



SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Revised July 15, 2011

Title I

and

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Council on Accreditation and School Improvement



Colquitt County School System
Mr. Leonard McCoy, Superintendent

Table of Contents

Continuous Improvement.....	3
District Profile	6
System Goals for Improvement	52
System Action Plans for Improvement	54
Quality Assurance Statement.....	118

Continuous Improvement

With ten elementary schools, one middle school, one junior high school, and one high school, the Colquitt County School System endeavors to continually improve and to transition from a quality school system to an excellent school system. The quest for continuous system improvement is guided by a central mission: The Colquitt County School System is committed to the daily pursuit of excellence in student achievement while serving the needs of all children in a positive and safe environment. To accomplish this mission, the Board of Education seeks to achieve three primary goals:

- 1) Excellence in maintaining a positive and safe environment
- 2) Excellence in student achievement
- 3) Excellence in stewardship of facilities and finances

In pursuing these goals, system personnel take pride in providing a positive, safe, and enriching learning environment for students. All stakeholders work together to ensure that every aspect of the school atmosphere promotes student security, high levels of academic achievement, and the responsible use of resources. Likewise, it takes a continuous improvement process to identify, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of the action steps that will ultimately lead to student success.

In the Colquitt County School System, a continuous improvement process begins at the classroom and school levels and leads to the cycle of continuous improvement at the system level. Teachers' professional growth is connected to the school improvement plan that is directly connected to the system's improvement plan. Collaboration between schools and the district has always been strong, and the improvement journey began many years ago. However, since 2006,

systematic efforts were set in motion to align individual school improvement plans with the system plan.

With goals, action steps, resources, and evaluation plans identified, progress checking for continuous improvement is an on-going activity. Checking involves the use of formative (e.g., classroom assessments) and summative (e.g., CRCT and GHSGT) assessments. Results of assessments establish the impact of strategies and interventions and guide further implementation or revision of the action steps. Essential to the cycle of continuous improvement is the analysis of the status of student learning and the inclusion of the district’s stakeholders’ contributions and challenges. Therefore, data gathered for the district profile is an important element in both determining strengths and weaknesses and targeting areas for improvement.

The profile answers the question, “where are we now?” and also initiates the question, “where do we want to be?” Analyzing the data gathered in the profile provides information on areas needing improvement, areas showing improvement, and areas that have improved. The data is constantly updated as information becomes available (often data is slow to come from state offices). While the data is constantly referred to throughout the school year the main analysis of student achievement data occurs in June and July as scores from state assessments become available. The intention is that, as a new school year begins in August, all schools and the system have knowledge of student performance from the previous year and can set targets for the new school year. The state CRCT scores for grades 1-8 are re-rostered in August to match new class rolls for the new school year. This data is used extensively on daily basis by principals and teachers to determine instructional grouping and strategies to meet the needs of students as they pursue excellence.

At the beginning of each school year all schools review the SACS CASI Accreditation Standards for quality schools, and now for a quality system, as well as the requirements for a

federally funded Title I school-wide program. Each principal shares the standards and requirements with all teachers and staff and together they assess their school's compliance to the standards and requirements. This review of school accreditation standards and Title I requirements is documented and stored at the school and at central office. All schools officially report the results of school improvement efforts to their School Councils at the first meeting of the year and at the first PTO meeting for the year. All schools have computerized, continuous stream, information on student achievement and school improvement initiatives in their reception area of their school offices.

However, the main force behind the *continuous* work towards improvement comes from the leadership of the Superintendent. The Superintendent emphasizes student achievement at every administrator meeting. He looks for improvement and asks pertinent questions if improvement is not evident. He challenges principals to challenge teachers to analyze and reason why students are not showing improvement on state assessments. He consistently reiterates the need for high expectations. He meets individually with principals to review their school's data and asks difficult questions. The Superintendent's focus on excellence is *continuous*.

The "numbers" in the detailed profile that follows indicate the status of the Colquitt County School System in its journey towards excellence for all schools. System goals for improvement are based on the "numbers" and action plans are developed to achieve excellence.

District Profile

Colquitt County, a rural agrarian region, is located in the southwest corner of Georgia, approximately 65 miles north of Tallahassee, Florida. The total land area of Colquitt County is 552 square miles, and the population is approximately 45,000. Moultrie is the county seat and the largest of the seven incorporated towns (Berlin, Doerun, Ellenton, Funston, Norman Park, and Riverside) within the county. Colquitt County is one of Georgia’s poorer counties resulting in a free and reduced lunch rate of 73% for the school system, ranging from more than 95% F/R lunch at two elementary schools to 50% or less F/R lunch at another elementary school.

There are two significant challenges that face the Colquitt County School System for which there is no easy remedy. The first is poverty and the second is a rapidly increasing Hispanic population. The school system has led initiatives to have all educators and the community become more aware of the impact of poverty not only on learning but on the community as a whole. The increasing number of students who do not speak English presents additional difficulties to teachers as they attempt to instruct a diverse student population.

The **2010 Poverty Threshold** for a family of four in the continental United States was **\$22,314** (US census Bureau) In Colquitt County, 22% of our population is below the Poverty Threshold. (According to the National Center for Children in poverty, most families of four would have to make twice their assigned Poverty Threshold in order to provide their children with the basic necessities, such as food, housing and health care.)

	Percentage of all people in poverty (2009)	Children ages 0 - 17 (2009)
Georgia	16.6	22.7
Colquitt County	22.0	31.9

Number English Language Learners = ESOL Students:

2000	2005	2010
324	413	1021

% Hispanic of Total Student Population:

2000	2005	2010
9	14	22

Number of Hispanic Students:

	2000	2005	2010/11
Grades K-2	271	343	550
Grades 3-5	201	308	467
Grades 6-8	140	274	407
Grades 9-12	84	223	428

District Profile

School Board Members:

Mrs. Trudie Hill, Chairman
Mrs. Debra Hampton, Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Pat Anderson
Mrs. Jerry Meister
Mr. Roy Reeves
Mr. Jimmy Taylor

Superintendent:

Mr. Leonard McCoy

System Staff

Dr. Maureen Yearata	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction and Learning Services
Mrs. Jennifer Funderburk	Middle and Secondary Schools Curriculum Director
Mrs. Etta Faggioni	Special Education Director
Mr. Gerald Burke	Federal Programs Director
Dr. Fritzie Sheumaker	Alternative Education Director
Dr. Geni Akridge	Gifted Education Director
Mrs. Lynn Clark	Pre-K Director and Elementary Curriculum Director
Mr. Mickey Key	Assistant Superintendent for Business and Operational Services
Mrs. Alana Bolin	Comptroller
Mrs. Fay Wood	Employee Benefits Manager
Mrs. Monika Griner	School Nutrition Director
Mrs. Christine Page	Transportation Director
Dr. Fritzie Sheumaker	Director for Human Resources and Information Services
Mrs. Emily Nichols	Technology and Information Services Director
Mr. Greg Ponder	Technology Network Services Director
Mr. Rick Gehle	Facilities Director

Colquitt County Schools

Elementary: Pre K - 5

Middle: 6th – 8th

High: 9th – 12th

School	*Enrollment	AYP Status 2009	Principal
Cox Elementary	639	NI – Made AYP	Mrs. Laura Whitfield
Doerun Elementary	258	Distinguished 7 years	Mr. Chuck Jones
Funston Elementary	409	Distinguished 5 years	Mr. Ricky Reynolds
Hamilton Elementary	259	Distinguished 6 years	Mrs. Brenda Demott
Norman Park Elementary	578	Distinguished 5 years	Mr. Keith Adams
J.M. Odom Elementary	636	Adequate – Made AYP	Mr. James Harrell
Okapilco Elementary	458	Distinguished 5 years	Mr. Eric Croft
Stringfellow Elementary	372	NI	Mrs. Darlene Reynolds
Sunset Elementary	711	Adequate – DNM	Mr. Bruce Owen
R. B. Wright Elementary	487	Distinguished 5 years	Mr. Marc Bell
Willie J. Williams Middle	1272	Adequate – DNM	Mr. Doug Howell
C.A. Gray Junior High	1253	NI	Dr. Todd Cason
Colquitt County High	1711	NI – Made AYP	Mr. Bob Jones

* September 14, 2009

SYSTEM STUDENT DATA

Year	Total Enrollment	% Black	% White	% Hispanic	% Asian	% American Indian	% Multi-Racial	% Male	% Female	% Migrant
2010-2011	9237	27.21	47.58	22.22	.64	.25	2.00	51.72	48.28	6.77
2009-2010	9026	27.18	48.66	21.07	.64	.19	2.17	51.36	48.64	6.85
2008-2009	8866	27.95	49.89	18.43	.70	.07	2.97	50.89	49.11	5.68
2007-2008	8774	28.42	51.25	18.89	.60	.01	2.82	50.59	49.41	5.13

Free / Reduced Lunch	Number	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	6728	73.00
2009-2010	6735	72.74
2008-2009	6006	67.29
2007-2008	5785	64.98

Special Education	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	1273	13.78
2009-2010	1248	13.83
2008-2009	1109	12.51
2007-2008	1100	12.54

English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	1021	11.05
2009-2010	974	10.79
2008-2009	611	6.89
2007-2008	595	6.78

Migrant Education	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	625	6.77
2009-2010	618	6.85
2008-2009	504	5.68
2007-2008	450	5.13

System Student Data

Early Intervention Program (EIP)	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	0	0
2009-2010	0	0
2008-2009	36	.41
2007-2008	61	.69

Title I	# of Eligible Schools	# of Schools Served Targeted Assistance	# of School Served Schoolwide
2010-2011	13	0	13
2009-2010	13	0	13
2008-2009	12	1	11
2007-2008	12	1	11

Gifted Education	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	1488	16.11
2009-2010	1271	14.08
2008-2009	1095	12.35
2007-2008	964	10.96

System Data by Elementary Schools

Retention Rates	Total Number	% in K	% in 1 st	% in 2 nd	% in 3 rd	% in 4 th	% in 5 th
2010-2011	138	7.72	6.22	3.39	.75	.27	0.0
2009-2010	230	9.20	6.34	3.46	5.82	.59	6.41
2008-2009	300	9.24	4.85	1.38	12.95	0.0	14.29
2007-2008	170	7.49	4.91	2.37	3.74	3.31	2.08

Retention Rates	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Other Ethnic Groups	% Male	% Female
2010-2011	3.00	3.00	2.71	4.17	3.10	2.45
2009-2010	4.13	7.42	5.97	2.21	1.27	1.41
2008-2009	4.54	8.11	7.95	6.38	6.94	5.60
2007-2008	1.49	1.35	.96	.29	2.43	1.66

Special Education	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Other Ethnic Groups
2010-2011	15.77	17.90	8.22	8.93
2009-2010	17.18	20.56	10.68	11.03
2008-2009	13.15	17.24	8.57	10.64
2007-2008	5.82	6.64	10.14	21.05

Mobility* Rate of Students	Number	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	1371	27.74
2009-2010	1006	23.55
2008-2009	1099	23.02
2007-2008	973	23.45

Mobility* Rate of Students	% of Transfers within System	% of Transfers Out of System
2010-2011	45.22	54.78
2009-2010	25.15	74.85
2008-2009	52.41	47.59
2007-2008	48.13	51.87

6.

*For the purpose of this document, mobility rate for students is defined as the percentage of students who enter or leave school between September 1st and the last day of the school year.

System Data by Middle Schools

Retention Rates	Total Number	% in 6th	% in 7th	% in 8th
2010-2011	209	0.0	1.06	31.12
2009-2010	203	0.0	1.79	30.97
2008-2009	23	0.05	0.11	1.08
2007-2008	41	.48	1.27	4.85

Retention Rates	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Other Ethnic Groups	% Male	% Female
2010-2011	3.72	4.48	2.16	.15	5.89	4.63
2009-2010	4.03	3.98	2.60	.16	5.87	5.25
2008-2009	0.54	0.43	0.27	0.00	0.60	0.65
2007-2008	1.13	4.10	2.76	0.00	2.56	1.79

Special Education	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Other Ethnic Groups
2010-2011	2.68	4.11	3.78	0.92
2009-2010	2.14	4.92	4.95	1.75
2008-2009	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2007-2008	0.00	2.38	0.00	0.00

Mobility* Rate of Students	Number	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	305	15.35
2009-2010	340	18.05
2008-2009	336	18.18
2007-2008	254	13.59

Mobility* Rate of Students	% of Transfers within System	% of Transfers Out of System
2010-2011	41.72	58.28
2009-2010	n/a	8.28
2008-2009	47.62	52.38
2007-2008	41.73	58.27

*For the purpose of this document, mobility rate for students is defined as the percentage of students who enter or leave school between September 1st and the last day of the school year.

System Data by High School

Retention Rates: Percents should reflect the number of the retained students compared to the total number of students in each category/grade.

Retention Rates	Total Number	% in 9th	% in 10th	% in 11th	% in 12th
2010-2011	141	14.29	8.12	5.56	10.54
2009-2010	267	19.23	5.78	1.72	6.23
2008-2009	105	6.03	5.14	3.29	3.75
2007-2008	119	5.50	9.66	4.34	1.55

Retention Rates	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Other Ethnic Groups	% Male	% Female
2010-2011	5.94	13.50	6.75	4.55	10.96	5.68
2009-2010	6.76	13.19	11.52	3.97	11.37	7.04
2008-2009	1.87	2.05	0.71	0.04	2.85	1.83
2007-2008	3.85	7.44	7.88	0.00	6.86	3.96

Special Education	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Other Ethnic Groups
2010-2011	8.34	17.38	9.65	6.82
2009-2010	8.68	20.62	9.38	7.95
2008-2009	9.52	18.10	0.00	0.00
2007-2008	8.74	14.68	12.5	0.00

Mobility* Rate of Students	Number	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	335	15.92
2009-2010	399	17.42
2008-2009	392	17.47
2007-2008	429	19.37

Mobility* Rate of Students	% of Transfers within System	% of Transfers Out of System
2010-2011	N/A	7.20
2009-2010	N/A	6.68
2008-2009	N/A	4.99
2007-2008	N/A	8.35

*For the purpose of this document, mobility rate for students is defined as the percentage of students who enter or leave school between September 1st and the last day of the school year.

