only half of the administrators surveyed felt that teachers were well prepared and confident when implementing accommodations. It is suggested that teachers be surveyed to determine what would be most helpful to them in implementing accommodations. With that information an effective plan can be developed that focuses on coaching the implementation of accommodations within instructional and testing settings.

DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION

Concern

- 78% of teachers interviewed reported differentiating instruction in their classrooms; however, only 22% were able to provide appropriate examples of skill differentiation.
- The majority of administrators reported professional learning in the area of differentiation; however, few had observed classrooms where differentiation occurred.

Recommendation

Since only 22% of the teachers interviewed could provide appropriate examples of reading and/or math skill differentiation, it is suggested that professional learning focus on reading and math skill differentiation. Research sets apart the development of essential skills as what works in reading and math instruction. Student interests, learning styles, and multiple intelligences assist in increasing student achievement, but have less of a scientific research base. Differentiation based on specific reading and/or math skills, and maintained until targets are met, will have a positive impact on remediation.

Additional Concerns

- 20% of the parents (30) surveyed reported issues related to delay in developing IEPs and/or beginning related services, i.e. speech therapy, occupational therapy, and behavior therapy.
- 13% of the parents (20) reported that related services did not begin for three, four, or more weeks after the IEP was written...some related services had not begun at the time of the survey.
- 4% of the parents (6) reported that the online speech therapy program, Beyond Speech Therapy (BST), did not meet the needs of their children.
- 3% of parents (5) surveyed felt the specialized reading and/or math sessions were above their child's instructional level.

Recommendations

The remaining concerns are those noted in the electronic survey completed by parents and described previously in this report, i.e. delays in developing IEPs and implementing related services; appropriateness of the BST for some students; as well as the instructional level of the specialized reading and math classes for some students. While these issues are reported by a small number of parents, they are issues that will impact student progress in the general education curriculum. It is, therefore, recommended that GCA survey parents in order to identify those who have concerns in one or more of these areas and take steps to resolve those issues.

ODYSSEY STATE CHARTER

Summary of On-Site Findings:

The monitoring team found noncompliance in the following areas:

Applicable Federal Regulations:

C.F.R. 300.320-300.324	Individualized Education Program: Definition of the IEP
C.F.R. 300.106	Free Appropriate Public Education: Extended School Year Services
C.F.R. 300.115 (b) (2)	Least Restrictive Environment, Continuum of Alternative Placements (Co-Teaching)

Supporting Evidence:

Individualized Education Program

- 63% of the IEPs reviewed included results of the most recent evaluation/s; however, information was often missing, i.e. test name was not included; specific scores were not listed; meaning of scores was not provided; and no indication of specific deficits documented.
- 37% of the IEPs reviewed included reading and/or math goals that couldn't be correlated to the reading and/or math deficits identified in the PLAAFP.
- 13% of the IEPs reviewed did not include a statement regarding when student progress toward IEP goals will be reported to the parents.
- 0% of the IEPs reviewed included the location of special education services.
- Both of the administrators interviewed as well as both of the general education teachers interviewed reported that supplementary reading and/or math instruction was available. Upon further probes, however, administrators described supplementary instruction in the form of a traditional resource model; although supplementary sessions were not written into the IEP; nor was there evidence of clearly delineated needs-based instruction during the resource sessions. The general education teachers described supplementary instruction as the instruction that takes place during the RTI intervention sessions, i.e. sessions prior to any special education services.
- Although 100% of the IEPs reviewed considered assistive technology, none of the IEPs included any assistive technology services and/or devices.
- 50% of the teachers interviewed and surveyed felt well prepared and confident when implementing accommodations.

Free Appropriate Public Education: Extended School Year Services

- 100% of the IEPs reviewed included consideration for ESY service/s; however, none of the IEPs reviewed included any ESY services.

Least Restrictive Environment, Continuum of Alternative Placements (Co-Teaching)

- Both administrators and teachers interviewed reported that co-teaching was not an option at Odyssey. As a result, Odyssey does not offer a full continuum of services. The opportunities for co-teaching are further limited since there is currently only one special education teacher who is responsible for providing direct services to students and teachers as well as coordinating the special education program.

