

Budget

Portsmouth City (044669) - Scioto County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (145)

U.S.A.S. Fund #:

Plus/Minus Sheet ([opens new window](#))

Purpose Code	Object Code	Salaries 100	Retirement Fringe Benefits 200	Purchased Services 400	Supplies 500	Capital Outlay 600	Other 800	Total
Instruction		170,750.00	29,881.25	0.00	170,000.00	0.00	0.00	370,631.25
Support Services		2,000.00	351.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,351.00
Governance/Admin		10,000.00	1,755.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,755.00
Prof Development		0.00	0.00	189,045.00	33,338.00	1,500.00	0.00	223,883.00
Family/Community		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Safety		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Facilities		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transportation		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		182,750.00	31,987.25	189,045.00	203,338.00	1,500.00	0.00	608,620.25
Adjusted Allocation								0.00
Remaining								-608,620.25

Application

Portsmouth City (044669) - Scioto County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund - Application Number (145)

Please respond to the prompts or questions in the areas listed below in a narrative form.

A) APPLICANT INFORMATION - General Information

1. Project Title:
Early Literacy

2. Executive summary: Please limit your responses to no more than three sentences.

This project will provide a systemic, scientifically based, literacy model (The Ohio State University Literacy Collaborative Framework) for Kindergarten - Second Grade students. Four of the main elements are: development of a school leadership team; training for school-based literacy coaches; a comprehensive instructional literacy framework; and tiered instruction to meet the needs of all students. This literacy framework aligns well with Common Core Standards and provides embedded, on-going, professional development.

This is an ultra-concise description of the overall project. It should not include anything other than a brief description of the project and the goals it hopes to achieve.

521 3. Total Students Impacted:

This is the number of students that will be directly impacted by implementation of the project. This does not include students that may be impacted if the project is replicated or scaled up in the future.

4. Please indicate which of the following grade levels will be impacted:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K Special Education | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kindergarten |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> 12 |

5. Lead applicant primary contact: - Provide the following information:

First Name, last Name of contact for lead applicant
Lindsey Kegley

Organizational name of lead applicant
Portsmouth City Schools

Address of lead applicant
724 Findlay Street. Portsmouth, Ohio. 45662

Phone Number of lead applicant
740-354-5705

Email Address of lead applicant
Lindsey.kegley@portsmouthtrojans.net

6. Are you submitting your application as a consortium? - Select one checkbox below

- Yes
 No

If you are applying as consortium, please list all consortium members by name on the "Consortium Member" page by clicking on the link below. If an educational service center is applying as the lead applicant for a consortium, the first consortium member entered must be a client district of the educational service center.

[Add Consortium Members](#)

7. Are you partnering with anyone to plan, implement, or evaluate your project? - Select one checkbox below

- Yes

No

If you are partnering with anyone, please list all partners by name on the "Partnering Member" page by clicking on the link below.

[Add Partnering Members](#)

B) PROJECT DESCRIPTION - Overall description of project and alignment with goals

8. Describe the innovative project: - Provide the following information

The response should provide a clear and concise description of the project and its major components. Later questions will address specific outcomes and the measures of success.

The current state or problem to be solved; and

For the past several years, Portsmouth City Schools have consistently been low achieving according to the state's accountability system. Currently our data shows an alarming deficit in the number of K-3 students considered 'on-track' according to the state diagnostic assessments. General Education Students: On Track - 372 Not On Track - 275; ELL students: On Track - 2, Not on Track-3; IEP students: On Track 17, Not On Track - 49. The Fall 2013 OAA data shows the following: General education students: 62 limited, 24 basic, 22 proficient, 10 advanced, and 14 accelerated. IEP students: 22 limited and 1 accelerated. Portsmouth City Schools is located in an impoverished area with 76.6% economically disadvantaged students and close to 27% of students identified as special needs. The district recognizes the need to address all of the issues mentioned for both our regular education students and our disadvantaged population. This, coupled with the fact that currently there is no consistent, coherent plan of instruction for the elementary schools between grade levels and within grade levels and professional development being of a generic nature, strongly indicates the need for instructional reform and focus.

The proposed innovation and how it relates to solving the problem or improving on the current state.

The proposed innovation, (Literacy Collaborative through The Ohio State University) is designed to provide a balanced literacy framework that requires on-going and embedded staff development. The major components of the framework include: assessment for instruction, interactive writing, guided reading, writer's workshop, shared reading and writing, and systematic phonics and phonemic awareness and parent and community involvement. Components of the framework are differentiated according to grade level needs. The balanced literacy framework includes an evaluation plan for measuring student progress and monitoring program effectiveness through data collection and analysis. Student progress will also be measured in collaboration with The Ohio State University as part of a five year data and analysis study of the effectiveness of the Literacy Collaborative model. We will train Literacy Coaches that will continue the professional development and in-class coaching necessary for sustainability. This scientifically based literacy model will provide staff development focus for cohesive classroom instruction. It provides for vertical articulation and continuity of instruction within the grade levels. We will address the current state of instruction and improve student achievement by implementing this literacy framework of instruction. Expected changes in teaching practices and behaviors also relate to solving the current state. All K-2 teachers will implement the elements of the Early Literacy Framework as observed and documented by the Literacy coaches. With on-site, on-going professional development, teachers will have the opportunity to work as colleagues, learning to effectively change instruction so that our students can progress naturally and smoothly from emergent literacy through independent reading. Using teacher based and building leadership team meeting times effectively and efficiently by looking at student work and making instructional decisions as colleagues will make a positive impact. As teachers train they will also have the on-site support of in house literacy coaches that will guide them through effectively improving their instruction and making data based decisions that will impact their instruction for their students. Research indicates that true systemic change does not occur if the teachers involved do not receive on-the-spot, on-site assistance and encouragement. The support and training from literacy coaches will help ensure true systemic change. This training in the Literacy Collaborative model is not a 'flash-in-the-pan' professional development model. Teachers continue to train after year one through continuing contact training hours. This gives teachers the additional support to continually refine their practice. With the requirements of the Third Grade Guarantee, we will replace retention by aggressively employing proactive measures at the primary levels and provide Leveled Literacy Intervention as a 'safety net' for your K-2 students. With our special education placements being higher than average, principally because many of the children are not mentally deficient but lack early literacy experiences which lead to success in reading. This Literacy framework provides a rich background of oral language experiences, so necessary for making the transition from emergent to independent readers, resulting in fewer special education placements. Through a combination of total literacy immersion and interactive teaching techniques. Students who are good readers by the end of the third grade will be able to successfully use the skills they have acquired as tools for learning at grades four and five. These students will not only be able to read well, but they will be able to write readable, coherent, grammatical texts in a variety of learning situations.