System Data by High School

Remedial Education	Content Area(s)	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2005-2006	Both Reading and Writing	173	7.04
2005-2006	Both Writing and Mathematics	N/A	N/A
2005-2006	Both Reading and Mathematics	145	5.90
2005-2006	Remedial Mathematics	105	4.27
2005-2006	Remedial Writing	N/A	N/A
2005-2006	Remedial Reading (HS)	N/A	N/A
2004-2005	Both Reading and Writing	151	7.14
2004-2005	Both Writing and Mathematics	0	0.00
2004-2005	Both Reading and Mathematics	78	3.69
2004-2005	Remedial Mathematics	103	4.87
2004-2005	Remedial Writing	1	0.05
2004-2005	Remedial Reading (HS)	0	0.00
2003-2004	Both Reading and Writing	164	8.03
2003-2004	Both Writing and Mathematics	0	0.00
2003-2004	Both Reading and Mathematics	156	7.64
2003-2004	Remedial Mathematics	99	4.85
2003-2004	Remedial Writing	0	0.00
2003-2004	Remedial Reading (HS)	1	0.05

Technology/Career Education	Program Enrollment	Percent of Student Population
2010-2011	2826	81.63
2009-2010	2052	89.61
2008-2009	1818	81.02
2007-2008	1167	52.69

System Student Achievement: Elementary
Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – English/Language Arts
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

(GPS scores are highlighted. Other scores are based on QCC)

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 1				
Total Enrollment		710	712	751
% Black		63.00	56.00	66.00
% White		89.00	81.00	85.00
% Hispanic		66.00	69.00	73.00
% Asian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial		83.00	73.00	81.00
% Male		73.00	78.00	73.00
% Female		79.00	75.00	80.00
% Students with Disabilities		54.00	45.00	50.00
% Migrant Eligible		60.00	61.00	73.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 2				
Total Enrollment		679	722	663
% Black		61.00	71.00	70.00
% White		86.00	86.00	86.00
% Hispanic		80.00	77.00	71.00
% Asian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial		86.00	82.00	78.00
% Male		76.00	73.00	77.00
% Female		80.00	87.00	81.00
% Students with Disabilities		45.00	47.00	41.00
% Migrant Eligible		67.00	70.00	61.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – English/Language Arts
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 3				
Total Enrollment	655	735	680	657
% Black	81.00	73.00	74.00	70.00
% White	92.00	90.00	88.00	92.00
% Hispanic	88.00	85.00	83.00	78.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	80.00	73.00	85.00	88.00
% Male	85.00	78.00	81.00	77.00
% Female	92.00	89.00	87.00	88.00
% Students with Disabilities	62.00	57.00	62.00	63.00
% Migrant Eligible	80.00	90.00	76.00	68.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 4				
Total Enrollment	731	671	652	662
% Black	76.00	88.00	82.00	78.00
% White	89.00	91.00	92.00	89.00
% Hispanic	84.00	89.00	84.00	77.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	94.00	92.00	88.00	80.00
% Male	78.00	85.00	81.00	81.00
% Female	91.00	94.00	92.00	86.00
% Students with Disabilities	57.00	57.00	58.00	52.00
% Migrant Eligible	85.00	91.00	75.00	72.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – English/Language Arts
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 5 Total Enrollment	672	676	668	612
% Black	87.00	81.00	82.00	85.00
% White	93.00	94.00	91.00	93.00
% Hispanic	89.00	89.00	83.00	77.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	100.00	86.00	90.00
% Male	90.00	85.00	82.00	84.00
% Female	92.00	93.00	92.00	91.00
% Students with Disabilities	74.00	65.00	52.00	60.00
% Migrant Eligible	78.00	80.00	79.00	69.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Reading

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 1				
Total Enrollment		710	712	751
% Black		75.00	68.00	77.00
% White		95.00	89.00	90.00
% Hispanic		76.00	81.00	86.00
% Asian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial		100.00	75.00	86.00
% Male		85.00	78.00	84.00
% Female		85.00	85.00	88.00
% Students with Disabilities		66.00	55.00	59.00
% Migrant Eligible		65.00	69.00	83.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 2				
Total Enrollment		677	723	663
% Black		78.00	82.00	82.00
% White		93.00	90.00	95.00
% Hispanic		87.00	86.00	81.00
% Asian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial		91.00	91.00	87.00
% Male		87.00	84.00	85.00
% Female		89.00	91.00	92.00
% Students with Disabilities		59.00	56.00	63.00
% Migrant Eligible		75.00	79.00	70.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Reading

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 3 Total Enrollment	656	737	681	658
% Black	89.00	87.00	86.00	81.00
% White	95.00	95.00	94.00	96.00
% Hispanic	94.00	93.00	86.00	83.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	89.00	94.00	95.00	81.00
% Male	91.00	90.00	89.00	85.00
% Female	96.00	95.00	93.00	91.00
% Students with Disabilities	83.00	77.00	71.00	66.00
% Migrant Eligible	93.00	93.00	88.00	77.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 4 Total Enrollment	732	672	651	661
% Black	73.00	83.00	75.00	75.00
% White	89.00	93.00	93.00	90.00
% Hispanic	87.00	90.00	82.00	68.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	75.00	93.00	89.00	76.00
% Male	80.00	87.00	83.00	78.00
% Female	89.00	93.00	88.00	85.00
% Students with Disabilities	59.00	66.00	64.00	52.00
% Migrant Eligible	86.00	91.00	78.00	58.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Reading
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 5 Total Enrollment	672	676	669	613
% Black	87.00	85.00	85.00	82.00
% White	97.00	96.00	95.00	96.00
% Hispanic	96.00	88.00	85.00	79.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	91.00	89.00	91.00
% Male	94.00	90.00	88.00	85.00
% Female	94.00	94.00	93.00	94.00
% Students with Disabilities	79.00	72.00	58.00	66.00
% Migrant Eligible	87.00	80.00	82.00	77.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Mathematics

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 1				
Total Enrollment		712	712	753
% Black		66.00	69.00	87.00
% White		92.00	89.00	88.00
% Hispanic		78.00	83.00	87.00
% Asian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial		88.00	76.00	81.00
% Male		81.00	80.00	85.00
% Female		81.00	83.00	84.00
% Students with Disabilities		61.00	85.00	56.00
% Migrant Eligible		64.00	69.00	90.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 2				
Total Enrollment		680	725	663
% Black		79.00	78.00	73.00
% White		89.00	91.00	93.00
% Hispanic		88.00	80.00	91.00
% Asian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian		n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial		85.00	86.00	77.00
% Male		84.00	83.00	88.00
% Female		88.00	86.00	84.00
% Students with Disabilities		58.00	60.00	61.00
% Migrant Eligible		77.00	77.00	88.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores - Mathematics

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 3				
Total Enrollment	656	737	683	658
% Black	72.00	66.00	59.00	50.00
% White	85.00	89.00	82.00	84.00
% Hispanic	85.00	83.00	74.00	66.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	79.00	87.00	80.00	75.00
% Male	81.00	78.00	75.00	69.00
% Female	82.00	84.00	74.00	73.00
% Students with Disabilities	48.00	54.00	51.00	45.00
% Migrant Eligible	68.00	89.00	70.00	54.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 4				
Total Enrollment	731	670	653	663
% Black	68.00	67.00	53.00	50.00
% White	87.00	89.00	82.00	77.00
% Hispanic	83.00	84.00	75.00	65.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	81.00	85.00	77.00	64.00
% Male	81.00	83.00	73.00	67.00
% Female	81.00	81.00	73.00	68.00
% Students with Disabilities	54.00	49.00	44.00	30.00
% Migrant Eligible	83.00	86.00	64.00	60.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Mathematics
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 5 Total Enrollment	673	675	669	613
% Black	85.00	78.00	76.00	68.00
% White	90.00	94.00	89.00	87.00
% Hispanic	95.00	90.00	87.00	77.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	100.00	78.00	91.00
% Male	89.00	85.00	82.00	76.00
% Female	91.00	92.00	87.00	84.00
% Students with Disabilities	66.00	63.00	48.00	48.00
% Migrant Eligible	94.00	77.00	82.00	72.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Science
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 3 Total Enrollment	655	736	682	658
% Black	67.00	57.00	66.00	55.00
% White	89.00	90.00	86.00	88.00
% Hispanic	85.00	79.00	77.00	64.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	79.00	66.00	85.00	82.00
% Male	83.00	76.00	79.00	72.00
% Female	82.00	80.00	79.00	76.00
% Students with Disabilities	56.00	58.00	57.00	56.00
% Migrant Eligible	73.00	79.00	66.00	54.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 4 Total Enrollment	731	671	652	663
% Black	49.00	66.00	47.00	55.00
% White	88.00	89.00	88.00	82.00
% Hispanic	76.00	85.00	67.00	63.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	75.00	69.00	95.00	76.00
% Male	72.00	84.00	75.00	75.00
% Female	76.00	79.00	71.00	68.00
% Students with Disabilities	41.00	54.00	51.00	39.00
% Migrant Eligible	73.00	74.00	56.00	54.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Test (CRCT) Scores – Science
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 5 Total Enrollment	670	676	669	611
% Black	57.00	55.00	49.00	42.00
% White	84.00	86.00	78.00	83.00
% Hispanic	73.00	59.00	56.00	50.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	67.00	91.00	60.00	75.00
% Male	75.00	76.00	64.00	63.00
% Female	74.00	69.00	66.00	68.00
% Students with Disabilities	46.00	44.00	26.00	35.00
% Migrant Eligible	56.00	47.00	41.00	45.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests (CRCT) Scores – Social Studies

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 3				
Total Enrollment	655	733	675	658
% Black	69.00	58.00	60.00	79.00
% White	87.00	85.00	84.00	94.00
% Hispanic	85.00	76.00	80.00	82.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	79.00	73.00	68.00	87.00
% Male	83.00	73.00	79.00	85.00
% Female	82.00	77.00	75.00	89.00
% Students with Disabilities	55.00	53.00	53.00	75.00
% Migrant Eligible	71.00	77.00	82.00	80.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 4				
Total Enrollment	730	666	650	662
% Black	54.00	60.00	41.00	79.00
% White	85.00	80.00	77.00	93.00
% Hispanic	74.00	77.00	51.00	85.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	75.00	69.00	82.00	88.00
% Male	72.00	77.00	64.00	85.00
% Female	75.00	70.00	61.00	90.00
% Students with Disabilities	42.00	42.00	42.00	67.00
% Migrant Eligible	70.00	70.00	39.00	84.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests (CRCT) Scores – Social Studies

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 5 Total Enrollment	670	673	668	611
% Black	52.00	57.00	46.00	76.00
% White	78.00	79.00	73.00	92.00
% Hispanic	68.00	58.00	51.00	75.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	56.00	82.00	50.00	100.00
% Male	71.00	73.00	61.00	81.00
% Female	66.00	65.00	62.00	88.00
% Students with Disabilities	39.00	39.00	27.00	60.00
% Migrant Eligible	56.00	53.00	45.00	75.00

Grade 5 Writing Assessment: Percent of 5th graders in each category.

Categories of Scaled Scores	2005-2006	2004-2005
Stage 1: The Emerging Writer	2.00	1.00
Stage 2: The Developing Writer	3.00	1.00
Stage 3: The Focusing Writer	11.00	7.00
Stage 4: The Experimenting Writer	36.00	33.00
Stage 5: The Engaging Writer	33.00	45.00
Stage 6: The Extending Writer	15.00	14.00

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade 5 Writing Assessment	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Total Enrollment	667	656	654	590	628
% Black	68.00	54.00	58.00	70.00	55.00
% White	78.00	78.00	74.00	80.00	72.00
% Hispanic	75.00	66.00	72.00	65.00	42.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	71.00	54.00	56.00	87.00	46.00
% Male	69.00	63.00	60.00	62.00	52.00
% Female	80.00	74.00	78.00	86.00	72.00
% Students with Disabilities	34.00	33.00	29.00	35.00	34.00
% Migrant	72.00	45.00	61.00	58.00	41.00

System Student Achievement - Middle

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests (CRCT) Scores – English/Language Arts
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 6				
Total Enrollment	677	639	586	624
% Black	82.00	86.00	84.00	85.00
% White	92.00	94.00	92.00	90.00
% Hispanic	86.00	89.00	84.00	73.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	86.00	94.00	100.00	74.00
% Male	83.00	87.00	83.00	81.00
% Female	93.00	95.00	93.00	91.00
% Students with Disabilities	60.00	62.00	61.00	50.00
% Migrant Eligible	81.00	81.00	84.00	62.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 7				
Total Enrollment	642	603	615	613
% Black	88.00	82.00	86.00	77.00
% White	93.00	91.00	92.00	93.00
% Hispanic	88.00	86.00	83.00	82.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	100.00	53.00	90.00
% Male	86.00	83.00	83.00	86.00
% Female	96.00	93.00	93.00	87.00
% Students with Disabilities	65.00	54.00	53.00	48.00
% Migrant Eligible	76.00	81.00	78.00	70.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests (CRCT) Scores – English/Language Arts
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 8 Total Enrollment	648	613	622	609
% Black	81.00	83.00	78.00	80.00
% White	91.00	92.00	91.00	92.00
% Hispanic	88.00	83.00	82.00	81.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	89.00	82.00	92.00	84.00
% Male	80.00	83.00	83.00	82.00
% Female	93.00	93.00	88.00	91.00
% Students with Disabilities	68.00	62.00	38.00	44.00
% Migrant Eligible	81.00	73.00	71.00	66.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests – Reading