Required Evidence of Correction by February 24, 2011

Documentation that FAPE is provided based on review of IEPs, to include:

- Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) that includes:
 - Results of most recent evaluation/s with documentation of specific information
 - Results of state and district assessments
- Individualized reading and/or math goals that address specific reading and/or math deficits identified in the PLAAFP
- Statement concerning when progress toward IEP goals will be reported to the parents
- Specific reading and/or math accommodations for statewide testing correlated to both classroom accommodations and reading and/or math deficits identified in the PLAAFP
- A list, where applicable, of students receiving ESY services to include disability area, goals and objectives to be extended or modified; hours per week of service; beginning and ending dates of service; location of service; and title of the service provider
- Documentation of a full continuum of services to include:
 - general education with accommodations, co-teaching, and/or resource/supplementary reading and/or math services based on individual needs
 - hours per week of service; beginning and ending dates of service; location of service; and title of the service provider.

(In order to offer a full continuum of services it will be necessary to ensure that the special education teacher is able to provide daily special education services to students with disabilities and teachers.)

- Documentation of the location of special education services
- List of students using assistive technology to access standards based instruction to include name, disability, type of assistive technology device/service

OTHER PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

Georgia Performance Standards

Some training in the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) is referenced by the administrators and teachers interviewed; however, classroom observations revealed only minimal evidence of standards based classrooms, i. e. limited needs based grouping strategies; limited differentiation; standards with elements were not posted; not all work was connected to the standards; minimal formative assessment; and limited student work supporting the standard.

Progress Monitoring

Administrators and teachers report that progress monitoring is implemented by the RTI Team. The team administers progress monitoring assessments and then analyzes, interprets, and adjusts instruction based on those results. Results are reported to teachers, but teachers currently have little responsibility for progress monitoring.

Differentiated Instruction

Although administrators and teachers interviewed reported professional learning in the area of differentiating instruction, there was minimal classroom evidence of clearly delineated needs based reading and/or math differentiated instruction.

The GaDOE strongly urges Odyssey to examine the following concerns and take steps to resolve issues as appropriate.

(Unless otherwise noted, Professional Learning activities refer to instruction in professional learning topic areas and intensive, systematic classroom follow-up in the form of coaching and modeling.)

As a state charter school, Odyssey is not required to provide instruction using the GPS. Most teachers, however, report being trained in the GPS and providing grade level standards based instruction. Since teachers report delivering grade level standards based instruction, all aspects of that instruction must be evident. There was, however, little evidence of standards based instruction during the classroom observations, i.e. limited needs-based grouping strategies; limited differentiation; standards and elements not posted; some work not connected to the standard; minimal formative assessment; and limited student work supporting the standard. It is, therefore, recommended that teachers be surveyed in order to determine which teachers need beginning professional learning and which need more advanced training.

Since ESY service/s were considered, but none were implemented, it is highly recommended that Odyssey develop an extensive professional learning plan that addresses all criteria when considering ESY service/s, i. e. whether or not the student is likely to regress without ESY service is not the sole criteria considered.

Although there is a highly consistent progress monitoring process implemented by the RTI Team, progress monitoring implementation needs to become the responsibility of the classroom teachers. It is suggested that a formal action plan be developed to gradually hand over progress monitoring responsibilities to the classroom teachers with support from the RTI Team.

All of the teachers interviewed reported they knew which accommodations their students used. However, only half of the teachers surveyed felt well prepared and confident when implementing

accommodations. It is suggested that teachers be surveyed to determine what would be most helpful to them in implementing accommodations. With that information an effective plan can be developed that focuses on coaching the implementation of accommodations within instructional and testing settings.

Since training has been provided in differentiation, but there is little evidence of differentiation in the classroom, it is suggested that professional learning focus on reading and math skill differentiation. Research sets apart the development of essential skills as what works in reading and math instruction. Student interests, learning styles, and multiple intelligences assist in increasing student achievement, but have less of a scientific research base. Differentiation based on specific reading and/or math skills, and maintained until targets are met, will have a positive impact on remediation.

