The changes we face in this new fiscal year make the process of implementing Title I far more complex than in Title I’s humble beginnings in 1965. Future educational leaders must possess much more than a desire to help improve the educational achievement levels of Georgia’s children. Educational leaders must promote greater collaboration on educational issues and promote discussion on shared challenges in our work to better equip students with the skills they need. As we seek innovative methods for educating our 21st century children, change is inevitable. It necessitates examining where we are and then moving forward to where we need to be.

Education is not something that can be effectively achieved in isolation. It is most successful when educators and their communities work together. To that end, Education Support Services’ Parent Outreach Division represents a deliberate and conscious movement toward restructuring resources so that students and parents alike can benefit. The Department has learned valuable lessons in how to align our goals with parents’ needs, how to measure student progress towards these goals, and how to hold ourselves accountable for reaching said objectives. It is a paradigm shift in the way we view our major stakeholders – parents. Under this new direction, each parent will have the opportunity to become empowered and engaged in their children’s education through our Parent Outreach Division, headed by Andrea Fairlies-Moore. Our Title Programs Division, headed by Margo K. DeLaune, will continue to assist Title I staff and LEAs as they seek to make a difference in the lives of our children.

Education Support Services is committed to ensuring that Georgia’s education system provides students with the resources and instruction they need to be competitive. For this Department, education means promoting the best practices, fostering innovation and increasing transparency. Through shared collaboration of ideas, we can make Georgia’s children’s educational experience one of great promise and opportunity.

The prevailing theme of this current issue is change. In this issue, we will examine our two new divisions and their roles; present cutting-edge research that can assist in working with students; and a NCLB federal update section.

I hope you find this issue of the Education Support Services eNews a useful tool. As always, I appreciate the work you do for our children and I commend you on the high road you have taken to ensure that we educate every child!
Predicting the Future of NCLB

Another birthday for the NCLB Act has come and gone. On January 8, 2008, the legislation turned six years old. The law is already past due for an update from Congress; however, according to policy insiders, it is not likely that new legislation will be passed anytime soon. The Thomas B. Fordham Institute surveyed twenty Washington insiders in an attempt to shed light on when the reauthorization may take place, and what changes are likely. It is almost unanimous among those surveyed that reauthorization is unlikely until 2009. Those surveyed also agree that while the new legislation will include significant changes, a complete overhaul of the law is not predicted.

While it appears that President Bush has cited the legislation as an opportunity to forge common ground with Democrats, and Congressional leaders say passing the legislation is a high priority, eleven of the twelve respondents surveyed believe that the law will not be reauthorized until after the 2008 presidential election. Democrats are promising to push a new bill through soon, but Washington insiders are not buying these promises. The question on everyone’s mind is what happens if NCLB is not rewritten before it expires? According to Richard Long, IRA director of government relations, the answer is basically that the current statute will be extended. There are several mechanisms to do this, and it has been done previously for federal programs such as IDEA, and Head Start.

When the dust settles and the long awaited reauthorization occurs, Washington’s Fordham Institute survey respondents agree that major components of the law are likely to remain unchanged. Respondents generally agree that it is unlikely that Congress will mandate national standards, or add the mandate that states start testing students in history or social studies on a regular basis. They believe that states will continue to be required to disaggregate test scores as a part of the annual program evaluation, and that the new legislation will maintain “public school choice”. In other words, the law will most likely be tweaked, but not rewritten.

On the other hand, some significant changes do appear likely. Washington insiders believe that the best indicators of these changes can be seen by taking a look at the U.S. Department of Education’s pilot programs and proposals. The Administration’s growth model pilot program appears to be the basis for a statutory provision allowing states to voluntarily use such measures in their accountability component. Eleven of twelve survey respondents see this as “somewhat” or “very likely.” The same number of respondents agree that the reauthorization will incorporate the department’s pilot program allowing schools to offer supplemental education services (SES) before public school choice. The addition of science testing as a component to the annual evaluation process is believed by many to be another possible change.

There are also some rather significant policy issues that are completely undecided and the survey respondents are split, often right down the middle, on these issues. The undecided issues focus on whether Congress will:

1. Provide incentives for states to adopt national standards.
2. Increase dramatically the flexibility that states or districts receive through a “charter state” or “charter district” provision.
3. Maintain the requirement that students, new to the country, continue to participate in the annual accountability testing.
4. Change the focus to “highly effective teachers” rather than “highly qualified teachers.”

It appears that the reauthorization process will be long and hard, with only rather small changes in the end. Still no one can predict with 100% accuracy what Congress will do. While the reauthorization process works in the background, the current NCLB legislative tenants will continue. When the reauthorization process is complete, those hoping NCLB would just go away or be transformed are not likely to get their wishes.

Exploring Gender Differences in Our 21st Century Classrooms

Dig into the very core of today's classrooms and you will find two genders - both requiring creative means of tapping into the differences that are scientifically proven to exist. Gender differences have been studied by scientists for years. The onset of MRI scans in the late 1980's allowed for in-depth revelations that provided astonishing evidence about the brains of males and females. These observations clearly indicate different parts of the brain working in different ways for males and females to accomplish the same task.