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 6 Total Enrollment	677	638	587	624
% Black	86.00	87.00	81.00	87.00
% White	97.00	95.00	94.00	95.00
% Hispanic	90.00	91.00	86.00	83.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	86.00	100.00	94.00	80.00
% Male	90.00	90.00	85.00	87.00
% Female	95.00	94.00	93.00	94.00
% Students with Disabilities	70.00	62.00	60.00	65.00
% Migrant Eligible	100.00	87.00	84.00	75.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 7 Total Enrollment	642	604	616	613
% Black	83.00	80.00	87.00	76.00
% White	93.00	93.00	93.00	94.00
% Hispanic	78.00	85.00	80.00	78.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	88.00	100.00	67.00	90.00
% Male	83.00	84.00	85.00	85.00
% Female	91.00	92.00	94.00	86.00
% Students with Disabilities	55.00	58.00	62.00	38.00
% Migrant Eligible	62.00	81.00	76.00	64.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests – Reading
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 8 Total Enrollment	648	608	623	608
% Black	92.00	93.00	89.00	88.00
% White	97.00	98.00	97.00	96.00
% Hispanic	92.00	91.00	88.00	84.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	94.00	91.00	100.00	83.00
% Male	94.00	94.00	92.00	88.00
% Female	96.00	96.00	94.00	93.00
% Students with Disabilities	84.00	85.00	62.00	57.00
% Migrant Eligible	81.00	89.00	80.00	70.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests – Mathematics

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 6 Total Enrollment	677	641	587	624
% Black	54.00	59.00	51.00	46.00
% White	82.00	79.00	76.00	73.00
% Hispanic	67.00	72.00	62.00	56.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	71.00	72.00	69.00	47.00
% Male	70.00	70.00	65.00	61.00
% Female	72.00	73.00	69.00	66.00
% Students with Disabilities	33.00	30.00	28.00	24.00
% Migrant Eligible	59.00	66.00	68.00	45.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 7 Total Enrollment	642	607	616	617
% Black	87.00	72.00	72.00	60.00
% White	91.00	89.00	84.00	86.00
% Hispanic	85.00	85.00	76.00	64.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	100.00	60.00	90.00
% Male	88.00	80.00	75.00	74.00
% Female	89.00	88.00	84.00	74.00
% Students with Disabilities	61.00	51.00	37.00	22.00
% Migrant Eligible	72.00	65.00	79.00	45.00

Criterion-Reference Competency Tests – Mathematics

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 8 Total Enrollment	648	615	625	609
% Black	73.00	74.00	67.00	71.00
% White	87.00	89.00	85.00	86.00
% Hispanic	79.00	81.00	70.00	71.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	94.00	82.00	75.00	78.00
% Male	79.00	82.00	76.00	74.00
% Female	84.00	85.00	78.00	84.00
% Students with Disabilities	68.00	50.00	24.00	31.00
% Migrant Eligible	81.00	84.00	70.00	63.00

Criterion Referenced Competency Tests – Science
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 6 Total Enrollment	677	633	586	623
% Black	42.00	46.00	39.00	38.00
% White	80.00	78.00	76.00	71.00
% Hispanic	64.00	60.00	55.00	43.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	71.00	78.00	63.00	40.00
% Male	70.00	66.00	61.00	58.00
% Female	62.00	65.00	61.00	56.00
% Students with Disabilities	33.00	27.00	24.00	25.00
% Migrant Eligible	63.00	56.00	64.00	33.00

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 7 Total Enrollment	642	603	615	616
% Black	68.00	52.00	50.00	58.00
% White	84.00	82.00	80.00	85.00
% Hispanic	75.00	58.00	55.00	61.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	88.00	100.00	33.00	90.00
% Male	78.00	69.00	67.00	74.00
% Female	78.00	70.00	68.00	72.00
% Students with Disabilities	38.00	29.00	25.00	25.00
% Migrant Eligible	48.00	56.00	52.00	47.00

Criterion Referenced Competency Tests – Science
 Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 8 Total Enrollment	648	615	621	608
% Black	39.00	36.00	28.00	34.00
% White	74.00	72.00	73.00	69.00
% Hispanic	54.00	39.00	36.00	44.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	89.00	54.00	50.00	62.00
% Male	61.00	60.00	56.00	59.00
% Female	59.00	53.00	48.00	51.00
% Students with Disabilities	30.00	22.00	12.00	21.00
% Migrant Eligible	42.00	31.00	21.00	43.00

Criterion Referenced Competency Tests – Social Studies

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 6				
Total Enrollment	677	630		
% Black	49.00	46.00	No Data Available	No Data Available
% White	77.00	67.00		
% Hispanic	56.00	60.00		
% Asian	n/a	n/a		
% American Indian	n/a	n/a		
% Multi Racial	71.00	83.00		
% Male	67.00	59.00		
% Female	62.00	61.00		
% Students with Disabilities	25.00	23.00		
% Migrant Eligible	37.00	57.00		

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 7				
Total Enrollment	642	599		
% Black	64.00	44.00	No Data Available	No Data Available
% White	79.00	73.00		
% Hispanic	63.00	55.00		
% Asian	n/a	n/a		
% American Indian	n/a	n/a		
% Multi Racial	81.00	86.00		
% Male	70.00	58.00		
% Female	74.00	64.00		
% Students with Disabilities	32.00	22.00		
% Migrant Eligible	41.00	58.00		

Criterion Referenced Competency Tests – Social Studies

Percent of students who met or exceeded standards.

Grade Level	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Grade 8 Total Enrollment	648	599	616	606
% Black	47.00	57.00	42.00	30.00
% White	80.00	81.00	71.00	60.00
% Hispanic	62.00	60.00	34.00	39.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	83.00	70.00	50.00	39.00
% Male	66.00	72.00	57.00	50.00
% Female	68.00	70.00	54.00	46.00
% Students with Disabilities	33.00	36.00	11.00	12.00
% Migrant Eligible	65.00	31.00	26.00	33.00

Middle Grades Writing Assessment

Percent of students in On Target and Exceeds Target performance levels and average scale score.

MGWA	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Percent of Students				
% Black	57.00	57.00	54.00	56.00
% White	81.00	78.00	74.00	82.00
% Hispanic	77.00	59.00	47.00	65.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	83.00	60.00	55.00	77.00
% Male	64.00	60.00	57.00	64.00
% Female	82.00	78.00	70.00	80.00
% Students with Disabilities	23.00	25.00	10.00	24.00
% Migrant Eligible	69.00	61.00	36.00	64.00

System Student Achievement – High

Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT): Percent of 11th graders passing on first administration.

Subject	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
English Total	583	554	455	461
% Black	71.00	75.00	86.00	80.00
% White	88.00	92.00	95.00	93.00
% Hispanic	70.00	85.00	88.00	87.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	82.00	100.00	n/a	n/a
% Male	76.00	83.00	89.00	88.00
% Female	84.00	90.00	94.00	90.00
% Students with Disabilities	42.00	45.00	56.00	53.00
Mathematics Total	522	554	454	462
% Black	79.00	79.00	95.00	92.00
% White	84.00	96.00	98.00	97.00
% Hispanic	72.00	93.00	97.00	94.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	90.00	100.00	n/a	n/a
% Male	81.00	89.00	96.00	95.00
% Female	82.00	92.00	99.00	96.00
% Students with Disabilities	23.00	42.00	80.00	63.00
Social Studies Total	604	551	453	457
% Black	54.00	64.00	79.00	82.00
% White	75.00	85.00	94.00	92.00
% Hispanic	57.00	80.00	84.00	92.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	63.00	80.00	n/a	n/a
% Male	68.00	80.00	88.00	92.00
% Female	61.00	75.00	90.00	87.00
% Students with Disabilities	47.00	35.00	52.00	53.00
Science Total	559	550	455	457
% Black	77.00	79.00	88.00	80.00
% White	94.00	95.00	97.00	96.00
% Hispanic	81.00	89.00	89.00	90.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	90.00	n/a	n/a
% Male	81.00	90.00	94.00	92.00
% Female	92.00	88.00	93.00	90.00
% Students with Disabilities	66.00	60.00	68.00	57.00

System Student Achievement – High School

Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT): Percent of 11th graders passing on first administration.

Subject	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Writing Total	498	480	479	460
% Black	82.00	88.00	83.00	73.00
% White	94.00	96.00	92.00	93.00
% Hispanic	81.00	83.00	79.00	80.00
% Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Multi Racial	100.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Male	85.00	88.00	85.00	83.00
% Female	95.00	95.00	90.00	88.00
% Students with Disabilities	49.00	60.00	48.00	49.00

Graduate Data: Number of students and percent of student population.

Diplomas	2010-2011		2009-2010		2008-2009	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
College Prep and Tech/Career Prep Seal				113		81
Black			21.2	24	19.75	16
White			54.9	62	65.43	53
Hispanic			20.4	23	14.81	12
Asian			0.0	0	0.0	0
American Indian			0.0	0	0.0	0
Multi Racial			3.5	4	0.00	0
Male			27.4	31	40.74	33
Female			72.6	82	59.26	48
Students with Disabilities			n/a	n/a	0.0	0
College Prep Seal				166		147
Black			17.5	29	21.09	31
White			68.1	113	69.39	102
Hispanic			12.0	20	8.16	12
Asian			1.2	2	0.00	0
American Indian			0.0	0	0.00	0
Multi Racial			1.2	2	1.36	2
Male			44.0	73	45.58	67
Female			56.0	93	54.42	80
Students with Disabilities			n/a	n/a	1.36	2
Tech/Career Prep Seal				186		219
Black			37.6	70	39.73	87
White			43.0	80	43.38	95
Hispanic			17.2	32	16.44	36
Asian			17.2	32	0.00	0
American Indian			0.0	0	0.00	0
Multi Racial			2.2	4	0.46	1
Male			60.8	113	52.05	114
Female			39.2	73	47.95	105
Students with Disabilities			n/a	n/a	9.13	20
Special Education*				12		10
Black			58.3	7	60.00	6
White			33.3	4	20.00	2
Hispanic			8.3	1	20.00	2
Asian			8.3	1	0.00	0
American Indian			0.0	0	0.00	0
Multi Racial			0.0	0	0.00	0
Male			58.3	7	50.00	5
Female			41.7	5	50.00	5
Students with Disabilities				12		10

Diplomas	2010-2011		2009-2010		2008-2009	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Total All Diplomas				504		457
Black			27.8	140	30.63	140
White			53.0	267	55.14	252
Hispanic			16.5	83	13.57	62
Asian			8.3	42	0.00	0
American Indian			0.0	1	0.00	0
Multi Racial			2.0	11	0.66	3
Male			47.8	241	47.92	219
Female			52.2	263	52.08	238
Students with Disabilities			n/a	n/a	7.00	32
Certificates of Attendance*				27		14
Black			37.0	10	78.57	11
White			29.6	8	7.14	1
Hispanic			25.9	7	14.29	2
Asian			25.9	7	0.00	0
American Indian			3.7	1	0.00	0
Multi Racial			3.7	1	0.00	0
Male			63.0	17	64.29	9
Female			37.0	10	35.71	5
Students with Disabilities			n/a	n/a	7.14	1

***Does not count towards graduation rate for AYP.**

Completion Rate: Percent of 9th grade enrollment in graduating class by year.

Completion Rate	2010-2011 (2007 9th grade)	2009-2010 (2006 9th grade)	2008-2009 (2005 9th grade)	2007-2008 (2004 9th grade)
All Students	82.00	80.42	65.81	65.78
% Black	73.65	73.20	63.84	46.84
% White	88.00	78.83	69.15	76.82
% Hispanic	75.53	71.95	62.38	62.07
% Asian	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
% American Indian	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Multi Racial	100.00	80.00	33.33	47.06
% Students with Disabilities	30.91	42.11	31.31	33.87

Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT): Use students' highest verbal and highest math scores.

Year		# Taking Test	Average Verbal	Average Math	Total
2010-2011	All				
	White				
	Black				
	Hispanic				
	Asian				
	Male				
	Female				

Year		# Taking Test	Average Verbal	Average Math	Total
2009-2010	All	169	471	467	938
	White	110	487	488	975
	Black	34	424	397	821
	Hispanic	13	448	488	936
	Asian	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Male	53	474	482	956
	Female	116	469	460	929

Year		# Taking Test	Average Verbal	Average Math	Total
2008-2009	All	139	482	484	966
	White	94	498	502	1000
	Black	23	434	433	867
	Hispanic	17	444	460	904
	Asian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Male	63	493	496	989
	Female	76	473	473	946

Year		# Taking Test	Average Verbal	Average Math	Total
2007-2008	All	165	493	498	991
	White	127	506	508	1014
	Black	16	418	442	860
	Hispanic	7	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Asian	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Male	78	484	509	993
	Female	86	501	490	991

American College Testing (ACT)

Year	# Taking Test	English	Math	Reading	Science	Composite Score
2010-2011						
2009-2010	93	17.0	18.0	17.4	18.1	17.8
2008-2009	62	19.0	19.2	19.4	19.8	19.5
2007-2008	48	18	18.7	18.5	17.6	18.3

Advanced Placement Exams (AP)

Year	# of Students Taking AP Classes	# of Students Taking Tests	# of Tests Taken	# of AP courses offered
2010-2011	217	217	305	13
Black	27	27	31	
White	166	166	240	
Hispanic	14	14	17	
Asian	7	7	14	
American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Multi Racial	3	3	3	
Male	94	94	147	
Female	123	123	158	
Students with Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Year	# of Students Taking AP Classes	# of Students Taking Tests	# of Tests Taken	# of AP courses offered
2009-2010	226	226	309	11
Black	13	13	19	
White	183	183	246	
Hispanic	19	18	29	
Asian	8	8	11	
American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Multi Racial	3	3	4	
Male	95	94	134	
Female	131	131	175	
Students with Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Faculty/Staff Data

*Attrition rate is defined as the number of teachers who leave the profession or transfer to another system from the beginning of the school year to the beginning of the next school year, excluding retirement.

Attrition Rate* of Teachers (two most recent years available)	Number	Percent of Teacher Population
2010-2011	23/656	3.5
2009-2010	36/672	5.35
2008-2009	16/652	2.45
2007-2008	39/634	6.00

*Attrition Rate of administrators is defined as the percentage of administrators who leave the profession or transfer to another school from the beginning of the school year to the beginning of the next school year, excluding retirement.