As the Odyssey staff is developing professional learning in the area of co-teaching, it is recommended that the following information be considered. There are six co-teaching approaches that are driven by the instructional objectives of the teachers: One-Teach-One-Observe, One-Teach-One-Support, Team Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Station Teaching, and Alternate Teaching. **The power of co-teaching lies in the increased instructional intensity it offers, i.e. reduced student teacher ratio.** Team Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Station Teaching, and Alternate Teaching are the approaches offering the most intensive instruction. Although valid co-teaching approaches, One-Teach-One-Observe and One-Teach-One-Support are supportive in nature and offer only minimal increases in instructional intensity. Without a clear definition of co-teaching and specific implementation strategies, the co-teaching approach will default to One-Teach-One-Observe and/or One-Teach-One Support where the general education teacher delivers the instruction and the special education teacher functions as a support for students who have difficulty.

CAP Development

GCA and Odyssey must develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in order to address the cited compliance items. The CAP is a long range plan to improve the academic performance of students with disabilities. The improvement activities must be added to the schools' Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan. The CAP must be completed and submitted to the Division for Special Education Services by **April 12, 2010**. In addition to the funds for FY 10, GCA and Odyssey will receive a total of \$20,000.00 to be divided equally between the two schools. These funds are to be used to assist with the implementation of CAP activities.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP)				GEORGIA CYBER ACADEMY AND ODYSSEY STATE CHARTERS			
YEAR ONE CLEARANCE DATE: 4/19/2011				FINAL CAP SUBMISSION DATE: 4/19/10		DRAFT CAP SUBMISSION DATE: 4/15/09	
ACTIONS/STRATEGIES INTERVENTIONS/ PROGARMS	PROFESSIONAL LEARNING	Resources or Materials Needed (Include funding source, personnel and cost)	Person or Position Responsible for Supervision of Implementation	Timeline for Implementation (Specific Dates)	Means of Evaluation (Who ensures that activities are completed?)	Documentation of CAP activities due to the DES with dates	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)

Teachers will implement the five co-teaching models.	Training in delivering co-teaching to include: - Five co-teaching models - Co-Planning - Virtual Implementation	GaDOE Online LRE -\$0 -Co-Teaching Modules \$0 GLRS Online Co-Teaching Training- \$0	GCA: Spec Ed Director GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads	June 15-16, 2010 2 day Training August 2-3, 2010 2 Day Co-Planning	GCA: Hd of School GCA: Asst Head of School	August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011 Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings	Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD. -Aims web Benchmarks -Performance Series and/or Study Island results
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

<p>PLAAFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recent evals ● State Assessments ● Specific Deficit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading ○ Math <p>Description of strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic ● Developmental ● functional <p>Impact of disability on involvement in GenEd Curriculum</p>	<p>Training, Monitoring and In-house Audits:</p> <p>PLAAFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recent evals ● State Assesmnts ● Specific Deficit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading ○ Math <p>Description of strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic ● Developmental ● functional <p>Impact of disability on involvement in GenEd Curriculum</p>	<p>GADOE Website \$ 0</p> <p>GCA Special Ed Leadership \$ 0</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>Weekly staff Meetings: May 3, 2010 May 17, 2010</p> <p>Department PD October 6, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>Five IEPs</p> <p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--	---	--

<p>Individualized reading /math goals that address specific reading and/or math deficits identified in PLAAFP</p>	<p>Training, and Post Observations and In House Audits</p> <p>Individualized reading /math goals that address specific reading and/or math deficits identified in PLAAFP</p>	<p>GA DOE Personnel \$0</p> <p>GCA Special Ed Lead Teachers \$0</p> <p>GCA Spec Ed Director \$0</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>August 23, 2010</p> <p>September 20, 2010</p> <p>October 4,2010</p> <p>Department PD October 6, 2010</p> <p>All Staff PD December6- 7, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>Agenda and Sign In sheet Dates??</p> <p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Five IEPs</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