When it comes to language, females will typically use more of the brain, while males are more likely to use a small area of the brain on only one side, for tasks they are asked to perform. When asking the different genders for directions, women tend to be far more detailed and will point out things like “the blue house with the pink door with yellow flowers painted on it.” Men will typically give more direct instructions; such as, “go three blocks north, turn west on 10th Street, and go south on Bay Street. (National Association for Single Sex Public Education - NASSPE, 2007).

According to the Council for Exceptional Children, males tend to be right-brain dominant and they typically have an advantage in spatial learning. Math and science are often viewed as their strong points. Boys tend to have an advantage on multiple choice tests because they tend to be more deductive which allows for an extra advantage on standardized multiple choice tests. Girls, on the other hand, are typically left-brain dominant and often excel in verbal skills like reading and writing. They are far more likely to be inductive thinkers. They tend to see, hear, smell, taste, and feel more than boys giving them a distinct advantage on essay tests.

Clearly, different strategies need to be addressed when it comes to the genders. For a change in the classroom, try giving boys the opportunity to move around more and enough space to spread out when doing their work. Allow boys to squeeze a stress ball when asked to read aloud and give boys “brain breaks” when learning challenging information. Encourage girls to speak up more in the classroom. Use word problems in math to help girls. Allow girls to draw and work with puzzles and mazes.

More strategies for working with genders can be found at: www.cec.sped.org

In October 2006, the federal government published new regulations that allow for single-gender education in public schools. Research suggests test scores for both boys and girls may be improved when single-gender classes are offered (NASSPE, 2007) and that students attending single-gender schools tend to have higher aspirations for post-secondary education and careers. In addition in a systematic review of several studies on single-gender schools in this country, the U.S. Department of Education reports that single-gender schools can impact student achievement in all areas in a positive manner.

In Georgia, Atlanta Public Schools is currently piloting two single-gender middle schools - one female and one male. They have partnered with several community agencies to assist in making the single-gender schools a viable option for improving student achievement. Stay tuned for further information about this project and other similar projects implemented within the state.
General Monitoring Information

In early January, the Title Programs Division embarked on the third cycle of cross-functional monitoring for districts in Georgia. Each monitoring team consists of specialists from Title I, Title II, Title V, Title VI, and Title X. This year, the seventy-one districts slated for monitoring will experience the newly created electronic monitoring system. In preparation for these visits, districts scheduled for monitoring were each given the opportunity to attend a full-day training during the Fall of 2007.

LEAs are monitored on a three year cycle. Cycle three of the monitoring schedule is being conducted by the Georgia Department of Education (Department) during the 2007-2008 school year. The monitoring of federal programs is conducted to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. Monitoring emphasizes accountability for using resources wisely. It also serves as a vehicle for the Department to help local educational agencies achieve high quality implementation of educational programs in Georgia.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires the State educational agency (SEA) to monitor the implementation of program requirements and the expenditure of federal funds by each local educational agency (LEA). Georgia’s monitoring process consists of four major components:

1. **Monitoring of Expenditures** – LEAs must submit for approval an annual budget through the Consolidated Application process. Program Specialists review each application and budget to ensure that expenditures are appropriate for the program area before approving LEA budgets. Once budgets are approved, Program Specialists track how well LEAs are requesting funds for expenditures to ensure that LEAs are likely to meet the expenditure requirements for federal funds.

2. **Single Audit** – LEAs with single audit findings are “flagged” for technical assistance.

3. **Onsite Monitoring** – An SEA onsite Cross-Functional Monitoring Team visits an LEA to apply the criteria included in the Monitoring Instrument.

4. **Self-Assessment Checklist** – LEAs not receiving an onsite visit complete the Self-Assessment Checklist and submit it to the Georgia Department of Education.
MONITORING OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS (continued)

The LEA monitoring form has been updated with minor revisions. A change in the monitoring team collaboration and reporting process is the latest improvement for cycle three. The 2007-2008 Cross-Functional Monitoring teams will use an electronic monitoring form to record their findings for each item of documentation. The e-monitoring form can be completed either on-line or by using a downloadable Excel spreadsheet. After each team member assesses items of documentation: a rating of “Meets”, “Meets With Recommendation”, or “Does Not Meet” is assigned to each item. When all team members have responded with their ratings, the team chairperson develops the final report. The Department maintains a database of all site visit reports by monitoring cycle. Summary analyses of the findings, recommendations, and commendations from the reports provide a more complete picture of federal program implementation. These summary analyses provide LEAs with better information on how to provide leadership activities within their districts. It also allows the Department to provide more specific technical assistance to the districts.

School districts not being monitored onsite must complete a Self-Assessment checklist. The Self-Assessment Checklist has been updated with minor revisions. The LEAs must still maintain appropriate documentation and complete the Self-Assessment Checklist. The LEA determines if criteria for each item was met. If analysis of the self-monitoring reveals non-compliance for any criteria, the LEA must: determine appropriate corrective action(s), develop a corrective action plan to include the area(s) of non-compliance, develop a timeline for implementing the corrective action plan, and designate a person responsible for implementing the corrective action plan. The Self-Assessment Checklist and any appropriate corrective action plans must be maintained at the LEA. A copy of this documentation must be submitted to the Department.