Attrition Rate* of Administrators (two most recent years available)	Number	Percent of Administrator Staff
2010-2011	2/47	4.2
2009-2010	3/48	6
2008-2009	0/49	0
2007-2008	3/48	6

Highly Qualified Teachers – 2010/11

Number of Certified Teachers	Percent of Highly Qualified Teachers Teaching in Field for the Entire Day	Number of Core Teachers Teaching out of Field for One or More Periods during the School Day
656	99.8	1

2010-2011 DISTRICT REPORT CARD SUMMARY
Available from the State Office of Student Achievement
Late September 2011

2009-2010 DISTRICT REPORT CARD SUMMARY
1) Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

System did not meet AYP
System met criteria in 14 out of 18 areas
Improvement Status : Needs Improvement

2) Performance Index

The Performance Index shows two components for each school: the percent of schools with the greatest gains and the highest percentage of students meeting and exceeding standards. Criteria were developed utilizing 2009 CRCT (grades 1-8 in Reading, ELA, Math, Social Studies, Science) compared to 2008 CRCT (grades 1-8 in Reading, ELA, Math, Social Studies, Science) and 2009 GHS GT (grade 11 first time test takers - English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies) to 2008 GHS GT (grade 11 first time test takers - English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies). Criteria will be based on Full Academic Year (FAY) students.

The following schools in this system qualified for a Highest Percentage of Students Meeting and Exceeding Standards Award:

None

The following schools in this system qualified for a Greatest Gain of Students Meeting and Exceeding Standards Award:

[Doerun Elementary School](#)
[Hamilton Elementary School](#)

Platinum award winner
Platinum award winner

3) Performance Highlights

This information reflects the 2008-2009 State Report Card data which includes data for all students, not just Full Academic Year (FAY) students. Performance Highlights list the academic measurements for this school system that meet or exceed 80%.

<u>8th Grade - CRCT Reading</u>	95.39 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
<u>3rd Grade - CRCT Reading</u>	92.4 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
<u>6th Grade - CRCT Reading</u>	91.85 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
<u>Georgia High School Writing Test</u>	91.67 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard

5th Grade - CRCT Reading	91.57 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
6th Grade - CRCT English Language Arts	90.92 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
11th Grade - GHSGT Mathematics	90.61 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
4th Grade - CRCT Reading	89.58 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
5th Grade - CRCT English Language Arts	89.5 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
11th Grade - GHSGT Science	89.09 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
4th Grade - CRCT English Language Arts	88.82 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
5th Grade - CRCT Mathematics	88.59 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
7th Grade - CRCT Reading	88.08 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
8th Grade - CRCT English Language Arts	87.93 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
7th Grade - CRCT English Language Arts	87.89 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
2nd Grade - CRCT Reading	87.74 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
11th Grade - GHSGT English Language Arts	86.28 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
2nd Grade - CRCT Mathematics	86.03 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
1st Grade - CRCT Reading	85.07 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
3rd Grade - CRCT English Language Arts	83.81 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
7th Grade - CRCT Mathematics	83.36 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
8th Grade - CRCT Mathematics	83.25 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
4th Grade - CRCT Mathematics	81.94 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
4th Grade - CRCT Science	81.67 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
3rd Grade - CRCT Mathematics	81.28 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard
1st Grade - CRCT Mathematics	80.9 Percent Meeting and Exceeding Standard

Nineteen years of **norm referenced testing** (Iowa Test of Basic Skills – ITBS) persistently indicates that while students in Colquitt County Schools may be improving on their mastery of the state curriculum (the state Criterion Referenced Competency Test – CRCT) students continue to be less than average when compared to students from a nationally normed group.

<u>Year</u>		<u>3rd</u>		<u>5th</u>		<u>8th</u>
1991-92	R	41	R	57	R	51
	M	49	M	53	M	51
1992-93	R	46	R	51	R	44
	M	46	M	46	M	43
1993-94	R	36	R	42	R	39
	M	41	M	39	M	39
1994-95	R	39	R	44	R	38
	M	44	M	48	M	43
1995-96	R	49	R	49	R	42
	M	55	M	52	M	45
1996-97	R	43	R	44	R	40
	M	51	M	48	M	48
1997-98	R	46	R	47	R	46
	M	57	M	51	M	55
1998-99	R	43	R	39	R	39
	M	50	M	44	M	47
1999-00	R	50	R	51	R	37
	M	60	M	53	M	42
<i>***** 2000-01 & 2001-02 SAT9 was administered in place of ITBS</i>						
2002-03	R	53	R	49	R	41
	M	56	M	57	M	44
2003-04	R	50	R	45	R	39
	M	49	M	53	M	43
2004-05	R	51	R	48	R	39
	M	50	M	52	M	43
2005-06	R	51	R	48	R	39
	M	51	M	58	M	47
2006-07	R	47	R	47	R	41
	M	58	M	47	M	41
2007-08	R	49	R	50	R	43
	M	60	M	53	M	38
2008-09	R	41	R	55	R	36
	M	54	M	61	M	39
2009-10	R	45	R	47	R	39
	M	58	M	56	M	39

COLQUITT COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM GOALS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

NCLB Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Annual Measurable Objective 1:

To increase the percentage of all students in grades 1-8 who meet or exceed performance standards in **reading/language arts** as measured by the Georgia CRCT for the federal AYP and in grade 11 as measured by the GHSGT for AYP

Annual Measurable Objective 2:

To increase the percentage of all students in grades 1-8 who meet or exceed performance standards in **mathematics** as measured by the Georgia CRCT for the federal AYP and in grade 11 as measured by the GHSGT for AYP

NCLB Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better.

Annual Measurable Objective 3:

To increase the percentage of ELL students who demonstrate English proficiency by meeting or exceeding reading/language arts and math standards on the state mandated CRCT or GHSGT.

NCLB Performance Goal 3: All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Annual Measurable Objective 4: By June 2007, all teachers in the Colquitt County School System will be highly qualified as defined by state and federal regulations

NCLB Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.

Annual Measurable Objective 5: To decrease by at least 5% annually the number of referrals to administration for incidents that disrupt the learning environment.

Annual Measurable Objective 6: To increase the amount of technology available for instructional use in core academic classrooms to achieve “21st Century” status.

NCLB Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

Annual Measurable Objective 7: To increase the percentage of all students who successfully complete and graduate from high school in four years.

CONTINUED: **COLQUITT COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM GOALS FOR
IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

IDEA Performance Goal I: To improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities.

Annual Measurable Objective 8: To increase the percentage of students with disabilities who graduate from high school (annual increase of 3%) and who transition to either employment (annual increase of 3%) or post-secondary education (annual increase of 1%).

IDEA Performance Goal II: To improve services for young children (ages 3-5) with disabilities.

Annual Measurable Objective 9: To increase the identification and assessment of young children (ages 3 – 5) in order to provide appropriate special education services and ensure successful transition to kindergarten

IDEA Performance Goal III: Improve the provision of a free, appropriate, public education to students with disabilities.

Annual Measurable Objective 10: To increase the number of SWD who successfully participate in the regular education environment, grades K -12.

IDEA Performance Goal IV: Improve compliance with state and federal laws and regulations.

Annual Measurable Objective 11: All identified state and federal noncompliance incidents (including but not limited to dispute resolutions, formal complaints, due process hearings, and timelines) will be corrected.

For each annual measurable objective there is an ACTION PLAN to achieve the goal.

STATUS KEY FOR THE ACTIONS PLANS

RED—Established Actions Requiring Annual Review

GREEN—Actions Begun but Not Complete, In Constant Review

Yellow— Actions Still To be Implemented

COLQUITT COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Identified Goal for Improvement:

NCLB Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Annual Measurable Objective 1: (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

To increase the percentage of all students in grades 1-8 who meet or exceed performance standards in **reading/language arts** as measured by the Georgia CRCT for the federal AYP and in grade 11 as measured by the GHSGT for AYP.

Grade	Year	All students	Black	Hispanic	White	SWD	ELL
1 - 8	2006 baseline	81.3	71.9	69.2	89.7	49.8	46.0
CRCT	2007	83.6 83.3	75.4 74.5	73.1 75.0	91.0 90.6	56.1 52.6	52.0 56.9
	2008	85.9 87.0	78.9 80.0	77.0 79.2	92.3 93.2	62.4 58.5	58.0 64.9
	2009	88.2 88.2	82.4 82.0	80.9 84.2	93.6 92.9	68.7 59.2	64.0 74.7
	2010	90.5 90.1	85.9 84.0	84.8 88.4	94.9 93.7	75.0 65.7	70.0 83.3
	2011	92.8 88.9	89.4 81.8	88.7 88.1	96.2 93.0	81.3 65.6	76.0 82.8
11	2006 baseline	87.1	77.3	69.2	94.7	59.5	60.0
GHSGT	2007	88.7 91.9	80.1 88.8	73.1 82.4	95.4 94.2	64.6 53.6	65.0 too few
	2008	90.3 89.0	82.9 82.1	77.0 86.4	96.1 93.7	69.7 64.7	70.0 too few
	2009	91.9 91.2	85.7 85.2	80.9 86.9	96.8 95.3	74.8 57.6	75.0 63.6
	2010	93.5 86.6	88.5 75.0	84.8 85.2	97.5 93.2	79.9 51.7	80.0 64.0
	2011	95.1 87.3	91.3 82.5	88.7 80.7	98.2 92.4	85.0 55.1	85.0 56.5

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>1. Teachers will utilize Georgia Performance Standards (GPS), and will begin work towards using Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS), in curriculum planning and classroom instruction to improve academic achievement for all students in reading/language arts. (it is particularly important that SWD access grade level curriculum)</p>	<p>C - 1, 2 I - 1, 2, 3 PL - 2, 3 PO - 3</p>	<p>Provide ongoing opportunities for teachers to master SBRR “Best Practices” that constitute successful implementation of the GPS/CCGPS: Workshops, peer coaching, in-service training, peer observations, mentor teachers, and services provided by RESA and educational consultants</p> <p>(State professional learning funds; Title II funds)</p>	<p>Common planning time/ exploratory teachers</p> <p>Release time/ substitutes</p> <p>Professional books and materials, videos</p> <p>(Title I, State professional learning funds, Title II funds)</p>	<p>Instructional Support Specialist</p> <p>Administrators</p> <p>Lead Teachers / Department Heads</p> <p>System Curriculum Directors</p>	<p>Ongoing 20011-2014</p> <p>Weekly planning meetings for teachers</p> <p>Monthly meetings for literacy coaches</p> <p>Monthly meetings for school-based improvement teams</p> <p>Twice yearly system-wide grade group meetings</p> <p>Monthly meetings for district and school-based administrators</p>	<p>Classroom observations and focus walks will used to assess the implementation of the GPS and CCGPS.</p> <p>CRCT, ITBS, GHS GT, State Writing Assessments, and evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Professional learning logs and PLU credit verification forms;</p> <p>Meeting agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations, completed rubrics from focus walks, practice tests for students, samples of student work</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. Administrators will facilitate the continued implementation of system school improvement initiatives (standards-based instruction, standards-based classrooms, standards-based grading and reporting student work)</p>	<p>C – 2, 3 PO – 1, 2 L – 1, 2, 4 SC - 1</p>	<p>School-based training for new and veteran teachers in the rituals and routines of effective instructional strategies.</p> <p>System-based training for new and veteran administrators on role of instructional leader in promoting change</p> <p>(No cost)</p>	<p>Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>RESA and program consultants</p> <p>(Title I and Title II funds:\$500,000)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p> <p>Superintendent</p>	<p>On-Going 2001-2014</p> <p>Annually (August) New Teacher Orientation</p> <p>Weekly training updates during planning periods</p> <p>Weekly school leadership team meetings</p> <p>Monthly administrator meetings</p>	<p>Classroom observations and focus walks will used to assess the implementation of the school improvement initiatives.</p> <p>CRCT, ITBS, GHSGT, State Writing Assessments, and evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Professional learning logs and PLU credit verification forms</p> <p>Training and meeting agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations, completed rubrics from focus walks, samples of student work</p> <p>Principal evaluations with the Superintendent</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. Teachers will diagnose reading problems, based upon analysis of all available student data and continued progress monitoring of student performance, to provide differentiated instruction for improved student achievement.</p>	<p>I - 4 A - 3</p>	<p>School based training for teachers on analysis of student data and use of effective differentiation strategies including the Georgia Pyramid of Interventions</p> <p>System/school-based training on addressing the needs of students from poverty</p> <p>Reading endorsement courses (Title II, State Professional Learning Funds)</p>	<p>Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>RESA and GLRS support</p> <p>GRASP progress monitoring data management program</p> <p>(Title I and Title II funds)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Department head, lead teachers</p> <p>Assistant Director for Special Education</p> <p>SST Coordinator</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014</p> <p>Annually (August) New Teacher Orientation</p> <p>Weekly grade group/department meetings during planning periods to review IEP, SST, lesson plans</p>	<p>Lesson plans indicating use of GRASP data & ‘best practice’ strategies for differentiation of instruction</p> <p>Classroom observations to assess success of students’ learning experience</p> <p>Student work will demonstrate a variety of acceptable responses to the standard.</p> <p>CRCT, ITBS, GHSGT will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Professional learning logs and PLU credit verification forms</p> <p>Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations, samples of student work</p> <p>IEP and SST documentation</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>4. The school system will adopt and facilitate the use of appropriate reading programs to best meet the instructional needs of <u>all</u> students.</p>		<p>Training for new and veteran teachers in the use of selected reading programs.</p>	<p>Adopted materials for K-8 reading and 9 - 12 English courses</p> <p>Materials for elementary, middle, and high school students with severe reading problems (“Safety Nets” and After School programs)</p> <p>Computer networked coursework for individualized reading instruction</p> <p>Instructional Providers for small group tutoring</p> <p>(Title I and Title II funds)</p>	<p>Principal Curriculum Director</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual training for teachers on use of instructional materials</p> <p>Quarterly training updates</p> <p>After school tutoring and in school “Safety Nets”</p>	<p>GRASP - Progress monitoring on students’ reading performance</p> <p>CRCT, ITBS, GHSGT and evaluation of student reading will indicate improved student achievement</p>	<p>Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>GRASP progress monitoring reports</p> <p>Running records, individual and classroom reading logs</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
5. Teachers will use every available opportunity to instruct and encourage student writing across the curriculum.	I - 1	Training for new and veteran teachers on the integration of writing in all content areas (No cost)	Instructional Support Specialists, and RESA consultants (Title I and Title II funds)	Principal Instructional Support Specialists Curriculum Director	On-Going 2011-2014 Annual training for new teachers (August Orientation) Weekly training updates during planning periods Quarterly grade group meetings to review writing standards	Classroom observations Student writing samples State Writing Assessments for Grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 (GHSWT)	Anecdotal records from classroom observations Student journals and writing folders Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion	Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups. All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>6. Teachers will provide opportunities for pre-teaching or acceleration as an instructional strategy for low achieving students.</p>	<p>I - 4</p>	<p>School-based training for all staff in all content areas on use of pre-teaching and acceleration strategies (<i>Learning Focused Schools</i>) (No cost)</p>	<p>Instructional Support Specialists, and RESA consultants (Title I and Title II funds)</p>	<p>Principal Instructional Support Specialists Curriculum Director</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014 Annual training for new teachers (August Orientation) Weekly training updates during planning periods</p>	<p>Classroom observations Lesson Plan Review CRCT, ITBS, GHSGT, and evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Anecdotal records from classroom observations Lesson plans Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups. All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>7. Teachers will utilize modern technology and other multi-media resources for problem solving, communication, collaboration, and data exchange in the learning process.</p>	<p>C – 2 I - 3</p>	<p>System and school-based training for all staff in all content areas on the effective use of instructional technology in the classroom (Title I, Title II)</p>	<p>Instructional Technology Specialists Hardware and software (Title I and Title IID)</p>	<p>Principal Technology Director Classroom teacher</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014 Annual training for new teachers (August Orientation) Weekly training updates during planning periods PLU training opportunities after school and during the summer</p>	<p>Classroom observations Lesson Plan Review Documenting use of hardware and software Evaluation of student work will indicate appropriate use of available technology to improve student achievement.</p>	<p>Anecdotal records from classroom observations Lesson plans Computer program logs Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups. All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
8. Schools will provide meaningful opportunities for parent involvement in student learning to promote improved student achievement in reading/language arts.	SFCS - 1, 2, 3	Training on improving home-school relationships (Title I, Title II)	Parent involvement coordinators Migrant service specialists System translator School social workers, counselors Home-school connection agendas, brochures, Student Handbooks “Parent Portal” Communities in Schools and Family Connections Community mentors / role models Business partners (Title I, Title III, Migrant Ed)	Principal Federal Programs Director Parent Involvement Coordinators	On-Going 2011-2014 Fall Open House Monthly school based parent workshops PTO meetings PAC meetings School Council meetings Semi-annual system wide parent-teacher conferences	Parent/family attendance at: PTO meetings, Open House, Workshops, Conferences Number of parent volunteers Number of student mentors Number of home visits	Event sign-in sheets Training agendas School and class specific newsletters, handbooks Volunteer logs Migrant service report Social worker / counselor reports	Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups. All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.	