Statement concerning when progress toward IEP goals will be reported to the parents	<p>Training, and Post Observations and In House Audits</p> <p>Statement concerning when progress toward IEP goals will be reported to the parents</p>	<p>GA DOE Personnel \$0</p> <p>GCA Special Ed Lead Teachers \$0</p> <p>GCA Spec Ed Director \$0</p>	<p>GCA: Spec Ed Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>January, 15, 2010</p> <p>June 15-16, 2010 2 day Training</p> <p>August 2-3, 2010 2 Day Co-Planning</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>-Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>
Specific reading and/or math accommodations for statewide testing correlate to classroom accommodations and reading and/or math deficits	<p>Training, and Post Observations and In House Audits</p> <p>Specific reading and/or math accommodations for statewide testing correlate to both classroom accommodations and reading and/or math deficits</p>	<p>GADOE Site \$ 0</p> <p>GCA Accommodations Specialist \$ 0</p>	<p>GCA: Spec Ed Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>June 15-16, 2010 2 day Training</p> <p>March 8, 2010 August 2-3, 2010 September, 2010 October, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings</p> <p>Five IEPs</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>- Standardized test results (i.e CRCT)</p> <p>-Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>

<p>Explanation of the extent, if any to which the child will not participate with peers without disabilities in the regular classroom and/ or non academic and extracurricular activities</p>	<p>Training, and In House Audits of IEPs</p> <p>Explanation of the extent, if any to which the child will not participate with peers without disabilities in the regular classroom and/ or non academic and extracurricular activities</p>	<p>GCA Special Ed Leadership \$0</p> <p>Related Services Coordinator \$0</p> <p>GADOE Personnel \$0</p>	<p>GCA: Spec Ed Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>June 15-16, 2010 2 day Training</p> <p>August 2-3, 2010 2 Day Co-Planning</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings</p> <p>Five IEPs</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>- -Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>
---	--	---	---	--	--	--	---

<p>Compensatory svcs for the student who had an IEP that recommended ESY svcs, but no ESY were actually provided. The kind of ESY services provided must correlate with the services recommended in the IEP</p>	<p>Training, and Post Observations and In House Audits Compensatory svcs must be provided for the student who had an IEP the recommended ESY svcs, but no ESY were actually provided. The kind of ESY services provided must correlate with the services recommended in the IEP</p>	<p>GCA Special Ed Leadership \$0 Related Services Coordinator \$0 GADOE Personnel \$0</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>August 2-3, 2010 September, 2010 October, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011 Agenda and sign in sheet Actual IEPs indicating compensatory services, this may not be due to ESY but due to services rendered late or a lack of progress of due to insufficient tools</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math scores of SWD.</p>
---	---	---	--	---	--	---	---

<p>A list, where applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students receiving ESY services • Goals and Objectives to be extended or modified for ESY • Hours per week of service • Beginning and end dates of services • Location of service • Title of provider rendering service 	<p>Training, and In House Audits to identify students receiving ESY services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students receiving ESY services • Goals and Objectives to be extended or modified for ESY • Hours per week of service • Beginning and end dates of services • Location of service • Title of provider rendering service 	<p>GCA Special Ed Leadership \$0</p> <p>Related Services Coordinator \$0</p> <p>GADOE Personnel \$0</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>January 15th</p> <p>March 8, 2010</p> <p>August 2-3, 2010</p> <p>September, 2010</p> <p>October, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010</p> <p>November 15, 2010</p> <p>February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda and sign in sheet for training-</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p>
---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Documentation of supplementary reading and/or math instruction, based on individual needs, in the service delivery portion of the IEP in order to document a full continuum of services	Training, and Post Observations and In House Audits Documentation of supplementary reading and/or math instruction, based on individual needs, in the service delivery portion of the IEP in order to document a full continuum of services	GCA Special Ed Leadership \$0 GA DOE Website \$0 GADOE Personnel \$0	GCA: Spec Ed Director GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads	June 15-16, 2010 2 day Training August 2-3, 2010 2 Day Co-Planning	GCA: Hd of School GCA: Asst Head of School	August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011 Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings Five IEPs Indicating Supplementary Instruction	Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD. -Aims web Benchmarks -Performance Series and/or Study Island results
---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