9. Which of the stated Straight A Fund goals does the proposal aim to achieve? - (Check all that apply)

Applicants should select any and all goals the proposal aims to achieve. The description of how the goals will be met should provide the reader with a clear understanding of what the project will look like when implemented, with a clear connection between the components of the project and the stated goals of the fund. If partnerships/consortia are part of the project, this section should describe briefly how the various entities will work together in the project. More detailed descriptions of the roles and activities will be addressed in Question 16.

Student achievement (Describe the specific changes in student achievement you anticipate as a result of this innovation (include grade levels, content areas as appropriate) in the box below.)

This proposal aims to significantly increase the number of K-3 students who are 'on-track' for their grade level as designated by state diagnostic measures. We anticipate the state average of 35% passage rate (as predicted by the State Superintendent) on the upcoming PARCC assessments with continued improvement as the balanced literacy framework becomes institutionalized in the district. We also expect increased achievement in the content areas due to the increased number of students who become proficient readers. We expect all students will read and understand texts at their grade level with 90% accuracy or better as measured by running records, the Observation Survey and miscue analysis. All students will be able to read and write readable, coherent texts for different purposes using standard spelling and grammar. The evaluation tool will be writing journals, portfolios and other print projects. We expect a decrease in special education placements as students are provided with the intervention necessary before referring them to Special Education. RTI teams will ensure that

children are given EVERY opportunity to learn before referring them for testing.

Spending reductions in the five-year fiscal forecast or positive performance on other approved fiscal measures (Describe the specific reductions you anticipate in terms of dollars and spending categories over a five-year period in the box below or the positive performance you will achieve on other approved fiscal measures. Other approved fiscal measures include a reduction in spending over a five-year period in the operating budget approved by your organization's executive board or its equivalent.)

Spending reductions will be seen in the areas of Instructional Salaries: We expect to see a significant improvement in the numbers of students designated 'on-track' by the third grade. This growth in student achievement will result in a cost savings of an additional teacher needed to teach the numbers of students that would continue 'not on track' if this project of improved instruction was not implemented. This amounts to \$60,000 in staff salary and \$10,500 in staff fringes. Instructional Supplies: This project will provide 3 book closets of leveled readers for guided reading, big books for shared reading and classroom materials for learning centers and instructional support materials. We will also design the book rooms for maximum use and ease of availability to teachers. We can significantly make spending reductions for K-2 instructional supplies over the next five years due to the fact that these book rooms will be more than adequate to support instruction over a five year period. This amount is \$150,000 and shelving expenses of \$20,000 in supplies Professional Development:: Additional costs for professional development purchased services will drop dramatically for k-2 teachers after the first year of grant implementation. Training our own Literacy Coaches and having them provide the on-sight K-2 professional development will minimize the need for outside professional development presenters in reading instruction. Cost is \$38,000 in professional development services.

Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom (Describe specific resources (Personnel, Time, Course offerings, etc.) that will be enhanced in the classroom as a result of this innovation in the box below.)

This innovation will provide classroom libraries of leveled literature in different genres in order to support Common Core Standards; leveled books for guided reading; big books for instruction and familiar reading; writing journals; center materials and read aloud books. We will create two Book Rooms that include 6-packs of leveled literature to provide books for differentiated instruction in guided reading; a wide selection of 'big books' and read aloud books. These resources for Book Rooms and classrooms require additional storage and organizational items to protect, maintain and ensure these resources are readily accessible. We will invest in a huge selection of Keep Books to provide books to provide at-home materials to read and to promote parent involvement. We will provide intervention resources such as Leveled Literacy Intervention because it has the same theoretical base as the literacy framework. These resources will be enhanced in the classroom because of the professional development that teaches how to effectively and efficiently use them to boost student achievement. As stated before we will be utilizing our own personnel as literacy coaches to provide the necessary, required professional development and in-class coaching. This professional development will provide graduate credit to each participant and also provide them with credentials required by the state to teach students who are on a reading improvement and monitoring plan or have been retained. Both Literacy Collaborative and Leveled Literacy Intervention training are on ODE's approved list of credentials and scientifically researched-based reading instruction programs.

Implementing a shared services delivery model (Describe how your shared services delivery model will demonstrate increased efficiency and effectiveness, long-term sustainability, and scalability in the box below.)