Identified Goal for Improvement: :

NCLB Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Annual Measurable Objective 2: (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

To increase the percentage of all students in grades 1-8 who meet or exceed performance standards in **mathematics** as measured by the Georgia CRCT for the federal AYP and in grade 11 as measured by the GHSGT for AYP.

Grade	Year	All students	Black	Hispanic	White	SWD	ELL
1 - 8	2006 baseline	76.6	64.3	70.2	84.9	43.3	52.8
	2007	79.5 77.6	68.8 64.6	73.9 74.1	86.8 85.5	50.4 46.2	58.7 61.7
	2008	82.4 73.5	73.3 58.5	77.6 67.5	88.7 82.9	57.5 39.0	64.6 51.9
	2009	85.3 77.3	77.8 64.2	81.3 76.1	90.6 84.5	64.6 44.3	70.5 67.7
	2010	88.2 82.7	82.3 70.2	85.0 84.0	92.5 88.5	71.7 52.8	76.4 77.7
	2011	91.1 80.5	86.8 69.9	88.7 80.8	94.4 85.6	78.8 54.1	82.3 75.5
11	2006 baseline	74.3	57.1	80.8	83.6	45.9	70.0
	2007	77.5 75.6	62.5 56.5	83.2 52.9	85.7 84.5	52.7 57.1	73.8 too few
	2008	80.7 77.3	67.9 61.4	85.6 83.1	87.8 85.0	59.5 51.9	77.6 too few
	2009	83.9 83.1	73.3 68.0	88.0 78.7	89.9 91.3	66.3 51.5	81.4 63.6
	2010	87.1 70.5	78.7 47.9	90.4 65.9	92.0 85.3	73.1 36.2	85.2 32.0
	2011	90.3 79.9	84.1 77.6	92.8 72.2	94.1 83.6	79.9 39.6	89.0 68.2

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>1. Teachers will utilize Georgia Performance Standards (GPS), and will begin work towards using Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS), in curriculum planning and classroom instruction to improve academic achievement for all students in math. (it is particularly important that SWD access grade level curriculum)</p>	<p>C - 1, 2 I - 1, 2, 3 PL – 2, 3 PO - 3</p>	<p>Provide ongoing opportunities for teachers to master SBRR “Best Practices” that constitute successful implementation of the GPS and CCGPS: Workshops, peer coaching, in-service training, peer observations, mentor teachers, and services provided by RESA and educational consultants</p> <p>(State professional learning funds; Title II funds)</p>	<p>Common planning time/ exploratory teachers</p> <p>Release time/ substitutes</p> <p>Professional books and materials, videos</p> <p>(Title I, State professional learning funds, Title II)</p>	<p>Math Coaches</p> <p>Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>Administrators</p> <p>Lead Teachers / Department Heads</p> <p>Report to school administrators and System Curriculum Directors</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Weekly planning meetings for teachers</p> <p>Monthly meetings with math coaches</p> <p>Monthly meetings for school-based improvement teams</p> <p>Twice yearly system-wide grade group meetings</p> <p>Monthly meetings for district and school-based administrators</p>	<p>Classroom observations and focus walks will be used to assess the implementation of the GPS/CCGPS.</p> <p>Formative diagnostic benchmark assessments and evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Prof. learning logs and PLU credit verification forms;</p> <p>Meeting agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations, completed rubrics from focus walks, practice tests for students, samples of student work</p> <p>Formative assessment analysis</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS</p> <p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. Administrators will facilitate the continued implementation of system school improvement initiatives, (standards-based instruction, standards-based classrooms, standards-based grading and reporting student work) emphasizing the continuous raising of expectations for SWD academic achievement, particularly in math.</p>	<p>C – 2, 3 PO – 1, 2 L – 1, 2, 4 SC - 1</p>	<p>School-based training for new and veteran teachers in the rituals and routines of effective instructional strategies.</p> <p>System-based training for new and veteran administrators on role of instructional leader in promoting change</p> <p>(No cost)</p>	<p>Math Coaches</p> <p>Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>RESA and program consultants</p> <p>(Title I and Title II funds)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p> <p>Superintendent</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014</p> <p>Annually (August) New Teacher Orientation</p> <p>Weekly training updates during planning periods</p> <p>Weekly school leadership team meetings</p> <p>Monthly administrator meetings</p>	<p>Classroom observations and focus walks will used to assess the implementation of the school improvement models in K-12.</p> <p>Formative assessments for progress and evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Professional learning logs and PLU credit verification forms</p> <p>Training and meeting agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations, completed rubrics from focus walks, samples of student work</p> <p>Principal evaluations with the Superintendent</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS</p> <p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. Teachers will diagnose math problems, based upon analysis of all available student data and continued progress monitoring of student performance, to provide differentiated instruction for improved student achievement.</p>	<p>I - 4 A - 3</p>	<p>School based training for new and veteran teachers on: - analysis of student data from GRASP to guide instruction - use of effective differentiation strategies -the Georgia Pyramid of Interventions - writing individualized instructional plans for students with special needs -System/school-based training on addressing the needs of students from poverty -Math endorsement courses for teachers (Title II, State Professional Learning Funds)</p>	<p>Math Coach Instructional Support Specialist RESA and GLRS support GRASP progress monitoring and data management program (Title I and Title II funds)</p>	<p>Math coaches, Instructional coaches, Department head, lead teachers School lead SpEd teacher Principal Assistant Director for Special Education System IEP Coordinator SST Coordinator Curriculum Director</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014 Annually (August) New Teacher Orientation Weekly grade group/department meetings for <u>collaborative</u> planning periods to review IEP, SST, lesson plans</p>	<p>Lesson plans indicating use of GRASP data and ‘best practice’ strategies for differentiation of instruction Classroom observations to assess success of students’ learning experience Student work will demonstrate a variety of acceptable responses to the standard. Formative assessments will indicate progress in student achievement.</p>	<p>Professional learning logs and PLU credit verification forms Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion Anecdotal notes from classroom observations, samples of student work IEP and SST documentation that reflect learning goals based on achievement data</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHS GT, ITBS Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups. All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>4. The school system will adopt and facilitate the use of appropriate, standards-based, and vertically aligned math materials and resources (ex. “Do the Math” intervention materials) to best meet the instructional needs of all students.</p>		<p>Training for new and veteran teachers, regular ed and special ed, in the use of selected math materials and appropriate instructional strategies. (Title II)</p>	<p>Aligned adopted text and materials for K-8 math and 9 -12 math courses (Local and state funds)</p> <p>Aligned supplementary materials for elementary, middle, and high school students who demonstrate severe deficiencies in math to use when providing additional instruction in math (“Safety Nets” and After School programs)</p> <p>Computer networked coursework for individualized math instruction</p> <p>Instructional providers for small group tutoring (Title I and Title II funds:)</p>	<p>Math coaches Instructional coaches Principal Curriculum Director Special Ed Director</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual training for teachers on use of new materials</p> <p>Quarterly training updates</p> <p>October – April: After school tutoring and in school “Safety Nets”</p>	<p>Formative assessments, GRASP progress monitoring on students’ math performance will indicate improved student achievement and the need for intervention</p> <p>Classroom observations to monitor use of aligned math materials</p>	<p>Training attendance logs and agendas identifying who participated and the topics for learning and discussion</p> <p>GRASP progress monitoring reports</p> <p>Classroom observation notes</p> <p>Lesson plans</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS</p> <p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>5. <u>All</u> teachers will provide opportunities for pre-teaching or acceleration as an instructional strategy for <u>all</u> low achieving students.</p>	I - 4	<p>School-based training for all staff in all content areas on use of pre-teaching and acceleration strategies (<i>Learning Focused Schools</i>)</p> <p>(No cost)</p>	<p>Math Coaches</p> <p>Instructional Support Specialists, and RESA consultants</p> <p>(Title I and Title II funds)</p>	<p>Math Coaches</p> <p>Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>School lead SpEd teacher</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual training for new teachers (August Orientation)</p> <p>Weekly training updates for all teachers during planning periods</p>	<p>Classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson Plan Review for acceleration strategies</p> <p>Formative assessments and evaluation of student work will indicate students in need of acceleration improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Anecdotal records from classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <p>Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHS GT, ITBS</p> <p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>6. <u>All</u> teachers will utilize modern technology and other multi-media resources for problem solving, communication, collaboration, differentiation of instruction, and data exchange in the learning process.</p>	<p>C – 2 I - 3</p>	<p>System and school-based training for all staff in all content areas on the effective use of instructional technology in the classroom - with particular emphasis on the use of available assistive technology for SWD.</p> <p>Assistive technology training for both regular and special ed teachers</p> <p>(Title I, Title II)</p>	<p>Instructional Technology Specialists</p> <p>Hardware and software – high tech and low tech</p> <p>(Title I and Title IID)</p>	<p>Assistive technology specialist</p> <p>Instructional technologists</p> <p>Technology Director</p> <p>School lead SpEd teacher</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Classroom teacher</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual training for new teachers (August Orientation – one of the five days)</p> <p>Weekly training updates and technical support during planning periods</p> <p>PLU training opportunities after school and during the summer</p>	<p>Classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson Plan Review</p> <p>Documenting <u>use</u> of hardware and software in classrooms</p> <p>Evaluation of student work will indicate appropriate use of available technology to improve student achievement.</p>	<p>Anecdotal records from classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <p>Computer program logs</p> <p>Training agendas identifying topics for learning and discussion</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS</p> <p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>7. The school system will plan and implement a program of professional learning activities to specifically address (1) math content weaknesses in all classroom and SpEd teachers, and (2) instructional weaknesses in new SpEd teachers with alternative certification</p>	<p>SFCS - 1, 2, 3</p>	<p><i>(Whenever possible, regular ed teachers and special ed teachers will attend training together)</i> Induction training and required, continuous, year-long courses of study for all teachers with alternative certification – especially an introduction to Special Education; identifying SWD; accommodations for instruction and testing of SWD; and the expected academic performance of SWD. Training for all teachers on math content; math programs; math texts and materials. Math Endorsement</p>	<p>GLRS, RESA, and local instructors and consultants “Release Time” for teachers Stipends for “off contract” hours and for Mentors Professional books for discussion (IDEA, Title II funds)</p>	<p>Curriculum Director Math Coaches SpEd Director</p>	<p>On-going 2011-2014 Monthly meetings of new SpEd teachers to review IEPs with system IEP Coordinator Monthly meetings of alt. certif. teachers Bi-Weekly observations with mentor Weekly group planning for instruction in math Quarterly grade group meetings with math coaches</p>	<p>Evaluations from participants of trainings Classroom observations of teachers Lesson Planning Teacher surveys and tests of understanding math content</p>	<p>Training attendance logs and agendas Lesson Plans SWD progress reports in math Teacher comments on math training and scores on math tests</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS Improved academic performance of SWD – particularly in math Improved retention of SpEd teachers</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>8. The Program for Exceptional Children will plan and provide continuous training to all SpEd teachers on the writing of IEPs for SWD, to specifically address (but not limited to):</p> <p>(1) student level of performance in all content areas, especially math</p> <p>(2) appropriate accommodations for instruction and testing</p> <p>(3) when appropriate, the increased use of available assistive technology</p>		<p>Planned, on-going, yearlong workshops for SpEd teachers and psychologists to write IEPs. collaboratively</p> <p>Annual summer workshop for all SpEd teachers and psychologists to review new and changed rules concerning IEPs</p> <p>Induction training for new SpEd teachers, especially those with alternative certification, on writing IEPs (IDEA Flow Through Funds)</p>	<p>“Release Time” for teachers</p> <p>Stipends for teachers</p> <p>RESA and GLRS consultants</p> <p>Local SpEd position to be responsible for mentoring teachers as they write and review IEPs</p> <p>System IEP Coordinator</p> <p>(IDEA, Title II and VI)</p>	<p>IEP Coordinator</p> <p>School lead SpEd teacher</p> <p>SpEd Director</p>	<p>On-going 2011-2014</p> <p>Monthly IEP reviews</p>	<p>Monitoring of random sample of IEPs</p> <p>Peer Review of IEPs</p> <p>DoE Monitoring of IEPs</p>	<p>Reviewer’s reports</p> <p>Sample IEPs</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS</p> <p>Improved academic performance of SWD – particularly in math</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>9. Schools will provide meaningful opportunities for parent involvement in student learning to promote improved student achievement in math.</p>	<p>SFCS - 1, 2, 3</p>	<p>Training on improving home-school relationships (Title I, Title II)</p>	<p>Parent Involvement Coordinators Migrant service specialists System translator School social workers, counselors Home-school connection agendas, Student Handbooks “Parent Portal” CIS and Family Connections Community mentors Business partners (Title I, Title III, Migrant Ed)</p>	<p>Principal Federal Programs Director Parent Involvement Coordinators</p>	<p>On-Going 2011-2014 Fall Open House Monthly school based parent workshops Semi-annual system wide parent-teacher conferences Regularly scheduled meeting for SWD parents to discuss topics of their concern – IEP, transitions Quarterly PTO meetings PAC meetings</p>	<p>Parent attendance at: PTO meetings, Open House, Workshops, Conferences Number of parent volunteers Number of student mentors Number of home visits</p>	<p>Event sign-in sheets Training agendas School and class specific newsletters, handbooks, etc. Volunteer logs Migrant service report Social worker / counselor reports Agendas indicating math as a topic for parent meetings</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHS GT, ITBS Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups. All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Identified Goal for Improvement:

NCLB Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students (ELL) will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better.

Annual Measurable Objective 3: (numbers in **black** = target for the system, numbers in **red** = actual results for the system)

To increase the percentage of ELL students who demonstrate English proficiency by meeting or exceeding reading/language arts and math standards on the state mandated CRCT or GHS GT towards 100% proficiency in 2014.

Grade	Year	Reading/English Language Arts			Mathematics		
		AYP Goal	System Goal	System Results	AYP Goal	System Goal	System Results
1 - 8	2006 baseline	66.7		46.0	58.3		52.8
CRCT	2007	66.7	52	56.9	58.3	58.7	61.7
	2008	73.3	58	64.9	59.5	64.6	51.9
	2009	73.3	64	74.7	59.5	70.5	67.7
	2010	73.3	70	83.3	67.6	76.4	77.7
	2011	80.0	76	82.8	75.7	82.3	75.5
11	2006 baseline	84.7		too few	68.6		too few
GHS GT	2007	87.7	65	too few	74.9	73.8	too few
	2008	87.7	70	too few	74.9	77.6	too few
	2009	87.7	75	63.6	74.9	81.4	63.6
	2010	90.8	80	64.0	81.2	85.2	32
	2011	90.8	85	56.5	81.2	89	68.2

Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives: Annual Report

(ACCESS Testing Scores)

Year	AMAO-1 Progress Percentage	Met AMAO-1 Criteria? (09-10 Target = 49%)	AMAO-2 Proficiency Percentage	Met AMAO-2 Criteria (09-10 Target = 6%)	AMAO-3 Did the ELL SubGroup for the system make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?
2006-07	37.30%	No	1.60%	No	YES
2007-08	46.20%	Yes	3.5%	No	YES
2008-09	63.98%	Yes	6.37%	Yes	YES
2009-10	69.2%	Yes	16.4%	Yes	YES
2010-11					

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	Georgia School Keys Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
2. All administrators and teachers who work with English language learners will become familiar with ACCESS scores, the required AMAOs for AYP, and using ACCESS data to inform instruction for ELL students	A 1.1 1.2 3.1	Annual Training sessions on interpreting ACCESS scores and information	Title III printed materials	Principals School Test coordinators Title III Coordinator ESOL teachers	on-going 2011-2014 August – ESOL teachers review ACCESS scores and AMAO status with teachers	System meeting the AMAO targets CRCT, GHSGT, and ACCESS plus the evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement	Attendance rosters from training Notes on interpreting ELL students' ACCESS scores	Individual student standardized test scores, ELL sub group scores, and ACCESS Progress/ Proficiency scores All scores should indicate annual improvement towards state and federal goals of achievement	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	Georgia School Keys Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. Classroom teachers will use the WIDA standards, appropriate instructional strategies and resources in instructing English Language Learners.</p>	<p>I 2.3 2.6</p>	<p>System and school based training in WIDA Standards and delivery models of ESOL service</p> <p>(Title II, Title III:)</p>	<p>Professional literature for training</p> <p>Instructional software for second language learning</p> <p>RESA and other consultants</p> <p>(Title II, Title III:)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p> <p>Title III Coordinator</p>	<p>On-going 2011- 2014</p> <p>SIOP training ; summer 2011 and 2012</p> <p>School based training for elementary teachers 2011/12</p> <p>Annual review training for effective use of software</p> <p>Weekly grade group/department meetings during planning periods to review differentiation for ELL</p>	<p>Classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson Plan Review</p> <p>CRCT, GHSGT, and ACCESS plus the evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Syllabus and attendance logs from training sessions</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson plans</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores, ELL sub group scores, and Progress/ Proficiency Scores from ACCESS</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards state and federal goals of achievement.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	Georgia School Keys Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>4. ESOL teachers will provide additional instructional assistance for eligible ELL students.</p>	<p>I 2.3</p>	<p>Encourage ESOL endorsement courses for all teachers</p> <p>System training for ESOL teachers in strategies to effectively teach English language learners</p> <p>(Title II, Title III)</p>	<p>Sufficient ESOL endorsed teachers for the number of ELL students</p> <p>Instructional materials and adopted texts in a second language</p> <p>Instructional software for second language learning</p> <p>RESA and other consultants</p> <p>(Title II, Title III)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p> <p>Title III Coordinator</p>	<p>Monthly system ESOL teacher meetings to share and discuss effective instructional strategies</p> <p>Semester review of the number of ELL students and the number of ESOL teachers</p>	<p>ESOL teacher observations</p> <p>Lesson Plan Review</p> <p>CRCT, GHSGT, and ACCESS plus the evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Anecdotal notes from ESOL classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson plans of ESOL teachers</p> <p>Daily schedules of ESOL teachers</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores, ELL sub group scores, and ACCESS Progress/ Proficiency scores</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards state and federal goals of achievement.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	Georgia School Keys Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>5. Students in grades 6 – 12 with extremely limited English proficiency will be provided additional support during the school day from bi-lingual teachers</p>	<p>I 2.3</p>	<p>ESOL endorsement courses</p> <p>Training for the Middle and High School ESOL teachers in strategies for rapid English language acquisition</p> <p>(Title II, Title III)</p>	<p>Two teachers from Mexico to work with new ELLs during the school day</p> <p>Instructional software for second language learning</p> <p>H1 visa and lawyer fees</p> <p>(Local, Title II, Title III)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Title III Coordinator</p>	<p>On-going 2011-2014</p>	<p>CRCT, GHSGT, and ACCESS plus the evaluation of student work will indicate improved student achievement.</p>	<p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <p>Interviews with students</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores, ELL sub group scores, and ACCESS Progress/ Proficiency scores</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards state and federal goals of achievement</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	Georgia School Keys Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
7. Each school in the system will develop and implement a home-school partnership program specifically for ELL students and parents.	SFC 1.1 1.4		Cooperation with system Parent Coordinator and Migrant Ed Recruiters	Title III Coordinator Principal ESOL teachers	On-going 2011-2014 Sept-Nov Schools develop a plan and conduct at least one parent activity Jan-May Schools fully implement the plan and conduct another parent activity	Increased numbers of parents of ELL students attending school activities	Copies of Home-School Partnership Plans for ELL students and parents. Copies of invitations, flyers, attendance sheets and descriptions of activities for parents of ELL students	Individual student standardized test scores, ELL sub group scores, and ACCESS Progress/ Proficiency scores All scores should indicate annual improvement towards state and federal goals of achievement	

Identified Goal for Improvement:

NCLB Performance Goal 3: All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Annual Measurable Objective 4: By June 2007, all teachers in the Colquitt County School System will be highly qualified as defined by state and federal regulations. (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

Year	Percentage HiQ	
	Title I Schools	Non-Title I Schools
2006	98.8	97.9
2007	100.0 99.7	100.0 97.2
2008	100.0 99.1	100.0 99.1
2009	100.0 99.9	100.0 99.8
2010	100.0 99.6	100.0 99.4
2011	100.0 99.8	N/A

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
1. The school system will recruit, employ, and retain highly qualified teachers.	SC - 1	<p>Training in recruitment practices for human resources personnel</p> <p>Training for teachers and administrators new to the system</p> <p>Training for teacher mentoring (Title II)</p>	<p>Recruiter (s) for critical need areas</p> <p>Public relations and recruitment materials</p> <p>Professional literature</p> <p>Teacher mentors</p> <p>Stipends for new teachers and mentors</p> <p>Substitutes and release time (Title II)</p>	<p>Superintendent</p> <p>Assistant Superintendent</p> <p>Human Resources Director</p> <p>Federal Programs Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual new teacher orientation in August</p> <p>Monthly new teacher meetings</p> <p>Semi-annual certification review</p> <p>Spring teacher recruitment</p>	<p>Certification status as reported by the Professional Standards Commission</p> <p>Teacher assignments</p> <p>Teacher/staff participation in training to renew or add-on necessary certification</p>	<p>Teacher certificates</p> <p>CPI report</p> <p>HiQ report</p> <p>Teacher mobility report</p> <p>Mentor teacher documentation</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. The school system will promote and facilitate add-on certification and/ or higher degrees especially in fields identified as critical need areas.</p>	SC - 1	<p>Reading endorsement with emphasis on teachers of students at risk in middle and high school</p> <p>Certificate Endorsements in: Math ESOL Gifted</p> <p>Content specific middle grades certification</p> <p>Special education certification</p> <p>System coordination with area universities for coursework toward Masters & Specialist degree</p> <p>(Title II)</p>	<p>Coordination with area universities, RESA, and GLRS</p> <p>(no cost)</p>	<p>Assistant Superintendent</p> <p>Human Resources Director</p> <p>Federal Programs Director</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Semi-annual certification review</p>	<p>Certification status as reported by the Professional Standards Commission</p> <p>Teacher assignments</p> <p>Teacher/staff participation in required courses</p>	<p>Teacher certificates</p> <p>CPI report</p> <p>HiQ report</p>	<p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014</p>	

Identified Goal for Improvement:

NCLB Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- **Annual Measurable Objective 5**: To decrease by at least 5% annually the number of referrals to administration for incidents that disrupt the learning environment. (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

Grade	Year	Total incidents*
PK - 12	2006 baseline	**8481
	2007	8266 7474
	2008	7853 5626
	2009	7460 4336
	2010	7087 6715
	2011	6732 4867

* Excluding bus incidents

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
1. Each school will maintain an emergency plan.	PO - 4	GEMA workshops	Coordination with 911, Red Cross, and GEMA (No cost)	Principal Assistant Superintendent	Ongoing 2011 – 2014 Annual review of plans each Fall	Regularly scheduled Emergency drills (e.g., weather, fire, bomb, or intruder alert)	Drill reports	A calm, uninterrupted learning environment	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
2. Each school will develop and implement school-wide discipline plan	PO – 4 SC – 2 I - 4	Classroom management training Crisis intervention training Restraint training Training for alternative programs Training through police and sheriff's departments (Title II)	System Code of Conduct Professional literature RESA and consultants 8-12 Alternative program School resource officers at MS, Jr H, and HS	Superintendent Principal Assistant Director for Special Education Alternate Education Director	Ongoing 2011-2014 Annual review of plans each Fall	Discipline referrals	Discipline reports	Reduced number of discipline incidents	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
3. Students will be instructed in personal safety and drug-free lifestyle.	PO – 4 SC - 2	Training for health, safety, and character education programs adopted by the system	RESA and consultants Sheriff’s Department (<i>CHAMPS</i>) Rotary Club (<i>Aids Awareness</i>) Text and materials for health, safety and character education (<i>I Can Problem Solve, Second Step, Menendez, Human Growth and Development</i>)	Principal Counselors PE teachers RESA	Ongoing 2011-2014 Annual review of all programs for new teachers in the fall. Spring survey for 5 th , 8 th , and 12 th grade students	Classroom observations Lesson Plan review Student attendance at special presentations	Anecdotal reports from observations Lesson plans Survey results Program agendas Dropout report	Decrease in number of students dropping out due to health, pregnancy, or substance abuse.	

Identified Goal for Improvement:

NCLB Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning..