SpEd Teachers will implement GPS .	<p>PL GPS Standards</p> <p>Walk thrus and audit of recorded sessions</p>	<p>GADOE \$0</p> <p>GCA Department Chairs \$0</p> <p>GCA Data Specialist \$0</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>June, 2010</p> <p>August 2-3, 2010</p> <p>October, 2010</p> <p>January, 2011</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings.</p> <p>Clstrm Obs Forms (5)</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>-Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>
Progress Monitoring consistently implemented by teachers	<p>Training on the importance of Progress Monitoring</p> <p>In addition to training on the various tools available here at GCA.</p> <p>i.e. OLS, Aimsweb, Scranton, DIBELS, Skills Review, Beyond Speech Therapy, Post Tests from the K-12 Curriculum</p>	<p>GCA Reading Coach \$3000</p> <p>GCA Math Coach \$3000</p> <p>GADOE Personnel via Elluminate \$0</p> <p>GCA Data Specialist \$0</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>May, 2010</p> <p>August, 2010</p> <p>October, 2010</p> <p>January , 2011</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings</p> <p>Progress Monitoring Data for 5 students per each data submission</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>-Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>

<p>Teachers will implement accommodations appropriately.</p>	<p>Training on the various accommodations available both in the classroom and testing within the different subject areas, and how to implement.</p> <p>This training will be given to all teachers not just special education</p>	<p>GADOE Personnel Provide training- \$0</p> <p>Mentoring Minds Accommodations Wheel for each Teacher \$1000.00</p> <p>GCA Accommodations Specialist, year round support and training \$ 3,000</p>	<p>GCA: SpEd Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>March 8, 2010</p> <p>August 2-3, 2010</p> <p>September, 2010</p> <p>October, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings.</p> <p>Clstrm Obs Forms documenting appropriate implementation of accommodations Five teachers per each documentation submission</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>-Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>
<p>Teachers will implement differentiated instruction based on individual student skill level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Math 	<p>PI in implementation of differentiated instruction based on individual student skill level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Math 	<p>GADOE Website \$0</p> <p>GADOE Personnel via Elluminate \$0</p> <p>GCA Teacher Trainer \$0</p>	<p>GCA: Spec Ed Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>August, 2010</p> <p>September, 2010</p> <p>October, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010 November 15, 2010 February 15, 2011</p> <p>Agenda/ Sign-In sheets from trainings Classroom Obs documenting implementation of differentiated instruction based on individual student skill level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Math <p>Five Classroom Obs per each documentation</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p> <p>-Aims web Benchmarks</p> <p>-Performance Series and/or Study Island results</p>

<p>The following will be developed and implemented in a timely manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEPs • Related Services <p>Teachers will analyze the BST data to determine if the program is appropriate for the students involved.</p> <p>Teaches will analyze progress monitoring data to determine if specialized classes are meeting the instructional needs of the students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Math <p>Bi-annual surveys concerning the above will be sent to parents to identify an parental concerns</p>	<p>PL in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of BST data • Analysis of PM Data • Development of Parent Survey 	<p>GCA Special Education Leads \$0</p> <p>Beyond Speech Therapy Personnel \$0</p>	<p>GCA: Spec Ed Director</p> <p>GCA: Middle School and Elementary Leads</p>	<p>May, 2010</p> <p>December, 2010</p>	<p>GCA: Hd of School</p> <p>GCA: Asst Head of School</p>	<p>August 30, 2010</p> <p>November 15, 2010</p> <p>February 15, 2011</p> <p>BST Data and Analys</p> <p>PM Data and Analys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Math <p>Srvey Data & Analy</p> <p>For 5 students per data submission.</p>	<p>Increase in reading and/or math CRCT scores of SWD.</p>
--	---	---	---	--	--	---	--