Cross-functional monitoring is a vital component of the Department’s on-going approach to providing support for LEAs. The expectation is that this continuous support will enhance each LEA’s ability to improve student achievement for all children in Georgia.

Many children labeled learning disabled or hyperactive have “hidden” food sensitivities or allergies. Milk and dairy products are common offenders.

A recent study by researchers at Pennsylvania State and the University of Michigan found that fathers in particular have a major influence on whether their daughters develop an interest in math.
After several years of implementing Georgia’s approved statewide policy to provide school choice to all students attending a “persistently dangerous” public school, the Georgia Department of Education (Department) has made significant changes in the guidelines for providing technical assistance to schools and school districts that are in danger of becoming identified as a persistently dangerous school. The main emphasis of these changes is in providing professional development and technical assistance to the school administration, support staff, and students to help them understand the importance of maintaining a safe school environment and the part that each plays in developing a safe school.

Georgia has defined a “persistently dangerous” school as any public school that has for three consecutive years on the property of a public school, or at an event within the jurisdiction of a public school, or at a school sponsored event had:

1. At least one student enrolled in that school is found by official action to have violated a school rule related to a violent criminal offense (including aggravated battery, aggravated child molestation, aggravated sexual battery, aggravated sodomy, armed robbery, first degree arson, kidnapping, murder, rape, and voluntary manslaughter);

2. At least 2% percent or more of the student population or ten students, whichever is greater, are found by official action to have violated a school rule related to other identified criminal offenses (including non-felony drugs, felony drugs, felony weapons, and terroristic threats);

3. Any combination of 1 and 2.

Although schools must have three consecutive years of USCO violations to be identified as persistently dangerous, the Department is committed to working proactively to identify schools at risk of being identified as persistently dangerous and provide them with the professional development and technical assistance needed to improve. At the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year, staff members from the Department’s Safe and Drug-Free Schools (SDFS) program developed a process to provide on-site training to schools and school districts regarding USCO definitions and regulations. The training also emphasizes the crucial task of reporting accurate USCO data on the school district’s end-of-year discipline report and monitoring the data for accuracy throughout the school year. In addition to the training, SDFS staff conducts school safety audits and school climate surveys for schools at risk of being identified as persistently dangerous.
The Department has established a three-tiered strategy to identify schools with one year, two consecutive years, or three consecutive years of USCO violations:

**Status One: Technical Assistance**

Schools that are identified as having one year of USCO violations are placed on Technical Assistance Status. Random Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities on-site monitoring visits will be conducted for LEAs with Status One schools. In addition, the Department shall contact each LEA in Status One and offer technical assistance to include the following:

- Record Keeping and Data Transmission Training
- School Safety Self-Assessment Tool
- School Climate Survey
- LEA shall provide mid-year USCO report

**Status Two: USCO Technical Assistance Year Two**

Schools that are identified as having two consecutive years of USCO violations are marked in the USCO Technical Assistance Year Two. This status was created to intervene and provide assistance before the LEA/school is placed on Georgia’s Persistently Dangerous Schools List. LEAs/Schools on the USCO technical assistance list will be required to participate in the following Department supported activities:

- Participate in a School Safety Audit administered by the Department and a School Safety Coordinator with the Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA).
- Develop a Corrective Action Plan to address the issues that resulted in their placement on the USCO technical assistance list.
- Participate in Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities on-site monitoring visits.
- Submit a mid-year USCO report.

**Status Three: Persistently Dangerous Schools**

LEAs/Schools identified as “persistently dangerous” with three consecutive years of USCO violations will be offered technical assistance and professional development opportunities from the Department. In addition, LEAs/schools identified will be required to do the following:

- Allow students to transfer to a safe public school in accordance with USCO State Board Rule 160-4-8-.16.
- Participate in a School Safety Audit administered by the Department and a School Safety Coordinator with the Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA).
- Develop a Corrective Action Plan to address the issues that resulted in their identification.
- Participate in Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities on-site monitoring visits.

**Summary**

With the implementation of this extensive technical assistance plan, the Department anticipates that districts currently experiencing a safety problem, will develop the tools to enable them to provide a safe and secure learning environment for their students.
The electronic Consolidated Application has new “Data Collection” tabs for many of the Title programs that have simplified program reporting for local educational agencies (LEAs) across the State of Georgia. The new Data Collection tabs replaces many paper reports required of districts in previous years.

Previously, LEAs would submit hard copies of the required reports to the appropriate Program Managers. Not only are those reports now part of the Consolidated Application, but also, some of the reports have been streamlined for LEAs. For example, in the past, LEAs filled out two separate surveys for the Neglected and Delinquent Program – one for “neglected” and another for “delinquent.” In addition, districts submitted a list of children in these residential facilities at the time of the survey. Now both forms have been merged into one and the student list is kept on file at the district.

Anthony Threat, Title I Program Specialist for Area 3, asserts that “the inclusion of all the Title grant programs in the Consolidated Application has helped all of us here at the Department to be aware of and be more responsive to the overall responsibilities and needs of school districts throughout the state”. Margo DeLaune, the Title Programs Division Director, builds on this point by stating that “LEAs should be having the same type of eye-opening revelations about the connection of the various programs. After all, the intent of the Consolidated Application is that it is ONE plan for serving our children most in need”.