Annual Measurable Objective 6: To increase the amount of technology available for instructional use in core academic classrooms to achieve “21st Century” status. (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

Year	# core academic classrooms K-12	# 21st Century core academic classrooms K-12
2009 baseline	435	100 102
2010	435	175 142
2011	435	300 375
2012	435	400
2013	435	435

21st Century Classroom = standardized technology equipment and resources which includes modern computer workstations, data projectors, student response systems, interactive whiteboards, laptops/netbooks, wireless access, Mobi, Elmo, and multimedia equipment.

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>1. Planned purchasing of technology equipment and resources for all core academic classrooms to reach 21st Century status as defined in the system 5-year Technology Plan</p>	<p>I – 2.7</p>	<p>Professional Learning opportunities provided for all teachers as the technology is placed in their classrooms.</p> <p>The system Instructional Technologists (3) will provide on-site training at schools as well as group training at the system computer lab.</p> <p>Vendors will provide training for teachers. Ex. Smartboard</p> <p>Summer Academy for Instructional Technology – June 2011</p>	<p>Primary source of funding is a SPLOST: \$265,000 per year</p> <p>Secondary source of funding (due to SPLOST receipts being insufficient) is federal funds:</p> <p>Title I AARA \$255,000</p> <p>Title I \$590,000</p> <p>State and Federal Professional Learning Funds: \$30,000</p>	<p>Superintendent</p> <p>Federal Programs Director</p> <p>Technology Director</p>	<p>Fall 2009 through Spring 2013 – years of SPLOST</p>	<p>Classroom observations</p> <p>Lesson Plan review</p>	<p>Anecdotal reports from observations</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <p>Training Agendas and Sign-in sheets</p> <p>Student Performance Products</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHSGT, ITBS</p> <p>Individual student standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by relevant subgroups.</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Identified Goal for Improvement:

NCLB Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

Annual Measurable Objective 7: To increase the percentage of all students who successfully complete and graduate from high school in four years. (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

Year	All students	Black	Hispanic	White	*SWD	*ELL
2006 baseline	63.1	44.0	58.0	74.5	9.6	25.5
2007	66.8 59.6	49.3 50.0	60.7 50.0	77.3 66.4	14.6 16.1	21.7 33.3
2008	71.5 70.7	56.5 56.3	66.3 67.2	80.6 77.7	19.6 22.0	26.7 46.2
2009	76.2 75.3	63.7 68.7	71.9 80.0	83.9 78.9	24.6 40.7	31.7 54.5
2010	80.9 81.0	70.9 71.9	77.5 81.5	87.2 85.9	29.6 35.2	36.7 65.0
2011	81.6 80.7	70.5 74.6	71.5 77.1	88.5 84.7	34.6 43.6	72.0 48.3

*Student subgroup below minimum

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
1. Students leaving one grade will be academically prepared for the next grade with particular emphasis on the transition from 5 th to 6 th and 8 th to 9 th .	CS – 1, 3	Continued training in strategies to raise student achievement: GPS/CCGPS, academic expectations, differentiation, acceleration, student support (Title I, Title II, Title III,, State Professional Learning Funds)	RESA, GLRS, program and other consultants, materials After School tutoring program, in school “Safety Nets,” Summer School for regular and migrant students (Title I, Title II, Title III, State Professional Learning Funds)	Principals Curriculum Director Assistant Superintendent Superintendent	Ongoing 2011-2014 Annual preparation in March for students needing summer school services or retention October – April: After school tutoring and in school “Safety Nets”	Decreased number of students not meeting expectations on CRCT	Individual and group CRCT scores	All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. The school system will adopt and facilitate the use of appropriate programs to best meet the instructional needs of students who need additional support to be prepared for the next grade level, with particular emphasis on 5th and 8th graders.</p>	CS – 1, 3	<p>Continued training in strategies to raise student achievement: GPS/CCGPS, academic expectations, differentiation, acceleration, student support</p> <p>(Title I, Title II, Title III, State Professional Learning Funds)</p>	<p>RESA, GLRS, and other consultants, materials</p> <p>Alternate Education opportunities for students</p> <p>After School tutoring program, in school “Safety Nets,” Summer School for regular and migrant students</p> <p>(Title I, Title II, Title III, State Professional Learning Funds)</p>	<p>Principals</p> <p>Curriculum Director</p> <p>Alternate Education Director</p> <p>Assistant Superintendent</p> <p>Superintendent</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual preparation in March for students needing summer school services or retention</p> <p>October – April: After school tutoring and in school “Safety Nets”</p>	<p>Number of students not meeting expectations on CRCT</p> <p>Number of students served in alternative education programs</p>	<p>Individual and group CRCT scores</p> <p>Alternative education rosters</p>	<p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p> <p>Fewer students served through alternative education</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. The school system will establish a consistent process to ensure communication and instructional articulation between elementary and middle, middle and junior high, and junior high to high schools.</p>		<p>Awareness training for teachers and administrators in the curriculum and instructional best practice for the schools feeding into their school. (No cost)</p>	<p>Designated administrator at each school Curriculum director or Central Office designee to oversee the process Release time for teachers</p>	<p>Principals Curriculum Director Federal Programs Director Assistant Superintendent</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014 Monthly administrator meetings across and within school levels Teacher meetings and peer observations across school levels</p>	<p>Lesson plans and instructional strategies demonstrating awareness of previous and next grade's curriculum</p>	<p>Meeting agendas and minutes</p>	<p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014. Fewer students retained</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>4. The high school will restructure and expand student guidance and advisory to monitor and support the same group of students from 10th – 12th grade.</p>		<p>Training on advisor/advisee program with emphasis on interventions for students at risk of not graduating— SST training</p> <p>Training for counselors on developing individual graduation plans for students</p>	<p>Full time graduation counselor in addition to a minimum of one counselor per grade level in high school</p> <p>School social worker</p> <p>RESA, GLRS, program and other consultants, materials</p>	<p>Principals</p> <p>Alternative Program Administrator</p> <p>Head Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual preparation in August for advisor/advisee groups</p> <p>Annual introduction to high school for 10th graders</p> <p>End of semester review of students' graduation plans and course placement</p> <p>Monthly meetings to identify students at risk and to discuss appropriate plans of action</p>	<p>Dropout and graduation rates</p> <p>Correct course placement for students</p>	<p>Training agendas</p> <p>Meeting minutes</p> <p>Individual student graduation plans</p>	<p>Increase in number of students graduating in four years</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>5. The high school will provide additional learning opportunities for students who are failing classes and/or who need additional assistance in test preparation.</p>		<p>Training for teachers on remediation, acceleration, and differentiation</p> <p>Training for administrators on alternative scheduling</p>	<p>Extended Day for selected teachers</p> <p>Courseware for remediation, course repair/recovery, and test preparation</p> <p><i>(Odysseyware, New Century, NovaNet, SAT and GHSGT Prep)</i></p> <p>“Study Skills” as an elective course</p> <p>After school tutoring</p> <p>Alternative program</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Alternative Program Administrator</p> <p>Head Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Daily opportunities for students to receive additional assistance and remediation</p> <p>Monthly meetings to identify students at risk and to discuss appropriate plans of action</p>	<p>Dropout and graduation rates</p> <p>Lesson plan review</p> <p>Midterm and final grade distribution</p>	<p>Training agendas</p> <p>Meeting minutes</p> <p>Individual student graduation plans</p> <p>Grade reports</p> <p>Lesson plans</p>	<p>Increase in number of students on track to graduate in four years</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
6. The high school will provide access to alternative options for high school course credit.		<p>Training for counselors and vocational and alternative administrators in the rules and guidelines for awarding credit outside the high school: Dual Enrollment, ACCEL, MOWR, Student Eligibility, Grading, Testing</p> <p>Training for administrators on alternative scheduling</p>	<p>Extended Day for selected teachers</p> <p>Courseware for alternative routes to course credit (<i>Odysseyware, Virtual High School</i>)</p> <p>Coordination with Moultrie Technical College (MTC) and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (ABAC)</p> <p>Vocational/Career Advisor</p> <p>Alternative program</p>	<p>Principals</p> <p>Alternative program Administrator</p> <p>Head Guidance Counselor</p> <p>High School Vocational Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Fall and Spring registration of high school students in MTC and ABAC courses</p> <p>Monthly meetings to monitor students on alternative routes to graduation</p> <p>Quarterly meetings of CCHS, MTC, and ABAC administrators</p>	<p>Dropout and graduation rates</p> <p>Number of students participating in alternative options</p>	<p>Training agendas</p> <p>Meeting minutes</p> <p>Individual student graduation plans</p>	<p>Increase in number of students on track to graduate in four years</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>7. The high school will develop and implement non-academic strategies to support students towards graduation.</p>		<p>Training for teachers, counselors, and administrators on motivating students, positive attitudes, and appropriate behavior, i.e., school climate</p> <p>Training for parents on graduation requirements and supporting their students through high school</p>	<p>RESA, GLRS, and other consultants</p> <p>Parent Involvement Coordinator</p> <p>School Social Worker</p> <p>Graduation Specialist</p> <p>Professional literature</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Head Guidance Counselor</p> <p>Federal Programs Director</p> <p>Alternate Education Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Daily opportunities for students to receive positive reinforcement and to be involved in decision-making process.</p> <p>Monthly meetings to identify students at risk and to discuss appropriate plans of action</p> <p>Annual review of school-wide discipline plan</p>	<p>Dropout and graduation rates</p> <p>Attendance rates</p> <p>Discipline referrals</p> <p>Parent attendance at events, training opportunities, and parent-teacher conferences</p> <p>Student engagement in extra-curricular activities</p>	<p>Training agendas</p> <p>Meeting minutes</p> <p>Individual student graduation plans</p> <p>Attendance and discipline reports</p> <p>Parent-teacher conference logs</p>	<p>Increase in number of students on track to graduate in four years</p>	

Identified Goals for Improvement:

IDEA Performance Goal I: To improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities.

Annual Measurable Objective 8: To increase the percentage of students with disabilities who graduate from high school (annual increase of 3%) and who transition to either employment (annual increase of 3%) or post-secondary education (annual increase of 1%). (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

Year	% of SWD Graduating	% of SWD Graduates Transitioning to Employment	% of SWD Graduates Transitioning to Post-Secondary Ed.
2006 baseline	9.6	40	60
2007	13 16.1	43 35	61 45
2008	16 22.0	46 41	62 29
2009	19 40.7	49	63
2010	22 35.2	52 27.5	64 47.5
2011	25 43.6	55	65

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
1. The school system will increase the number of SWD in all grade levels who receive instruction in the regular education environment (inclusion).	C -3	Training in LRE, inclusion of SWD: Accelerated, differentiated, additional instruction, Pyramid of Interventions, and co-teaching for both regular ed and special ed teachers	Local trainers; DOE trainers; GLRS, RESA and other consultants	Principals SPED Director Curriculum Director	Ongoing 2011-2014 Continuous support of inclusion and co-teaching models. Monthly classroom observations on inclusion and co-teaching. Annually review and revise teacher assignments	FTE Count 2 (environment count) Lesson plan review Student and school schedules Class rolls Graduation rate	FTE Count (2) report Student Schedules Lesson Plans Teacher/ Paraprofessional schedules Schools' master schedules Graduation rate report Training agendas and participation logs	Increase in SWD who complete high school and transition to employment or post-secondary education	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. The system will utilize transition and graduation specialists as effective collaborative resources to help students with disabilities to stay in school.</p>	C - 2	<p>Transition team training for both specialists. Transition specialist endorsement Teacher training in poverty and “at-risk” issues.</p>	<p>Transition specialist CCSS Transition Manuals for HS and MS Transition training materials/supplies Trainers/materials on poverty/at-risk issues</p>	<p>SPED Director Director Alternative ED MS & HS Principals</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014 Quarterly collect data, review, revise IEP/Transition Plans Annually redeliver poverty/at -risk training</p>	<p>Monthly dropout rates for SWD Ongoing data collection by Transition Support Specialist (TSS) Track dropouts by age, gender, ethnicity, eligibility, and reason(s) Annual Reports</p>	<p>Monthly/annual dropout reports SIS records TSS records Logs of student interviews and personal contacts Training agendas and participation logs</p>	<p>Increase in number of SWD students graduating from high school</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. The system will employ a Transition Support Specialist (TSS) to coordinate IEP/Transition plans and services and to provide guidance and support to SPED case managers as they implement IEP/Transition goals and objectives.</p>	<p>I – 1, 3</p>	<p>Training for SPED case managers in writing measurable goals and objectives for transition in IEPs.</p>	<p>Transition Specialist</p> <p>GLRS</p> <p>State Guidelines for Transition through the IEP</p> <p>Transition Manuals for MS and HS SPED teachers</p> <p>(IDEA: \$500; Local: \$45,000)</p>	<p>SPED Director</p> <p>Principals</p> <p>SPED Department Head</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Annually in the spring, provide support to 8th graders prior to transition to high school and introduce 5th graders to transition prior to entering MS (6th)-</p>	<p>IEP Review</p> <p>Transition plan review</p> <p>Graduation rates</p>	<p>IEPs</p> <p>Student transition plans</p> <p>Training agendas and participation logs</p> <p>Graduation rate report</p>	<p>Increase in SWD who complete high school and transition to employment or post-secondary education</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
4. The system will establish a “Transition Agency Alliance” by involving all stakeholders in opportunities to expand the network available for post-secondary education and/or employment activities for SWD.	SFCS – 1, 2, 3	Training for teachers in building relationships with community agencies (No cost)	Transition Manuals for HS and MS Interagency collaboration and cooperation (DOE, DOL, Vocational Rehab, Technical colleges, Universities, etc) Release time	Principals SPED Director Transition Specialist Director Alternative ED	Ongoing 2011-2014 Annually review of “Transition Agency Alliance” plan Fall survey of SWD who have left high school	Compare [Post-secondary survey results (annual Report) Review of student records Review of TAA plan Student Contacts/Interviews Graduation rates	Results of Post-secondary Activities Survey TAA listings of available opportunities for SWD Graduation rate report	Increase in SWD who complete high school and transition to employment or post-secondary education	

Identified Goals for Improvement:

IDEA Performance Goal II: To improve services for young children (ages 3-5) with disabilities.