10. Which of the following best describes the proposed project? - (Select one)

- New - never before implemented
- Existing: Never implemented in your community school or school district but proven successful in other educational environments
- Mixed Concept: Incorporates new and existing elements
- Established: Elevating or expanding an effective program that is already implemented in your district, school or consortia partnership

C) SUSTAINABILITY - Planning for ongoing funding of the project, cost breakdown

11. Financial Documentation: - All applicants must enter or upload the following supporting information. The information in these documents must correspond to your responses in questions 11-14.

* Enter a project budget in CCIP (by clicking the link below)

[Enter Budget](#)

* If applicable, upload the Consortium Budget Worksheet (by clicking the link below)

* Upload the Financial Impact Table (by clicking the link below)

* Upload the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics (by clicking the link below)

[Upload Documents](#)

For applicants without an ODE Report Card for 2012-2013, provide a brief narrative explanation of the impact of your grant project on per pupil expenditures or why this metric does not apply to your grant project instead of uploading the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metric.

The project budget is entered directly in CCIP. For consortia, this project budget must reflect the information provided by the applicant in the Consortium Budget Worksheet. Directions for the Financial Impact Table are located on the first tab. Applicants must submit one Financial Impact Table with each application. For consortium applications, each consortium member must add an additional tab on the Financial Impact Tables.

Partners are not required to submit a Financial Impact Table.

Applicants with an "Ohio School Report Card" for the 2012-2013 school year must upload the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics to provide additional information about cost savings and sustainability. Directions for the Supplemental Financial Reporting Metrics are located on the first tab of the document. If your organization does not have an "Ohio School Report Card" for the 2012-2013 school year, please provide an explanation in the text box about how your grant project will impact expenditures per pupil or why expenditure per pupil data does not apply to your grant project.

Educational service center, county boards of developmental disabilities, and institutions of higher education seeking to achieve positive performance on other approved fiscal measures should submit the budget information approved by an executive board or its equivalent on the appropriate tabs of the Financial Impact Table. Educational service centers should use the "ESC" tab and county boards of developmental disabilities and institutions of higher education should use the "non-traditional" tab.

12. What is the total cost for implementing the innovative project?

Responses should provide rationale and evidence for each of the budget items and associated costs outlined in the project budget. In no case should the total projected expenses in the budget narrative exceed the total project costs in the budget grid.

608,620.25 State the total project cost.

* Provide a brief narrative explanation of the overall budget.

The budget for our project will strongly support the necessary professional development in reading and writing instruction for K-2 teachers. This professional development is essential in creating systemic change in instruction. The initial year one training will provide teachers with a foundation in the literacy framework and assessment protocols. Instructional materials are also a big part of the grant budget. Providing professional development without the necessary tools and resources is like asking one to drive a car and not giving them the keys. This support in instructional supplies is essential. With professional development being provided during school hours, there is a substantial need in the budget for substitutes. There is a minimal cost in equipment for a document camera and projector to be used during professional development training. In order to support the professional development, textbooks that support the researched based learning will be purchased for the training classes. Support services are necessary for the additional workload of purchasing, preparing professional development materials and tracking expenditures. Administrative costs are necessary for overseeing the grant budget, planning and maintaining the success of the project implementation. Year 1 initial training will require a professional development provider, as our Literacy Coaches will not be trained until year 2.

13. Will there be any costs incurred as a result of maintaining and sustaining the project after June 30th of your grant year?

Sustainability costs include any ongoing spending related to the grant project after June 30th of your grant year. Examples of sustainability costs include annual professional development, equipment maintenance, and software license agreements. To every extent possible, rationale for the specific amounts given should be outlined. The costs outlined in the narrative section should be consistent and verified by the financial documentation submitted and explained in the Financial Impact Table. If the project does not have sustainability costs, applicants should explain why.

Yes - If yes, provide a narrative explanation of your sustainability costs as detailed in the Financial Impact Table in the box below.

Sustainability costs will include sending Literacy Coaches to required Reading Recovery/Early Literacy Conferences in years 2-5. These expenditures will include registration costs, meals, mileage, housing and substitutes. There will also be similar expenditures for the coaches in order to attend the required continuing contact training at The Ohio State University in years 2-5. This continuing professional development for Literacy Coaches ensures they keep up to date with theory and practice in both instruction and effective coaching practices. This cost will be \$33,573 Sustainability will require the district to provide substitute teachers for classroom teachers in training during years 3-5. This cost will be \$120,00

No - If no, please explain why (i.e. maintenance plan included in purchase price of equipment) in the box below.

14. Will there be any expected savings as a result of implementing the project?

Yes

No

Applicants with sustainability costs in question 13 or seeking to achieve significant advancement in spending reductions in the five-year forecast must address this response. Expected savings should match the information provided by the applicant in the Financial Impact Table. All spending reductions must be verifiable, permanent, and credible. Applicants may only respond "No" if the project will not incur any increased costs as a result of maintaining and sustaining the project after June 30th of your grant year. The Governing Board will use the cost savings as a tiebreaker between applications with similar scores during its final selection process. Cost savings will be calculated as the amount of expected cost savings less sustainability costs relative to the project budget.

120,000.00 If yes, specify the amount of annual expected savings. If no, enter 0.