The Homeless Education Survey, the Neglected or Delinquent Survey, the Public School Choice Survey, and surveys for Title V, Part A and Title VI, Part B are located under the Data Collection tab within their respective programs in the Consolidated Application. All these programs can be found in one place, allowing the Title Programs Division to be more effective in providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs. Furthermore, inclusion of data from various programs facilitates greater communication among offices in the Department and within the LEAs.

Dr. Ron Cox, the Education Program Specialist for the Consolidated Application, states that “the addition of the Data Collection tabs helps all educators properly plan the delivery of education services”. For example, a Title I Director could view the information in the data collection tab of other programs and, in a few clicks of the mouse, use that information to provide a description of program services in the Comprehensive LEA Improvement Plan (CLIP) without leaving the Consolidated Application site.

The Private School Enrollment Report and the Annual Evaluation Report required by Title V, Part A are now under the Data Collection tab within the Title V, Part A program in the Consolidated Application. Title VI, Part B, located under the Data Collection tab on the Title VI, Part B program, began in FY07 to gather data on how districts spent their allocations. The use and effectiveness of the federal funds is supported by submitting report information to the U.S. Department of Education (US ED). With the reports now online for all districts, data can be analyzed and reported not only on a local level, but also now on a statewide level as well.

The Homeless Survey located on the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program tab of the Consolidated Application allows LEAs to electronically submit data on the number of homeless students enrolled and the educational support services provided by LEAs. This replaces the paper survey reports of previous years. The School Choice Survey facilitates the collection of data required by the US ED and federal monitoring requirements for Public School Choice in Georgia. This data collection tab is located in the Title I, Part A program of the Consolidated Application.

All LEAs are required to submit these reports and are required to maintain copies of these documents for the annual monitoring of program requirements. The addition of these surveys has made access much easier for both LEAs and state personnel to report and collect accurate information for federal reporting and monitoring.
In 2006, the Georgia Legislature passed Senate Bill 618 (SB618) transferring the education responsibility for children in state custody to local educational agencies (LEAs). The Bill puts Georgia in compliance with state and federal law. As a result of SB618, the responsibility for the educational program(s) for children in the physical or legal custody of the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) or the Department of Human resources (DHR) rests with the local educational agency (LEA) where a child is located, and that child must be enrolled in the LEA immediately. This requirement removes the current sixty-day waiting period. These students must be provided the opportunity to meet state standards as other students enrolled in the LEA. Clara Keith, Associate Superintendent for Education Support at the Department, contends that the state and local educational agencies must provide services for eligible children. She states, “If children are in need, it is our responsibility as educators to make sure their needs are met”.

Full Time Equivalent (FTE) funds will flow through the LEA where the Residential Facility for Neglected or Delinquent children is located; however, SB618 does not hold an LEA responsible for the educational programs of:

- Any child in the custody of the Georgia Department of Corrections (GDC) or DJJ and confined in a youth development campus (YDC) or a regional youth detention center (RYDC) as a result of a sentence imposed by a court. YDCs and RYDCs are part of the DJJ school system.

- Any child placed in a state Residential Facility for Neglected or Delinquent children by a parent or another school district.

Prior to the passage of SB618, Residential Facilities for Neglected or Delinquent children operated independent of LEAs and may not have participated in the state’s accountability program and full-time equivalent (FTE) funding provided by the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE).

Despite the enhancement to educational services for these children, many districts are confused about their specific responsibilities in how to comply with the law. SB618 has implications for Title I, Part A and Title I, Part D that are not addressed in the law as written; therefore, some districts have expressed concern about the effect of adding these Residential Facilities for Neglected or Delinquent children will have on the district’s overall Title I funding.

In an effort to provide guidance on these and other questions, the leadership in the Title Programs Division initiated the creation of a technical assistance document entitled “Guidelines for Implementation of Senate Bill 618, Programs for Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk Children”. This document synthesizes the law and delineates the role of the Department, LEAs, and Residential Facilities for Neglected or Delinquent children. In addition to the Guidelines, Education Support Services has developed a Q &A document and a SB618 Facility List.

Documents can be found on the Department’s Web site under the Neglected and Delinquent Program in the “Resources” box. Point your browser to www.gadoe.org/tss_title.aspx
The monitoring requirements for Supplemental Educational Services (SES) providers have been revised for the 2007-2008 school year. Changes for SES can be categorized into three main areas: standards for monitoring, scoring, and consequences.

Previously, SES providers were scored on twenty-four standards. The number of standards has now been increased to forty-four. Some of these new standards were created by taking multiple requirements found in specific 2006-2007 standards and creating an individual standard for each requirement. For example, in 2006-2007 one of the standards included policies for student discipline, student attendance, and complaint protocol. That standard has now become three individual standards. Overall, there are eighteen additional standards. Furthermore, previous standards were revised to provide clarification regarding the Georgia Department of Education (Department) expectation.