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP)			GEORGIA CYBER ACADEMY AND ODYSSEY STATE CHARTERS				
Year One Clearance Date: 4/19/11			Final CAP Submission Date: 4/19/10		Draft CAP Submission Date: 4/13/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Actions/Strategies/ Interventions or Programs	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed (Include funding source, personnel and cost)	Person or Position Responsible for Supervision of Implementation	Timeline for Implementation (Specific Dates)	Means of Evaluation (Who ensures that activities in columns 1-5 are completed?)	Documentation of CAP activities due to the DES with dates	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)
1. SpEd teachers will appropriately include results of most recent evaluations in IEPs (test name, specific scores, meaning of scores, & specific deficits)	N/A	GaDOE IEP forms	Chris Schmieg	* Changes made on new IEPs in March 2010 * Annual reviews will include this information May 2010	Andy Geeter	5 Copies of student IEP with revisions August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math
2. SpEd teachers will appropriately include reading and math goals correlated to information in PPLAAFP in IEPs	Training with Dr. Margo Habiger	* GaDOE IEP form * Web-based session on writing Standard Based IEPs * <u>Writing Measurable IEP Goals and Objectives</u> by Bateman & Herr * Headsprout on-line early reading and comprehension Projected cost: \$ 1, 168 (early reading) \$ 400 (reading comprehension)	Chris Schmieg	* Changes made on new IEPs in March 2010 * April, 2010 * Annual reviews will include this information May 2010	Andy Geeter	5 Copies of student IEP with revisions August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math

3. SpEd teachers will appropriately include a statement regarding when student progress will be reported to parents	N/A	GaDOE IEP forms	Chris Schmieg	* Change made on new IEPs in March 2010 * Annual reviews will include this information May 2010	Andy Geeter	5 Copies of student IEP with revisions August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math
4. SpEd teachers will appropriately include location of special education services	N/A	GaDOE IEP forms	Chris Schmieg	* Changes made on new IEPs in March 2010 * Annual reviews will include this information May 2010	Andy Geeter	5 Copies of student IEP with revisions August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math
5. a) SpEd teachers will appropriately increase the general education staffs' knowledge of supplementary instruction versus resource for reading and math b) SpEd teachers will appropriately include description of delineated needs-based instruction in IEPs	a) In-service for general education teachers and paraprofessionals b) N/A	a) Hand-outs b) GaDOE IEP forms	Chris Schmieg	a) August 2010 b) Annual reviews will include this information May 2010	Andy Geeter	a) *Agenda * Sign in sheets b) 5 Copies of student IEP with revisions August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math
6. SpEd teachers will appropriately include AT services and/or devices in the IEPs	Training by consultant	Materials deemed appropriate by consultant Projected cost: \$ 600 (Read Write Gold Software) \$ 600 (Laptop) \$ 100 (Scanner) \$ 140 (First Strokes Keyboarding Program)	Chris Schmieg	August, 2010	Andy Geeter	* Agenda * Sign in sheets * List of students using AT devices and associated disabilities * 5 Copies of student IEP with revisions * Pre- & Post-test of identified students using the keyboarding program August 31, 2010	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math

						November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	
7. SpEd teachers will appropriately increase the knowledge/training of the general education staff for implementing accommodations	*In-service for general education teachers and paraprofessionals * Modeling/Observations within the classroom	*Hand-outs * GaDOE accommodations manual	Chris Schmieg	*August, 2010 (in-service) * On-going throughout the school year (modeling/observations)	Andy Geeter	*Agenda * Sign-in sheet *Pre/Post-test *Accommodation cheat sheet for teaching staff *Follow-up feedback survey done by general ed. staff	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math
8. SpEd teachers will appropriately document consideration of ESY for SWD	*ESY training to include all consideration for ESY * Training by Dr. Margo Habiger	*Materials deemed appropriate by Dr. Habiger * ESY manual	Chris Schmieg	April 13, 2010	Andy Geeter	*Agenda * Sign-in sheet *List of students receiving ESY * 5 Copies of student IEP with revisions August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math
9. The six co-teaching models will be implemented appropriately	PL in delivering co-teaching instruction to include: * Six Co-Teaching models *Co-Planning *Instructional Objectives that drive the Co-Teaching Models * Training with Dr. Margo Habiger	* GaDOE Online LRE Co-Teaching Modules * GLRS Co-Teaching PL *GaDOE Co-Teaching Practices DVD *GaDOE Co-Teaching Manual Projected Cost: \$1000	Chris Schmieg	*April 13, 2010 training *August, 2010 2 day co-planning	Andy Geeter	*Agenda *Sign-in sheet *Co-Teaching classroom observation form * Samples of co-teaching plans, activities, and student improvement samples August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011	Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math