If yes, provide details on the expected savings (i.e. staff counts and salary/benefits, equipment to be purchased and cost, etc.). If no, please explain

Spending reductions will be seen in the areas of Instructional Salaries: We expect to see a significant improvement in the numbers of students designated 'on-track' by the third grade. This growth in student achievement will result in a cost savings of an additional teacher needed to teach the numbers of students that would continue 'not on track' if this project of improved instruction was not implemented. This amounts to \$60,000 in staff salary and \$10,500 in staff fringes. Instructional Supplies: This project will provide 3 book closets of leveled readers for guided reading, big books for shared reading and classroom materials for learning centers and instructional support materials. We will also design the book rooms for maximum use and ease of availability to teachers. We can significantly make spending reductions for

K-2 instructional supplies over the next five years due to the fact that these book rooms will be more than adequate to support instruction over a five year period. This amount is \$150,000 and shelving expenses of \$20,000 in supplies Professional Development: Additional costs for professional development purchased services will drop dramatically for k-2 teachers after the first year of grant implementation. Training our own Literacy Coaches and having them provide the on-sight K-2 professional development will minimize the need for outside professional development presenters in reading instruction. Cost is \$38,000 in professional development services.

15. Provide a brief explanation of how the project is self-sustaining.

All Straight A Fund grant projects must be expenditure neutral. For applications with increased ongoing spending as documented in question 11-14, this spending must be offset by expected savings or reallocation of existing resources. These spending reductions must be verifiable, permanent, and credible. This information must match the information provided in your Financial Impact Table. Projected additional income may not be used to offset increased ongoing spending because additional income is not allowed by statute. Please consider inflationary costs like salaries and maintenance fees when considering whether increased ongoing spending has been offset for at least five years after June 30th of your grant year. For applications without increased ongoing spending as documented in questions 11-14, please demonstrate how you can sustain the project without incurring any increased ongoing costs.

For educational service centers and county boards of developmental disabilities that are members of a consortium, any increased ongoing spending at the educational service center or county board of developmental disabilities may also be offset with the verifiable, permanent, and credible spending reductions of other members of the consortium. This increased ongoing spending must be less than or equal to the sum of the spending reductions for the entire consortium.

Explain in detail how this project will sustain itself for at least five years after June 30th of your grant year.

This project will sustain itself for five years for several reasons. With the initial grant dollars providing for the bulk of the training, our district is able to take on additional costs through Title I and/or general fund. The district has committed to the sustainability because of the lasting impact we can make on student achievement. We will sustain the professional development and coaching support by having trained literacy coaches on sight to provide the necessary professional development and continuing contact needed to support teachers. By creating systemic change through investing in our teachers, this training will not only last over a five year period, the knowledge gained will last through a teacher's entire career. The shifts in mind sets will make a lasting impact on K-2 instruction in the district.

D) IMPLEMENTATION - Timeline, scope of work and contingency planning

16. Please provide a brief description of the team or individuals responsible for the implementation of this project, including other consortium members and/or partners.

This response should include a list of qualifications for the applicant and others associated with the grant. If the application is for a consortium or a partnership, the lead should provide information on its ability to manage the grant in an effective and efficient manner. Include the partner/consortium members' qualifications, skills and experience with innovative project implementation and projects of similar scope.

Enter Implementation Team information by clicking the link below:

[Add Implementation Team](#)

For Questions 17-19 please describe each phase of your project, including its timeline, scope of work, and anticipated barriers to success.

A complete response to these questions will demonstrate specific awareness of the context in which the project will be implemented, the major barriers that need to be overcome and the time it will take to implement the project with fidelity. A strong plan for implementing, communicating and coordinating the project should be outlined, including coordination and communication in and amongst members of the consortium or partnership (if applicable). It is recognized that specific action steps may not be included, but the outline of the major implementation steps should demonstrate a thoughtful plan for achieving the goals of the project. The time line should reflect significant and important milestones in an appropriate and reasonable time frame.

17. Planning - Activities prior to the grant implementation

* Date Range: September 2013 - August 2014

* List of scope of work (activities and/or events including project evaluation discussions, communication and coordination among entities).

Scope of Work- Discussions with teachers, principals, and stakeholders explaining the connection and impact of this project on our goals for school improvement. Look at and analyzing recent achievement data in reading. Coordination of project with The Ohio State University for training Literacy Coaches. Discussions of project evaluation including assessment protocols. Budget estimates were developed and finalized. A year long training has taken place with a small group of K-2 teachers to give them a foundation of the Literacy framework. These teachers have been the catalyst in further developing this project of professional development and instructional change.

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the planning phase

None anticipated

18. Implementation - Process to achieve project goals

* Date Range: 2014-2017

* List of scope of work (activities and/or events, including deliverables, project milestones, interim measurements, communication, and coordination).

Scope of Work: ONGOING: Professional Development for classroom teachers, Communication with DLT, BLT, TBT teams, and School Board, Collect diagnostic and Benchmark assessments and analyze data, Use data to make instructional decisions. Administrative support to teachers. Year One: Design, make purchases and complete the leveled book rooms. Assist teachers to set up a literacy classroom. Begin the cycle of assessment data collection. Make necessary intervention decisions. Provide foundational professional development to teachers

in the literacy framework, reading process and assessment protocols. Communicate continuously with stakeholders. Support teachers in the classroom with coaching provided by year one trainers. Year Two: Continue with data collection and analysis. Make necessary intervention decisions. Train the Literacy Collaborative Coaches at The Ohio State University. Year Three: Trained Literacy Coaches will begin Literacy Collaborative Training for the K-2 teaching staff. Continue data collection and analysis. Make necessary intervention decisions. Year Four: Literacy Coaches continue training teachers. Continue data collection and analysis for evaluation and make any necessary implementation changes. Make necessary intervention decisions. Year Five: Literacy Coaches continue training teachers. Continue data collection and analysis for evaluation and make any necessary implementation changes

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the implementation phase.

Changes in staffing could alter the professional development plans for the project, but it would not derail it. New teachers coming on board would create additional training classes for any teachers not having their first year training.