One important revision requires SES providers to conduct background checks on all employees who have contact with students during each school year. These background checks must be done prior to the staff member working with students during that school year. Failure to comply with this standard will result in a recommendation to the State Board of Education to remove this provider from the State Approved Providers List.

Another noticeable change does not require the local educational agency (LEA) to sign the compact between the provider and the parent. The provider and parent(s)/legal guardian(s) are required to sign the compact and then send it to the LEA. This change occurred in an attempt to reduce the number of signatures the LEAs were required to complete.

The Department has also revised test report availability requirements for SES providers. Districts not only must provide CRCT and GHSGT results to providers but also must provide enough assessment information to allow providers to make informed decisions regarding a student’s Individualized Student Plan (ISP). A good example of the type of information that should be provided to SES providers is the “Student Report” for the CRCT. The Department will closely monitor the student’s ISP, timeline, instruction and academic progress to ensure students are receiving services to meet their needs.

The instructional category has many revisions for 2007-2008. Last year this category had six standards monitored for instruction. This year, there will be sixteen standards monitored for instruction. It is the Department’s intent to hold providers accountable for a student’s academic progress. These extensive revisions to the instructional category will provide the Department with the tools it needs to better evaluate a provider’s academic program.

The scoring component of the monitoring document has been changed to ensure that each standard is scored as either “Meets” standard or “Does Not Meet” standard. The “Exceeds” standard category has been removed. Any provider scoring a “Does Not Meet” on any standard must provide corrective action to ensure compliance. Providers must score a minimum of 80% to receive an overall rating of “Meets” standards. If the provider does not meet the minimum percentage of 80%, the provider will be recommended for removal from the State Approved Providers List.

For a more in-depth look at all the changes made for SES, please see the Department’s Web site at: http://www.gadoe.org/tss_title_parent.aspx?PageReg=TSSTitleSES and look for 2007-2008 Monitoring Standards link on the right side.
The theme of this Title I issue is “The Changing Face of Title I.” For the Title I, Part C Program, we can also add “and changing places” to this theme. Our migrant students accept constant change as an integral part of their lives. Our students rarely complete a school year in the same school where they began in the fall. In fact, some students change schools multiple times during a year. Can you imagine what it must be like to always be “the new kid”? To never know “the rules”? To always be trying to put “a name with a new face”? Our migrant students have a sea of changing faces - a constant stream of new teachers, new bus drivers, new principals, and new friends.

On October 19th, thirty educators from around Southwest and Central Georgia met at the SWGA RESA in Pelham to discuss “What Works” in Migrant Education. These dedicated people wanted to talk about the unique challenges that our migrant students face because of their mobility and interrupted schooling. Despite having to drive in torrential rains, neither the group’s enthusiasm nor interest was dampened. After viewing PowerPoint presentations on the changes in Migrant Education, the Implementation Plan process and an overview of our state Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CAN) migrant data, the group plunged into a round table discussion of the areas in Migrant Education where improvements are needed. Problems and possible solutions were suggested for each of the Four National/State Migrant Education goals.

In the afternoon, three local educational agencies made presentations to the group about “What Works” in Migrant Education in their counties. Martha Fowler, Director of Teaching and Learning for Grady County Schools, shared techniques and materials for working in a home based program with pre-school migrant students and their mothers. Charlotte Bell, Decatur County ESOL teacher and Erika Mills, Decatur County Home School Liaison, explained to the group how to effectively plan and implement an after-school program for migrant students. The last presentation was made by Dr. Marie Barber, Director of Special Projects, and Louise Royal, a classroom teacher from Seminole County, on their highly successful summer migrant program. After the presentations, participants were invited to get hands-on experience in writing sample Implementation Plans.

A review of the evaluations revealed that the participants felt that the day was a worthwhile learning and sharing experience. Many participants asked to have these meetings on a regularly scheduled basis. When is the last time you have heard of anyone in education asking to attend more meetings? By those requests alone we knew that the day had been a success!

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, there are approximately 6.1 million elementary and secondary school children enrolled in private schools in 2007-2008.
One of the changing faces of Title I in Georgia is the increasing enrollment of English language learners in our schools. The majority of these students come from Spanish speaking backgrounds and homes. The Spanish Ministry of Education and Science offers a variety of unique opportunities for local educational agencies and educators to improve services to these students and their parents. Additional opportunities are also available to students learning Spanish as a foreign language. Some of these opportunities are discussed below.

**Visiting Teachers from Spain**

This program offers local educational agencies the opportunity to recruit foreign language and bilingual teachers from Spain to teach in a variety of content areas - including math, science, and Spanish - at the elementary, middle and high school levels. The program provides students, parents and educators with the opportunity to work with bilingual teaching professionals, bringing a valuable international perspective to Georgia classrooms. This unique experience is managed and operated in Georgia through the Visiting International Faculty (VIF) Program. Districts wishing to recruit teachers through VIF are encouraged to contact the VIF offices in Atlanta early for more information. (678) 424-5672  [www.vifprogram.com](http://www.vifprogram.com)

**Spanish Language and Culture Assistants in Georgia Spanish Language Classrooms**

This program gives Georgia’s students of Spanish an opportunity to practice the Spanish language and learn Spanish culture from native speaking classroom assistants. The assistants’ salaries ($750 a month) and medical insurance are paid by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science from October to June (both inclusive). The local educational agencies must provide free lodging and transportation for the same time period.