<p>10. The regular education teachers will provide in evidence of standard based classroom: * posting of GPS * needs-based groupings * formative assessments * connecting student work to the standards</p>	<p>a)Observation at Brighton Academy Charter School in Douglasville b)Consultant/Coach for training and implementation of GPS in the classroom</p>	<p>*GPS Standards Projected cost: \$ 1000 (Training & coaching)</p>	<p>Andy Geeter</p>	<p>a) May, 2010 (observation at Brighton Academy) b) On-going throughout the school year 2010-2011(consultation/coaching)</p>	<p>Andy Geeter</p>	<p>a) Obs forms for field experience b) *Obs forms using rubric (CD's Framework for Professional Practice) for the classroom * Samples of student improvement August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011</p>	<p>Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math</p>
<p>11. The regular education teachers will provide evidence of progress monitoring</p>	<p>* GRASP training through West GA RESA by Rachel Spates</p>	<p>* PowerPoint training on GRASP program *Hand-out deemed appropriate by RESA *helpsprogram.org for progress monitoring Projected cost: \$ 4500 (training) \$ 250 (student registration)</p>	<p>Andy Geeter</p>	<p>*To be determined by RESA instructor * August, 2010 PowerPoint</p>	<p>Andy Geeter</p>	<p>*Sign-in sheets *Agenda *Handouts *PowerPoint overview * Samples of progress monitoring August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011</p>	<p>Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math</p>
<p>12. The regular education teachers will provide evidence of differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>*Consultant/Coach on implementation of differentiation in the classroom *PL on differentiated instruction</p>	<p>* <u>Differentiated Instruction: Making It Work</u> by Patti Drapea *DVD on differentiating instruction through GLRS *RESA Hand-outs from differentiation workshop Projected cost: \$ 100 Headsprout</p>	<p>Andy Geeter</p>	<p>* To be determined by RESA instructor. On-going throughout the school year *August, 2010</p>	<p>Andy Geeter</p>	<p>*Sign-in sheets *Agendas *Handouts * Samples of differentiation plans, activities, and student performance August 31, 2010 November 29, 2010 March 1, 2011</p>	<p>Increased performance of SWD on statewide testing in reading and math</p>

		(Early reading & Reading Books \$300 comprehension – online software) \$500 Coaching						
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP)**Odyssey-Odyssey/GCA**

The following district stakeholders participated in the development of the CAP. These stakeholders assure that all responsible parties will complete tasks as outlined in order to impact student learning, i.e. "Evidence of Impact" Column 8.

Stakeholder Name	Position
Andy Geeter	Director-Odyssey School
Chris Schmieg	Special Education Coordinator-Odyssey
Quynh Wellons	Special Education/RTI Teacher-Odyssey
Adra Mayfield	Speech Language Pathologist-Odyssey
Lisa McDonald	Curriculum Coordinator of Brighton Academy-Odyssey
Rachel Spates	Assistant Director for GRASP/Training-Odyssey
Jermel Isaac	Special Education Director-GCA
Matt Arkin	Head of School-GCA
Lori Funk	Assistant Head of School-GCA
Veronica Clemons	Director of Operations-GCA
Shannon Covington	Special Ed Middle School Lead-GCA
Leslie Mulcahy	Special Ed Elem. Lead-GCA
Carolyn McClain	Math Coach-GCA
Holly Witcher	Reading Coach-GCA

Susan Bridwell	Middle School Director-GCA
Kelly Morando	Elementary Director-GCA
Tara Richardson	Southern Region SPED Manager-K12
Jenny Kendall	National Director Student Services-K12
Cyndney Rolle	Teacher Trainer-GCA
Angela Walsh	SPED Parent Teacher Trainer-GCA
Leah Taylor	Accommodations Specialist-GCA
Leah Falls	RTI Coordinator--GCA
Mayya Standley	Related Services Coordinator-GCA
Leslie Mulcahy	Special Ed Elem. Lead-GCA