19. Summative Evaluation - Plans to analyze the results of the project

* Date Range September 2014-June 2017

* List of scope of work (activities and/or events, including quantitative and qualitative benchmarks and other project milestones).

Fall diagnostics starting August 2015 will provide yearly baseline data. Running records from DRA to find instructional reading levels will be administered 3 times each year along with state approved Star Early Literacy assessments will provide continuous tracking of the number of students 'on-track' and 'not on-track' throughout the year. These assessments along with running records will guide intervention. Weekly running records coded and analyzed with classroom spread sheet.s will provide for constant assessment and data from which to make instructional decisions on a weekly basis. These running records and looking at student work in weekly Teacher Based Team meetings will provide the necessary formative evaluations to guide daily instruction. The 3rd grade PARCC assessments will give summative data to show the impact of this K-2 Early Literacy project.

* Anticipated barriers to successful completion of the summative evaluation phase.

None are anticipated

20. Describe the expected changes to the instructional and/or organizational practices in your institution.

The response should illustrate the critical instructional and/or organizational changes that will result from implementation of the grant and the impact of these changes. These changes can include permanent changes to current district processes, new processes that will be incorporated or the removal of redundant or duplicative processes. The response may also outline the expected change in behaviors of individuals (changes to classroom practice, collaboration across district boundaries, changes to a typical work day for specific staff members, etc.). The expected changes should be realistic and significant in moving the institution forward.

Please enter your response below:

Permanent K-2 changes will include: systematic, cohesive, instruction by using the scientific literacy model of Literacy Collaborative from Ohio State University. This model provides ongoing, embedded literacy training for classroom teachers. We will train two Literacy Coaches that provide training and individual classroom teacher support. We will provide small group intervention, Leveled Literacy Intervention designed by Gay Su Pinnell. This intervention model also follows the theory and practice of the Literacy. This training will provide the entire K-2 faculty (including intervention teachers) with continuity of instruction (guided reading, interactive writing, shared reading and writing to name a few), and common teacher language as they discuss student achievement in IAT and RTI meetings. We have visited other school districts that have implemented Literacy Collaborative and have been very impressed with the increase in student achievement and how the teaching at different grade levels were consistent but differentiated based on grade level needs and expectations. Our district needs to explore the assessment protocol, training teachers to use scientific-based instruction instead of relying on computer based instruction, and having consistent teacher support by providing on-going training and in-class coaching. We will have Resource Rooms that house leveled literature, big books, and other teaching tools to support the model and instruction. The administration will explore schedules to maximize instructional time. We foresee a much more collaborative staff that supports one another in their instruction. and a building that shows it's students are readers and writers! The culture of the school will certainly change into one of students with a true love of reading and writing and a desire to read and write. In essence, our motto will become 'We Read, We Write, We Achieve!' We advocate the four beliefs upon which this program was built. Literacy for All addresses each belief in the following ways: 1. All students can learn. We are adopting new student-oriented instructional methods. Working to change negative mind sets, and improving assessment practices--all of which will ensure equity and education for every student. We will strive to make sure that 100% of our students reach the targeted achievement levels. 2. Learners possess multiple Intelligences. By applying a variety of instructional approaches and our understanding of multiple intelligences. We will be able to reach all our students so that they learn to read and write well. 3. Participation In a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional, and intellectual growth. We believe that students who are competent readers and writers possess the key to future success. Their skills will smooth the way for them to grow socially, emotionally. and intellectually. These children, many of whom come from families on the edge of poverty, are likely to break out of the mold and become productive citizens in their communities. 4. Diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning. Our Literacy for All improvement model is a comprehensive school-wide program which utilizes diverse, research-based instructional strategies and a variety of learning environments It is designed to enable our students to learn how to learn.

E) SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT AND LASTING VALUE - Impact, evaluation and replication

The responses in this section are focused on the ability to design a method for evaluating the project's capacity for long-term sustainable results. Therefore, the questions focus on the method of defining the problem(s) the project hopes to solve and the measures that will determine if the problem (s) have been solved.

21. Describe the rationale, research or past success that supports the innovative project and its impact on student achievement, spending reduction in the five-year fiscal forecast or utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom.

The response should provide a concise explanation of items which provide rationale that will support the probability of successfully achieving the

goals of the project. Answers may differ based on the various levels of development that are possible. If the proposal is for a new, never before implemented project, the response should provide logical, coherent explanations of the anticipated results based on some past experience or rationale. For projects that have been implemented on a smaller scale or successfully in other organizations, the response should provide the quantifiable results of the other projects. If available, relevant research in support of this particular proposal should also be included.

Please enter your response below.