**Spanish Language and Culture Summer Courses**

Spanish language and culture summer courses for Georgia Educators at all levels are offered at prestigious universities located in cities throughout Spain, all of which have plenty of culture to offer, thus allowing participants a unique opportunity to get to know the various regions of Spain while improving their language abilities. Courses include:

- **SPANISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS**
  - A Spanish language course for education professionals who want to learn or brush up on their Spanish - elementary to intermediate language levels.

- **MASTER'S DEGREE FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS OF SPANISH**
  - Minimum requirement of three years of experience in teaching Spanish and a very high command of the language.
  - Coursework completed during two summers in Spain and the in between year (Oct - June) through distance learning.

More information and opportunities to apply for scholarships to attend these courses in Spain are available at [www.becasmae.es](http://www.becasmae.es).
OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION (continued)

Grants for American Language & Culture Assistants to Work in Spain

Assistants have the opportunity to learn about the Spanish language and culture and use their experience upon their return to Georgia, thus helping to develop cultural understanding between the citizens of Spain and Georgia. At the same time, the program provides Spanish students and teachers of English an opportunity to broaden and increase their knowledge of the English language and U.S. culture through interaction with native speakers.

Center for Hispanic Studies

In addition to these unique opportunities, the Spanish Ministry of Education and Sciences works in collaboration with Kennesaw State University to deliver additional resources for Georgia's teachers of Spanish. Please visit the Center for Hispanic Studies in Kennesaw State University via the Internet at http://www.kennesaw.edu/chs/resourcematerials.htm.

For further information on any of these opportunities, please visit:
http://www.mec.es/sgci/usa/home/index.shtml
or
Contact Eva Martinez at the Georgia Department of Education by email at eva.martinez@doe.k12.ga.us

According to the Encyclopedia of Childhood and Adolescence, by the time Japanese students complete high school, they have spent the equivalent of at least three times more years in school than their U.S. counterparts. Students in the U.S. spend fewer days per year in school than any industrialized nation (tied with Spain and Sweden). Japanese students spend 243 days a year in school as compared to 180 days in school for U.S. students. Students in South Korea spend 220 days in school; students from Israel and Luxembourg spend 216 days per year in school; and students from the Netherlands, Scotland, and Thailand spend 200 days in school per year. Students from Finland, New Zealand and Nigeria top U.S. students' attendance with 190 days in school per year.
Under Title I, Part C, Education of Migratory Children of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), State educational agencies (SEAs) must deliver and evaluate the Georgia Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded services to migratory children based on a state plan that reflects the results of a current statewide comprehensive needs assessment. As with many federal program requirements, the Georgia MEP was required to begin conducting a comprehensive needs assessment. The organizational structure of the Georgia MEP made it difficult to assess the needs from all stakeholders in the program without any true standardized format to follow. As a result, Georgia began to piece together a comprehensive needs assessment process. The efforts of the past three years of the Georgia MEP and the changes made to better the comprehensive needs assessment process have resulted in a logical, focused, and quality assessment of migrant education in Georgia.

The primary purpose of Georgia’s comprehensive needs assessment is to guide the overall design of the Georgia MEP on a statewide basis. SEAs and local educational agencies (LEAs) must identify the special educational needs of migrant children and determine the specific services that will help migrant children achieve the state’s measurable outcomes and performance targets. Because there are never sufficient resources to meet all the needs of migrant children, the comprehensive needs assessment helps SEAs and LEAs prioritize those needs.

The current comprehensive needs assessment process in Georgia has been guided by past efforts and data collected, along with a new organizational strategy that determines the needs and objectives from Level 1 (migrant students) to Level 3 (Georgia MEP). Based on the information gathered over the past two years, four measurable goals were determined as the primary focus of the Georgia MEP. The Georgia MEP goals are measurable and include a three year period for evaluation purposes.

**Goal 1**
• Migrant students in grades 4 through 8 will improve failing grades and CRCT scores in Reading/English and Math by 1% in 2008-09, 2% in 2009-10, and 2% in 2010-11 as measured by local and/or state formal assessment tools.

**Goal 2**
• Migrant students in grades 9 through 12 will improve End of Course Test, Georgia High School Graduation Test, and Georgia High School Writing Test outcomes by 1% in 2008-09, 2% in 2009-10, and 2% in 2010-11 as measured by local and/or state formal assessment tools.

**Goal 3**
• The Georgia Migrant Education Program will increase the amount of educational opportunities for migrant Out of School Youth (OSY) by identifying or developing one new opportunity in 2008-2009, two in 2009-2010, and three in 2010-2011 from the baseline.

**Goal 4**
• The Georgia Migrant Education Program will increase the amount of educational opportunities that will promote school readiness by developing or identifying one new educational opportunity in 2008-2009, two in 2009-2010, and three in 2010-2011 from the baseline.
LEAs must also conduct individual needs assessments to:

- Determine the needs of migrant students and how those needs relate to the priorities established by the state
- Design local services
- Select students for the receipt of those services

While the SEA and LEAs must jointly ensure that needs assessment procedures at the local operating agency level are aligned with those at the state level, local operating agencies are able to narrow their needs assessments because local staff have access to more precise information than is available at the SEA level. This enables the LEA to identify such critical elements as the specific needs of children by grade levels, academic areas in which the project should focus, instructional settings, instructional materials, staffing, and teaching techniques.