Annual Measurable Objective 9: To increase the identification and assessment of young children (ages 3 – 5) in order to provide appropriate special education services and ensure successful transition to kindergarten
(numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

Year	# Students Assessed	# Students Identified
2006 baseline	29	29
2007	60	40
2008		14
2009	55	48
2010	54	38
2011	22	18

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>1. Special education administrative staff will work closely with Babies Can't Wait, physicians, DFCS and other local agencies to improve and enhance Child Find services.</p>	<p>SFCS – 1, 3 A - 3</p>	<p>Training on Child Find procedures (No cost)</p>	<p>Publications, e.g. Child Find flyers, Newspaper ads</p>	<p>SPED Director Pre-K Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014 Semi-annual interagency meetings with SPED administrative staff Monthly reports on preschool transition Eligibility and placement meetings as needed</p>	<p>Review of Preschool Transition reports Number of eligibility assessments</p>	<p>Preschool transition reports Student records Number(s) of eligibility assessments</p>	<p>Increase number of SWD who successfully transition to kindergarten</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. The system will increase least restrictive environment (LRE) opportunities for young children with disabilities in Pre-Kindergarten.</p>	<p>I - 1 C - 3</p>	<p>LRE/Inclusion training for Pre-K teachers</p>	<p>Adaptive instructional materials as appropriate for LRE</p> <p>Professional literature on LRE for young child</p> <p>RESA, GLRS, and other consultants</p> <p>(IDEA: \$2000)</p>	<p>SPED Director</p> <p>Pre-K Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014</p> <p>Annual fall review for all Pre-K teachers on LRE</p>	<p>Review of: Student placement and schedule, teacher schedules, class rosters</p> <p>FTE report</p>	<p>FTE Count 2- (environment count)</p> <p>Teacher/student schedules</p>	<p>All identified young SWD have opportunities to learn in LRE.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. The system will monitor the progress of young SWD and, when necessary, provide specialists' support services to promote success in the LRE with particular emphasis on tracking and intervention for at risk students.</p>	I - 4	<p>Training in developmentally appropriate education for preschool students</p> <p>Training for the understanding of PS/PK behaviors</p> <p>Training SLP Strategies w/ PS/PK</p>	<p>Developmentally appropriate preschool materials</p> <p>RESA, GLRS</p> <p>Local support specialists</p>	<p>SPED Director</p> <p>Pre-K Director</p>	Ongoing 2011-2014	<p>Developmental checklist</p> <p>Progress monitoring towards benchmark behaviors</p> <p>Student work</p> <p>Individual student assessments</p> <p>Behavior Charts</p>	<p>Work samples</p> <p>Checklists</p> <p>Behavior Charts</p> <p>Intervention Charts</p> <p>Progress monitoring reports</p>	Young SWD interact appropriately with peers in LRE	

Identified Goals for Improvement:

IDEA Performance Goal III: Improve the provision of a free, appropriate, public education to students with disabilities.

Annual Measurable Objective 10: To increase the number of SWD who successfully participate in the regular education environment, grades K -12. (numbers in black = target , numbers in red = actual results)

We initiated the Inclusion model system-wide during the 2006-2007 school year.
Supervision and support for Least Restrictive Environment practices is being provided

Year	> 80% in Regular Ed.	40 -79% in Regular Ed.	<40% in Regular Ed.
2006 baseline	59.6	12.8	27.6
2007	68.2	12.1	19.6
2008	80.5	5.8	13.5
2009	83.7	5.6	10.3
2010	84.5	2.9	12.4
2011			

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>1. The Program for Exceptional Children will work to ensure that all students who are evaluated for Special Education services will have eligibility status determined within 60 days of initial referral.</p>	<p>A -3 L – 1, 3</p>	<p>Training on procedures and practices for student eligibility evaluation: SLPs, psychologists, facilitators/liaisons, Special Ed. Teachers and Administrative staff (No cost)</p>	<p>Current, research-based assessment instruments for student evaluations GLRS Update laptop computers for school psychologists as needed</p>	<p>SPED Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014 Monthly review of status of student evaluations</p>	<p>Monthly evaluation reporting</p>	<p>School contact logs Psychologists’ monthly logs; SLPs and others’ logs Administrative Clerk’s logs</p>	<p>SWD will receive appropriate instructional modifications from special services in an expedient manner to ensure learning success in LRE.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. The system will establish a system review team to monitor the disproportionate representation of subgroups within SWD and to promote alternative instructional options prior to referral for Special Education services.</p>	<p>PO - 1 A - 3</p>	<p>Training for regular ed. teachers and Academic Coaches on tier level intervention strategies (Pyramid of Interventions) Training for teachers and administrators on SST intent and procedures (No cost)</p>	<p>Publications, e.g. Pyramid of Interventions flipcharts SST manuals GLRS</p>	<p>SPED Director Alternate Education Director Principals Curriculum Director</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014: Continue interventions to decrease risk ratio .10 annually</p>	<p>Review of: SST/SPED referrals DOE reports on disproportionality DOE risk ratio reports per eligibility and ethnicity Numbers of students in Tiers 2, 3 and 4</p>	<p>Data reports from DOE on risk ratio and disproportionality Number of eligible students by ethnicity SST reports Psychologists logs</p>	<p>Before receiving special education services, all students with learning difficulties will demonstrate a continued lack of academic success despite the use of tier level interventions.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>3. The Program for Exceptional Children will include all school sites in a systematic plan to consistently increase and improve opportunities for SWD to be included in instruction in the regular education classroom, particularly for math, and to participate in statewide testing, by providing a full continuum of services to SWD.</p>	<p>I – 2, 3, 4 C – 3 A – 1, 2, 3 L - 2</p>	<p>Training on Pyramid of Interventions: LRE/Inclusion Training with Intervention Strategies Training: Training on Co-teaching; Training on the use of assistive technology; training on appropriate use of accommodations and modifications for standardized testing for LRE Coaches, SPED facilitators, , Administrators and RegEd and SpEd Teachers</p> <p>Sunday training for Pre-K teachers</p>	<p>LRE and academic coaches</p> <p>Substitutes</p> <p>Sunday Kits Instructional materials</p> <p>Teacher accommodation spreadsheet</p> <p>Accommodation guidelines</p> <p>DoE, GLRS, RESA, and local trainers and consultants</p>	<p>SPED Director</p> <p>System Test Coordinator</p> <p>Principals</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014 implement inclusion plan</p>	<p>FTE Count 2- Data on environment</p> <p>Lesson plans indicating use of strategies for differentiation of instruction for SWD</p> <p>Classroom observations to assess success of SWD learning experience</p> <p>SWD work will demonstrate a variety of acceptable responses to the standard.</p> <p>Formative benchmark assessments to indicate progress in math</p> <p>LRE checklists</p>	<p>FTE Count 2- Data on environment</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <p>Anecdotal notes from classroom observations , samples of student work</p> <p>IEP and SST documentation</p>	<p>Summative assessments —CRCT, GHS GT, ITBS</p> <p>The Individual standardized test scores and group scores disaggregated by disability of SWD who have been included in the regular classroom</p> <p>All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014.</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>4. The Program for Exceptional Children will assist the administrators of all schools to implement innovative scheduling of all available personnel to permit effective co-teaching and inclusion of SWD in the regular education program, particularly for instruction in math. .</p>	C – 3	<p>Training on effective scheduling for SWD: Training on Co-Teaching and Inclusion Practices: Training on building a school schedule: Training on the effective use of collaborative planning time for... School lead SpEd teachers SIS Coordinator</p>	<p>Local, DoE, GLRS, and RESA trainers and consultants Substitutes</p>	<p>Principal School lead SpEd teacher SPED Director SIS Coordinator</p>	Ongoing 2011-2014 implement co-teaching and inclusion plan	<p>FTE Count 2- Data on environment Review of teacher and student schedules Review of school master schedule Review of class rolls</p>	<p>FTE Count 2- Report Student and teacher schedules Teacher/paraprofessional schedules Training agendas and participation logs</p>	<p>Summative assessments – CRCT, GHS GT, ITBS Increase of SWD who meet expectations - All scores should indicate annual improvement towards 100% mastery for 2014</p>	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
5. Schools will use IEP teams and intervention specialists to address behavioral or disciplinary concerns of SWD to maintain 100% compliance with IDEA regulations.	L -3	Training in Functional Behavioral Assessment/Manifestation Determination (No cost)	LEA trainers and specialists	SPED Director Principals Alternative Ed. Director	Ongoing 2011-2014 with annual reporting	Attendance rate Discipline referrals Students' IEPs	Attendance and discipline records Student Data Management System Reports	Behavior of SWD will be managed to minimize interruption of instruction to foster student achievement and academic success.	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>6. The Program for Exceptional Children will provide additional opportunities for parents of SWD to be involved in their student's learning and activities.</p>	<p>SFCS – 1, 2, 3</p>	<p>Training opportunities for parents</p>	<p>Parent Involvement Coordinator Publications, e.g. Parent Newsletters Parent Needs Assessment</p>	<p>SPED Director Parent Involvement Coordinator</p>	<p>Ongoing 2011-2014 Semi-annual Parent Event</p>	<p>Parent surveys; Parent Needs assessment Parent attendance at school functions and IEP meetings</p>	<p>Parent Logs documenting parent attendance at school functions, meetings, etc. Parent Survey responses; Needs assessment survey responses IEP documentation</p>	<p>SWD will be successful in the LRE.</p>	

Identified Goals for Improvement:

IDEA Performance Goal IV: Improve compliance with state and federal laws and regulations.

Annual Measurable Objective 11: All identified state and federal noncompliance incidents (including but not limited to dispute resolutions, formal complaints, due process hearings, and timelines) will be corrected.

Individual incidents are assessed and addressed as they are identified and corrective action is taken. The scope of this goal makes the use of comparable data unbeneficial.

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
1. The Program for Exceptional Children will monitor SWD transition plans for measurable goals and objectives and eligibility redetermination.	I - 3 L -4 SC - 2	Training for Transition Specialist and SPED teachers on developing transition plans	Transition Manuals Transition Specialist Endorsement	SPED Director Alternative Ed. Director Principals	2011-2014 implementation of compliant transition plans 100% Eligibility Redeterminations compliance Continued compliance	Transition Plans Eligibility redeterminations	IEPs and Transition Plan Documentation Psychologists' logs and timeline reports	By being in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations, SWD will have optimal opportunities for learning success.	

Actions, Strategies, Interventions or Programs	GSSP Standard	Professional Learning	Resources or Materials Needed	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation	Timeline For Implementation	Means of Evaluation	Monitoring of Intervention (Artifacts)	Evidence of Impact (Student Learning Data)	Status
<p>2. The Program for Exceptional Children will coordinate all complaints, hearings, and resolutions concerning SWD and will submit required reports according to state and federal laws and regulations.</p>	L - 3	<p>Annual update for Special Ed. administrators on existing and new state and federal laws and regulations. (No cost)</p>	<p>GLRS, RESA School Board Attorney State and federal rules and regulations (No cost)</p>	SPED Director	Ongoing 2011-2014 with annual review in the fall	State and federal monitoring	Documentation of compliance to policies and procedures.	By being in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations, SWD will have optimal opportunities for learning success.	

Quality Assurance

Working collaboratively to conduct an internal self-review allows the Colquitt County School System the opportunity to assure all of its stakeholders that the school system is committed to student success. In light of that assurance, all functions of the school system, as described in this report, are focused on helping the system promote high achievement for all students. The system feels confident that all SACS Standards and Title I requirements are being met and that continuous improvement for excellence in student achievement will occur through the processes that are currently in place.

The system and school plans that guide the improvement process are “living documents”. They are reviewed and revised at least annually and progress toward goals is documented. Each school submits an annual report of progress to Central Office. Attention is focused on comparing data so that system and school administrators can collaborate on changes to the system and school plans for the coming year.

The system superintendent meets formally with each principal twice a year, once for a mid-year conference and once for a year-end conference. Among the items for discussion are the quality of leadership provided at each school, the school’s current profile, the school improvement plan, student achievement data results for the year, and individual school needs and personnel concerns. In addition, principals’ meetings are held monthly with all principals and the system leadership team. Many of the issues listed above are discussed in these meetings, and there is also the opportunity for book studies, presentations by resource experts, or in-depth looks at specific topics such as “Standards-Based Instruction” and “Grading and Reporting Student Work”.

At the school level, each faculty and staff engages in a continuous school improvement process by revisiting the SACS standards and Title I requirements on an annual basis. Each principal reviews and reports online to SACS its progress toward the goals, activities, and improvements of the SACS standards and individual school goals. The Assistant Superintendent for Instruction and Learning Services reviews these as they are submitted to assure alignment with system goals.

To further align school efforts with system goals, professional learning collaborative groups have been established at each school. Groups are comprised of grade level and/or subject area colleagues. These groups meet to discuss, plan, and develop effective instructional materials especially as related to the Georgia Performance Standards. System level collaborative groups also meet to accomplish similar goals for the system.

In response to an ever-increasing concern for safety, the system and schools have worked with emergency preparedness agencies to produce a local safety plan. Each school also produces a current emergency plan. Safety meetings and planning for drills are guided through the Risk Management Coordinator.

School Councils play an integral part in quality assurance and in establishing the schools' relationship with the community, the Superintendent and the School Board. The establishment of School Councils is for the purpose of sharing ideas for school improvement and to serve as a communication tool between community, school, and the School Board. Each School Council meets a minimum of four times a year and prepares a report to the Board of Education summarizing its transactions for the year.

As documented in the Action Plan, the system has provided specialized trainings for school personnel to ensure that quality programs continue to be implemented. For example, new

teachers are provided with an in-depth induction with follow-up throughout the year. All teachers in the system also have been trained on the Georgia Performance Standards, and the system provided Least Restrictive Environment training for inclusion/co-teaching for special and regular education students. Special emphasis has been given to differentiating instruction for English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Gifted students as well as addressing the needs of students of poverty.