Dr. Anthony Bryk, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and his research team, including researchers from Stanford University, University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Leslie University and The Ohio State University, conducted a four-year study of the value-added effects of Literacy Collaborative on student learning and achievement in grade K-2. The project was also designed to study growth in teacher expertise and changes in professional communication networks in Literacy Collaborative schools. The primary findings were: students' average rates of learning increased by 16% in the first implementation year. Teacher expertise increased substantially and the rate of improvement was predicted by the amount of coaching a teacher received. Professional communication amongst teachers in the schools increased over the three years of implementation, and the Literacy Coach began more central in the schools' communication networks. The complete study can be found at lcosu.org. Literacy Collaborative has been evaluated through internal evaluations, third-party outside studies, and collaborative projects conducted with researchers at other universities. Several large-scale quantitative studies have documented the effect of Literacy Collaborative on both teaching and student learning. In addition, three survey studies of teachers and students have provided evidence of teacher perceptions of the Literacy Collaborative program and of student attitudes toward reading and writing. Positive effects of LC were found for both teachers and students, including improved teaching and increased student achievement in literacy. LC program research has been reviewed by the Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center1 (CSRQ) in Washington, D.C. CSRQ set very stringent research standards and found no programs with strong evidence of effectiveness. Literacy Collaborative was rated among the stronger comprehensive school reform programs, with moderately strong evidence of positive effects on diverse student populations. Literacy Collaborative Surveys (2001-2004) Literacy Collaborative researchers conducted two surveys of literacy coordinators and teachers in Literacy Collaborative schools (Bartlam & Boucher, 2001, 2003). Surveys indicate: ? LC Improved teaching skills and improved staff relationships; and. ? Increased reflection on teaching practice, more focus on the needs of individual students, and increased time spent on literacy instruction and activities. Literacy Collaborative provided school staff with a common language for communicating about the successes and needs of their students. Indiana Early Literacy Intervention Grant Program (1998-2004) In Indiana, the state Department of Education contracted with the Center for the Evaluation of Educational Policy (CEEP) at Indiana University to evaluate several programs that were funded by the state's Early Literacy Intervention Grant Program (ELIGP), including Literacy Collaborative. Comparing schools that had adopted the Literacy Collaborative with schools that had not adopted any programs, CEEP found the following: ...Literacy Collaborative is indeed a powerful intervention... ? Literacy Collaborative schools, on average, showed substantially larger increases in passing rates than schools with no interventions, particularly in high-poverty schools. ? Literacy Collaborative schools, on average, had lower special-education referral rates than schools with no special programs. ? Literacy Collaborative schools, on average, had modestly lower 2nd grade retention rates, particularly in urban schools. In their summary report, CEEP wrote that "of the individual ELIGP-funded interventions included in prior CEEP evaluations, Literacy Collaborative has most consistently demonstrated success on student outcomes" (Plucker, Simmons, and Ravert, 2005, p. 35). References

22. Describe the overall plan to evaluate the impact of the concept, strategy or approaches used in the project.

This plan should include the methodology for measuring all of the project outcomes. Applicants should make sure to outline quantitative approaches to assess progress and measure the overall impact of the project proposal. The response should provide a clear outline of the methods, process, timelines and data requirements for the final analysis of the project's progress, success or failure. The applicant should provide information on how the lessons learned from the project can and will be shared with other education providers in Ohio.

* Include the name and contact information of the person who will be responsible for conducting the evaluation and whether this will be an internal or external evaluation.

Lindsey Kegley, Coordinator of State and Federal Programs, Findlay St. Portsmouth, OH 45662; Lindsey.Kegley@portsmouthtrojans.net / 740-354-5705 - will be responsible for conducting the internal evaluation. Short term objectives will be measured by running records, Concepts about Print (CAP), and writing samples. We will take and analyze running records at the beginning of school for all K-2 students as baseline data (benchmarks). We will measure and maintain text reading level and self-correction rate and monitor progress throughout the year. The goal for all readers is to be on or above level and maintain a self-correction rate of 1:1-1:4 at the end of the school year. Kindergarten and first grade will be given Concepts about Print (CAP) to measure basic understandings of how print works in a book. We will measure such concepts as 1-1 match with return sweep, difference between word and letter, and other vital understandings that contribute to successful early literacy. We will administer the CAP three times during the school year to measure progress and differentiate instruction. There are 20 possible points on the CAP and our goal will be to reach an average score of at least 12 for Kindergarten students by the end of the school year and an average point score of 18 for first grade. Writing samples will be collected and scored by a rubric to measure to letter formation, Hearing Sounds in Words, and response to writing prompt to be determined. The method(s) we will use over a five year period to measure progress for long term goals are as follows: 20% increase of passage of 3rd grade for each school year 2014-2019; and a 20% decrease in special education placements during that same time frame.

* Include the method by which progress toward short- and long-term objectives will be measured. (This section should include the types of data to be collected, the formative outputs and outcomes and the systems in place to track the project's progress).

Fall diagnostics starting August 2015 will provide yearly baseline data. Running records from DRA to find instructional reading levels will be administered 3 times each year along with state approved Star Early Literacy assessments will provide continuous tracking of the number of students 'on-track' and 'not on-track' throughout the year. These assessments along with running records will guide intervention. Weekly running records coded and analyzed with classroom spread sheet.s will provide for constant assessment and data from which to make instructional decisions on a weekly basis. These running records and looking at student work in weekly teacher Based Team meetings will provide the necessary formative evaluations to guide daily instruction. The 3rd grade PARCC assessments will give summative data to show the impact of this K-2 Early Literacy project.

* Include the method, process and/or procedure by which the project will modify or change the project plan if measured progress is insufficient to meet project objectives.

The implementation team will keep watch over the progress of the project. If insufficient progress is being made, several areas will be addressed for making changes. The Literacy Coaches will give input on the progress of training and make any necessary adjustments.

Literacy coaches may have to make shifts in their coaching, giving more support to teachers that may need it. Teachers will look closer at formative assessments and make necessary changes in delivery of instruction. Administration will also play a role in making expectations clear and supporting teachers in their instruction. Discussions regarding data will take place in Teacher Based and Building Leadership Team meetings, ensuring that all stakeholders are a part of improvement decisions.

23. Describe the substantial value and lasting impact which the project hopes to achieve.

The response should provide specific quantifiable measures of the grant outcomes and how the project will lead to successful attainment of the project goals. Applicants should describe how the program or project will continue after the grant period has expired.