The Georgia MEP, Regional Migrant Education Agencies, and LEAs could have vastly different objectives or ways to meet the indicated goals. These objectives are defined by examining the data and other forms of information (including research-based instructional strategies, professional development workshops, various trainings, and other programs) at each level and should flow from bottom to top. Objectives at each level should also be measurable and should support the Georgia MEP goals.

Although the comprehensive needs assessment of the Georgia MEP is a cumbersome and time-consuming task, the process will indicate the true needs of our migrant students and ultimately contribute to the overall academic achievement of these students.

For more information about the comprehensive needs assessment process, please visit: www.gadoe.org

A recent study released by the U.S. Department of Education indicates that 73% of district & school Title I funds were spent on instruction, 16% was used for instructional support and another 11% was used for program administration and support cost such as facilities and transportation during the 2004-2005 school year.
What is Doing What Works?

Doing What Works (DWW) is an exciting new Web site sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (US ED) dedicated to helping educators identify and make use of effective teaching practices. The US ED recently unveiled this new Web site to support educators across the nation working towards No Child Left Behind's goal of having every student proficient in reading and math by 2014.

"Doing What Works" - available at http://dww.ed.gov - provides an online library of resources for teaching practices that have proven to be effective. It draws primarily from the evaluations of research findings compiled for the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), established in 2002 by the Department's Institute of Education Sciences.

For practical applications based on the findings of WWC, the Web site includes:

- Videos of leading researchers discussing the research base behind high-quality instructional practices.
- Slideshows illustrating strategies that have been successful in teaching English language learners (ELLs) at schools around the country.
- Downloadable tools to help teachers identify their strengths and weaknesses for improving ELL instruction.

The site is also ideal for building professional learning activities for groups of teachers. Other topics cover: cognition and learning; early childhood education; high school reform; literacy; math and science education; and school restructuring.

DWW is led by the Office of Planning, Evaluation & Policy Development (OPEPD) at the US ED. OPEPD relies on the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) (and occasionally other entities that adhere to standards similar to those of IES) to evaluate and recommend practices that are supported by rigorous research.

Much of the DWW content is based on the IES What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). The WWC evaluates research on practices and interventions to let the education community know what is likely to work. For each practice, it issues a guide and/or an intervention report that describes what the practice involves and the research available on the practice. In addition some DWW content is based on other information and materials from IES.
WHAT IS DOING WHAT WORKS? (continued)

DWW also provides examples of possible ways educators might apply research findings, but is careful to point out that these are not necessarily the only ways to carry out these teaching practices. Importantly, the examples provided on DWW, including any products named in school materials or found on Web sites referenced on DWW, should not be construed as an endorsement of any products, programs, or curricula by the US ED or the Georgia Department of Education (Department).

Finally, the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Office of English Language Acquisition, and other Departmental offices help to disseminate the tools and resources so that research-based practices can be implemented in our nation’s classrooms.

How Can DWW Help Meet the Goals of NCLB?

Researchers, policymakers, and practitioners at DWW, care about providing a quality education to all of the nation’s children. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, is designed to ensure that this happens by holding schools accountable for helping all students read and perform math at grade level by 2014. To help schools reach this goal, the law requires:

- Highly qualified teachers in every classroom.
- Timely information and options for parents.
- Annual assessments and disaggregated data to monitor progress.
- The restructuring of schools that are failing to make progress.

The more examples of tools and materials available to educators about research-based instructional practices are shared, the more likely it will be that they can affect an increase in student achievement. As student achievement increases, it is more likely that the goal of proficiency for all children in reading and mathematics can be met by 2014!
At the November 2007 national meeting of the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth, three Georgia students were honored as recipients of LeTendre Education Fund scholarships. The scholarship funds are available to students who are homeless or who have been homeless during their school attendance and have demonstrated average or higher than average achievement.

The LeTendre Education Fund was established in 1998 in memory of Andre’ E. LeTendre, husband of Mary Jean LeTendre, former Director of Compensatory Education for the U.S. Department of Education. The fund has awarded 81 scholarships to date.

A national advisory board that includes local, state, and national educators reviews the applications and makes recommendations to the LeTendre family. The LeTendre Fund is administered jointly by the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (NAEHCY) and the LeTendre family.

Three of the sixteen students honored at the 2007 NAEHCY Annual Conference in Portland, Oregon, were students from Georgia.

---

**Jessica Ashley Dunn**  
*Armuchee High School, Rome, Georgia*  
*Ashley will attend Jacksonville State University and then go to law school*

---

**Paige Perry**  
*Decatur High School, Decatur, Georgia*  
*Paige will attend Northwestern University to study Political Science/Government and then go to law school to be a family law attorney*

---

**Tiffany Lynn Smith**  
*Ware County High School, Waycross, Georgia*  
*Tiffany will attend Valdosta State University to major in pre-dental*

---

Jessica, Paige and Tiffany expressed their strong belief that a quality education was the vehicle of hope to reach their dreams for a better life.