Please enter your response below.

Our district has a history of low achievement, high special education enrollment, and lack of a systematic, unified, and scientific based curriculum. Each classroom is taught according to the individual teacher's understandings. There is no mutually agreed upon grade level instructional strategies. There is an overall need for classroom management. There is an abundance of technology and computer programs that are a staple of classroom instruction. However, it is common that teachers rely on the technology rather than their instructional impact on the students. These factors contribute to the low student achievement. Quantifiable measures will include: 1. Implementation of an assessment protocol that measures text reading level and the attainment of early behaviors that are necessary for literacy acquisition. Data from the assessment protocol will guide staff development and intervention, with support from the Literacy Coach; 2. The grant will provide the money to train Literacy Coaches, implementation of Literacy Collaborative, and books and teaching supplies to support these endeavors; 3. The project will continue after the grant period has expired because sustainability is inherent in the Literacy Collaborative model. The trained Literacy Coach will not only train the K-2 staff but provide in-class teacher support with coaching on a regular basis. The books and instructional supplies will be provided at the end of the project. These books can be used at least 7 years. Everything is in place after the first year of implementation of Literacy Collaborative to sustain the model. Teachers will develop their understanding of the reading process and the Literacy Collaborative Framework. This investment in teachers will last well beyond the grant period as knowledge is forever with you. With this knowledge and support, we will create not only student achievement, but teachers that become life long learners themselves. We want to help students become proficient readers and writers and develop a school culture that is 'rich in books and words'. We strongly believe that the initiative we are adopting will bring about many changes that will positively affect student learning. A few of the more significant changes are 1. Student Activities. The students will be observed actively reading and writing, taking books home to be read, creating book clubs for shared and independent reading, appearing comfortable with print, and exuding confidence that "I'm a reader and a writer! ", 2. School Environment. The schools will literally be a showplace for our children's literacy projects. The hallways will display classroom and individual reading and writing activities. The children will have access to every nook and cranny for cooperative reading and writing. Portfolios of students' work will be used for shared and independent reading as well as for assessment. Books, books, books will be everywhere! 3. Curriculum. Transactive/interactive learning and teaching will be the instructional delivery system for all learners in the school community--students, teachers, and parents.

24. Describe the specific benchmarks, by goal as answered in question 9, which the project aims to achieve in five years. Include any other anticipated outcomes of the project that you hope to achieve that may not be easily benchmarked.

The applicant should provide details on the quantifiable measures of short- and long- term objectives that will be tracked and the source of benchmark comparative data points. Responses should include specified measurement periods and preliminary success points that will be used to validate successful implementation of the project. If a similar project has been successfully implemented in other districts or schools, identification of these comparable benchmarks should be included.

*** Student Achievement**

First year, we will provide an overview of the literacy framework and preliminary training for all K-2 teachers. This year of training will also share official expectations, assessment skills, and an overview of the reading process. The implementation team and teachers will collect K-3 'on-track/not on-track' baseline data. We anticipate moderate increase in student achievement (on-track) attributed to the fact that teachers will make adjustments in teaching as the professional development continues throughout the year. Second year, the Literacy Coaches will be in training at Ohio State University. The K-2 teachers will refine their theory and practice. We again expect an increase in the number of 'on-track' students surpassing the first year student achievement results. Third year, the entire K-2 staff will participate in the official Literacy Collaborative training. We anticipate teachers' practice to reap significant increase in the number of students' on-track status. Thus, impacting the number of students designated as proficient. Our goal is a 20% increase per year in the number of students' proficient. We expect fewer special education placements in K-2. In years 4 and 5, we expect continual growth in student achievement as described above. South-Western City School district has full implementation of Literacy Collaborative and LLI. The District ratings since 2003-2004 are as follows: 2003-04 Continuous Improvement (CI); 2004-05 CI; 2005-06 CI; 2006-07 CI; 2007-08 CI; 2008-09 CI; 2009-12 Excellent. This district is the 6th largest district in the state with one of the largest ESL populations. Literacy Collaborative has made a tremendous impact on student achievement not only in this district but many hundreds in the United States.

*** Spending Reduction in the five-year fiscal forecast**

Spending reductions will be seen in the areas of Instructional Salaries: We expect to see a significant improvement in the numbers of students designated 'on-track' by the third grade. This growth in student achievement will result in a cost savings of an additional teacher needed to teach the numbers of students that would continue 'not on track' if this project of improved instruction was not implemented. This amounts to \$60,000 in staff salary and \$10,500 in staff fringes. Instructional Supplies: This project will provide 3 book closets of leveled readers for guided reading, big books for shared reading and classroom materials for learning centers and instructional support materials. We will also design the book rooms for maximum use and ease of availability to teachers. We can significantly make spending reductions for K-2 instructional supplies over the next five years due to the fact that these book rooms will be more than adequate to support instruction over a five year period. This amount is \$150,000 and shelving expenses of \$20,000 in supplies Professional Development: Additional costs for professional development purchased services will drop dramatically for k-2 teachers after the first year of grant implementation. Training our own Literacy Coaches and having them provide the on-site K-2 professional development will minimize the need for outside professional development presenters in reading instruction. Cost is \$38,000 in professional development services.

*** Utilization of a greater share of resources in the classroom**

By the end of school year 2014-2015 the Resource Book Rooms will be completed with all books and supplies available for teacher use in

the classroom. During the 2014-15 school year all k-2 teachers will participate in initial training to gain a better understanding of the reading process and have a foundational understanding of a literacy framework. By the end of school year 2015-16 we will have 2 trained literacy coaches ready to begin training teachers the following year. By the end of 2016-17 all K-2 teachers will be trained in the Literacy Collaborative model and implementing such in their classrooms.