Extreme poverty, high mobility, and school policies often make attending and succeeding in school a formidable challenge for homeless students. Despite these obstacles, many students who experience homelessness not only graduate from high school, but also wish to continue to pursue a college education.

For more information about the fund, please visit [www.naechy.orgletendre_ab.html](http://www.naechy.orgletendre_ab.html) or contact NAEHCY by phone at (202) 364-7392.
In an effort to ensure that the parents of Georgia are continuously engaged in their child’s education, Kathy Cox, State Superintendent of Schools, unveiled a comprehensive strategic plan that encompasses every facet of the Department’s vision to lead the nation in improving student achievement. All research points to the concept that when parents are fully engaged in their child’s education, remarkable changes can occur. In order to clearly define the expected role of the parent, Strategic Goal 11 of the Strategic Plan (Increase parental engagement at all levels of child’s education”) was announced. To ensure the Department focused the necessary resources to reach this goal, the Parent Outreach Division was formed.

The Parent Outreach Division is a division in Education Support Services in the Office of Education Support and Improvement and is led by the Division Director, Andrea Fairries-Moore. Ms. Moore and staff members, Renee’ Shields, Brenda Williams, and Shannon Spann-Revels will implement Goal 11 of the strategic plan.

Strategies include:

- Coordinating programs and services aimed at parent engagement within the Department of Education.
- Collaborating with other state and community-based agencies working with parents to increase access to services and other resources.
- Communicating with parents on key educational issues to ensure parents are aware of how such issues may impact their child’s education.

The division will continue to work with our partners in local school districts to provide parents with the best opportunity to help their child succeed in school.
Changes
Georgia has passed new legislation which revises Georgia law regarding the operation of school councils and places more emphasis on the role of parents on the school council. This represents a major change in that parents or guardians must make up a majority of the council. Additionally, the chairperson of the school council must be a parent.

Plan-Do-Check-Act
The beginning of the school year is the time to begin the necessary steps to build a strong parent involvement program for the year. Now is a great time to pause and “check” how well the strategies in your parent involvement plan are working. How likely are you to get the expected results? Schools receiving Title I parent involvement funds must include parents in the decisions regarding how funds are allotted for parent activities. Including parents in the “check” of strategies is an excellent way to meet this requirement and to ensure that funds are spent on activities important to parents.

Parents of Private School Students
Funds for parental involvement activities for parents of private school children who participate in Title I, Part A activities must be reserved from the amount the LEA has reserved for parental involvement. The LEA must reserve these funds before any allocation of funds to schools. The requirement to allocate an equitable amount for the involvement of private school parents is calculated based upon the entire Title I, Part A amount set-aside for parental involvement.

Flexibility
Principals of participating Title I schools willing to ‘give back’ their portion of the parent involvement reserve must sign the ‘District Set Aside Agreement’. This agreement will allow allotted parent involvement funds to be retained at the district level for district wide activities. This agreement can be found on the GaDOE Web site at http://www.gadoe.org/tss_title_lea.aspx?PageReq=TSSTitleIA, under worksheets. The form must be attached to the Consolidated Application.

Accountability
34 C.F.R. § 80.20(a) (Standards for financial management systems), require that fiscal control, accounting procedures and records be established sufficient enough to permit the tracing of funds back to source documentation. LEAs and schools must be able to link financial records to parent activities and ultimately back to the goals and objectives of the school/district parental involvement policy/plan. Therefore, documentation should be maintained showing exactly how parent involvement funds have been spent.

Carryover
Unspent funds may be carried over from one fiscal year to the next. However, funds must remain in the parental involvement category of the budget, must be used for parent involvement activities in the new fiscal year, must be appropriately documented, and must be distinguishable from other funds.
Title IV, Part B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (21st CCLC) is also a part of the Parent Outreach Division. The purpose of Georgia’s 21st CCLC is to provide federal funds to establish or expand community learning centers that operate during out-of-school hours and that have three specific purposes:

1. To provide opportunities for academic enrichment and tutorial services.
2. To offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities to reinforce and complement the regular academic program.
3. To offer families of 21st CCLC students opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

Any public or private organization is eligible to apply for a 21st CCLC grant. Examples of agencies and organizations eligible under the 21st CCLC program include, but are not limited to: LEAs, non-profit agencies, city or county government agencies, faith-based organizations, institutions of higher education, and for-profit corporations. Information about upcoming grant opportunities will be available in late spring.

U.S. News & World Report recently named nineteen schools in Georgia to the “America’s Best High Schools” list. Screven County High (Sylvania, GA) and Telfair County High (McRae, GA) both Title I Schools, were honored in the Bronze Medal category.
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Federal law prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, or disability, in education programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. Employees, students and the general public are hereby notified that the Georgia Department of Education does not discriminate in any educational programs or activities or in employment policies. Inquiries regarding the application of these practices may be addressed to the Georgia Department of Education, Twin Towers East, Atlanta, Georgia 30334 (404) 656-2800.