* Implementation of a shared services delivery model

* Other Anticipated Outcomes

25. Is this project able to be replicated in other districts in Ohio?

Yes

No

If the applicant selects "Yes" to the first part of the question, the response should provide an explanation of the time and effort it would take to implement the project in another district, as well as any plans to share lessons learned with other districts. To every extent possible, applicants should outline how this project can become part of a model so that other districts across the state can take advantage of the learnings from the proposed innovative project. If there is a plan to increase the scale and scope of the project within the district or consortium, it should be included here.

* Explain your response

If another school district would like to replicate this project, call The Ohio State University College of Education and Human Ecology, Department of Teaching and Learning. 1100 Kinnear Road Columbus, Ohio 43212, 800-678-6486 or lcosu.org. In general, Literacy Collaborative partnerships require a five-year commitment from each school or district and literacy coach. Program implementation takes place in stages. Year 1: Training the literacy coach, building a leadership team LC implementation begins with literacy coach training and the development of a literacy leadership team comprised of administrators, classroom teachers, the literacy coach, and other stakeholders involved in reading and writing instruction. The literacy leadership team is responsible for guiding the implementation of Literacy Collaborative at their school. These responsibilities include: communicating the goals and outcomes of Literacy Collaborative with the home and school community; engaging the school community in discussion about literacy teaching and learning; and developing an evaluation plan for measuring student progress and monitoring program effectiveness through data collection and analysis. Literacy Coach training involves face to face as well as online learning at a participating university site. The rigors of the training prepare the coach to work effectively with children as well as adults in the school. Years 2-4: Classroom implementation, professional development, and coaching Classroom implementation begins during the second year when the literacy coach begins providing 40+-hours of job-embedded professional development for teachers in the school. Through regular meetings and assignments, teachers learn about the language and literacy teaching framework, the rationales & theory behind it, and how to implement and refine their practices. They also begin to monitor student progress through individual student assessments, data collection, and analysis. The literacy coach provides individual coaching for participating teachers as they learn to implement the framework across the training year. The next two years are dedicated to training additional classroom teachers and implementing Literacy Collaborative in every classroom throughout the school. Work continues with the leadership team, district personnel and parents to support increased learning and to build a vibrant community of enthusiastic readers and writers.

By virtue of applying for the Straight A Fund, all applicants agree to participate in the overall evaluation of the Straight A Fund for the duration of the evaluation time frame. The Governing Board of the Straight A Fund reserves the right to conduct an evaluation of the project and request additional information in the form of data, surveys, interviews, focus groups and other related data on behalf of the General Assembly, Governor and other interested parties for an overall evaluation of the Straight A Fund.

PROGRAM ASSURANCES: I agree, on behalf of this applicant, and any or all identified consortium members or partners, that all supporting documents contain information approved by a relevant executive board or its equivalent and to abide by all assurances outlined in the Straight A Assurances (available in the document library section of the CCIP).

Lindsey Kegley, Portsmouth City Schools

Save And Go To 

Consortium Contacts

No consortium contacts added yet. Please add a new consortium contact using the form below.

Partnerships

Portsmouth City (044669) - Scioto County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Save And Go To 

Partnerships

No partners added yet. Please add a new partner by using the form below.

Implementation Team

Portsmouth City (044669) - Scioto County - 2015 - Straight A Fund - Rev 0 - Straight A Fund

Save And Go To 

Implementation Team

First Name	Last Name	Title	Responsibilities	Qualifications	Prior Relevant Experience	Delete Contact
Lindsey	Kegley	Federal Grants and Curriculum Supervisor	Maintain and oversee the grant implementation Communicate with stakeholders on the progress of the grant implementation Assist with planning and providing professional development Oversee the grant budget Purchase materials Oversee the development of bookrooms	Certifications: k-8 permanent certificate Kindergarten certificate Elementary principal's certificate Supervisor certificate	20 years teaching experience in the primary level Trained Literacy Collaborative Coach Professional development facilitator Presenter at the National Reading Recovery/Early Literacy Conference 4 years experience in Federal Grants management	
Gary, 'Scott'	Dutey	Superintendent	Support Implementation Team and Teachers in the Grant Project Follow Grant implementation and benchmark data Communicate with Stakeholders on the progress of the grant project	6-12 Teaching Certificates 4-9 Principal Certificate Superintendent Certificate	Federal Grants and Curriculum Supervisor Teaching experience Programs supervisor	
Dana	Pollock	Principal	Maintain and oversee the grant implementation at Portsmouth Elementary Communicate with stakeholders on the progress of the grant implementation Collect and maintain data for the building Preside over Teacher based teams and building leadership teams to focus on student work and data. Classroom observations and walk-thrus	Certificates: K-8 Teaching Certificate Principal Certificate: PK-6, 4-9, 5-12	6 years teaching experience 7 years Principal / Leadership experience	
Kristi	Toppins	Principal	Maintain and oversee the grant implementation at Portsmouth Elementary Communicate with stakeholders on the progress of the grant implementation Collect and maintain data for the building Preside over Teacher based teams and building leadership teams to focus on student work and data. Classroom observations and walk-thrus	1-8 Teaching Certification Elementary Principal Certification	18 years Elementary Teaching Experience 15 years Elementary Principal / Leadership Experience	
Dianna	Reedy	Treasurer	Assist in maintaining budget requirements	School Treasuree License	6 years Assistant Treasurer 3 years Treasurer Experience	