North Carolina Teacher Academy Report on the Use of Teacher Academy Funds

to

Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee, Fiscal Research Division, and Office of State Budget and Management

March 15, 2009

Report on the Use of Teacher Academy Funds

Session Law 2008-107, Section 7.24

The North Carolina Teacher Academy shall report on the use of funds for literacy coach training to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee, the Fiscal Research Division, and the Office of State Budget and Management by March 15, 2009. The report shall include (i) actual expenditures by line item for the 2007-2008 fiscal year and for the first two quarters of the 2008-2009 fiscal year, (ii) total budgeted requirements by line item for both fiscal years, and (iii) activities supported by these funds.

- i. Actual expenditures by line item for 2007-2008 and the first two quarters of 2008-2009
- ii. Total budgeted amounts for 2007-2008 and the first two quarters of 2008-2009
- iii. Activities supported by these funds

	21st Century Middle School Literacy Coach Training Expenditures					
Source of Funds	Description	Fiscal Year 2007-2008	Fiscal Year 2008-2009 (July-December)	Fiscal Year 2008-2009 (scheduled January-June)		
531111	Regular Salaries	\$202,241.00	\$70,724.04	\$82,594.72		
531321	Contract Employees	\$83,025.00	\$7,600.00	\$30,700.00		
531511	Social Security contribution	\$17,686.49	\$4,856.09	\$6,797.68		
531521	Reg retirement contribution	\$11,862.48	\$4,243.44	\$4,955.68		
531561	Medical insurance contribution	\$4,136.35	\$1,135.70	\$1,586.12		
532181900	Workshop/Conference Food	\$193,725.50	\$25,804.50	\$119,254.50		
532199	Misc Contractual Services (including stipends for summer sessions and sessions offered for coach's schools)	\$318,300.00	\$20,000.00	\$115,900.00		
532449	Server software	\$30,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00		
532513900	Workshop/Conference Room Rental	\$193,725.50	\$19,400.00	\$61,400.00		
532524900	Workshop/Conference Equipment Rental	\$42,750.00	\$7,500.00	\$28,250.00		
532731900	Workshop Bd/Non-employee transportation					
	cohort 1	\$90,011.35	\$20,861.46	\$33,932.00		
	cohort 2	\$187,803.93	\$14,542.45	\$79,475.00		
	cohort 3		\$14,620.42	\$26,438.00		
	principals	\$10,527.04		\$1,046.95		
	trainers	\$9,347.89	\$1,101.66	\$1,434.85		
532732900	Workshop/Conference subsistence (including lodging, meals not included in workshop, and substitute reimbursements)					
	cohort 1	\$75,877.63	\$56,600.63	\$83,741.42		
	cohort 2	\$439,147.25	\$35,897.69	\$149,451.06		
	cohort 3		\$35,561.19	\$42,377.52		

Source of Funds	Description	Fiscal Year 2007-2008	Fiscal Year 2008-2009 (July-December)	Fiscal Year 2008-2009 (scheduled January-June)
532850	Print, Bind, Duplicate	\$41,740.00	\$1,900.00	\$15,000.00
533720900	Workshop/Conference Educational Supplies	\$35,791.75	\$3,840.00	\$20,000.00
	TOTAL *	\$1,987,699.16	\$361,189.27	\$919,335.50
*The total include	es only the costs of direct training, but does not reflect the cos	st of Teacher Academy staff in o	developing the training	ng.

Total allocated funds 2007-2008 \$2,000,000.00

Total allocated funds 2008-2009 \$1,500,000.00

Twenty-first Century Middle School Literacy Coaches

In July 2006 the North Carolina Teacher Academy was directed to provide training and support for one hundred twenty-first century middle school literacy coaches as an integral piece of the 21st Century Middle School Literacy Coach Initiative. The initiative was implemented as a result of statistical research highlighting that only sixty percent (60%) of the students entering ninth grade graduated from high school in five years, and nineteen percent (19%) of the same freshman class completed an associate or bachelor's degree from a school of higher learning. The Middle School Literacy Coach initiative has focused attention at the middle school to insure that students are competent readers before entering high school.

A literacy coach position was offered to the 100 lowest performing (based on a three year composite of reading EOG scores) middle schools in the state that contained an 8th grade class, along with \$1,000,000.00 of non-recurring funds to the North Carolina Teacher Academy for training. In 2007, a second cohort of 100 literacy coaches was added by the North Carolina General Assembly with \$2,000,000.00 in recurring funds for training. In 2008 the North Carolina General Assembly reduced the funding for training by \$500,000.00. In fall 2008, a third cohort of literacy coaches was created to address the training needs of new coaches in the 200 schools, replaced as a result of attrition of the original coaches. There is approximately a 12% annual attrition rate as a result of retirement, promotion, and transfer.

The Teacher Academy identified researched best practices for literacy coaches and provided the following training for each cohort of literacy coaches. At the completion of each component of training, the coaches were required to develop instructional materials as evidence of mastery of the concepts. The instructional materials were consolidated in an online learning community using Blackboard Learning System, where each literacy coach may access all of the resources developed by the entire cohort of coaches. The combined accumulated resources available to the coaches include more than 1600 lesson plans that incorporate literacy strategies, as well as presentation resources and internet resources that the coaches can use with the teachers in their schools.

2007-2008 Twenty-first Century Literacy Coach Training

The Teacher Academy provided the following Year II training for the literacy coaches hired in 2006-07 (cohort 1). Each component of training required an additional product for completion.

September 2007	9 hours	Visual /Early Literacy
	6 hours	The English Language Learner
January 2008	12 hours	Media Literacy training
February 2008	18 hours	English Language Learners, part 2
	6 hours	The Roles of the Literacy Coach and the Principal;
		Dr. Jim Knight, University of Kansas
March 2008	18 hours	Classroom Management
April 2008	18 hours	Differentiated Instruction
May 2008	18 hours	Word Study, Vocabulary and Writing strategies
June 2008	24 hours	Portable Computing and Digital Story Telling
	24 hours	Cooperative Learning or Learning Styles
Total	153 hours	

The Teacher Academy provided the following Year I training for the literacy coaches hired in 2007-08 (cohort 2). Each component of training required an additional product for completion.

October 2007	9 hours	Qualitative Reading Inventory training
	9 hours	Early Literacy Components
	12 hours	The Coaching Process/Adult Learning (part 1);
		Ann Kilcher and Lawrence Ryan,
		Paidea Consulting Group
November 2007	42 hours	Reading in the Content Area strategies
December 2007	18 hours	Reading/Vocabulary in the Content Area
January 2008	12 hours	Media Literacy training
	18 hours	Classroom Management

February 2008	12 hours	Word Study and Writing strategies
	12 hours	The Coaching Process/Presentation Skills (part 2);
		Ann Kilcher and Lawrence Ryan,
		Paidea Consulting Group
	6 hours	The Roles of the Literacy Coach and the Principal;
		Dr. Jim Knight, University of Kansas
March 2008	12 hours	School Leadership, Dr. Linda Lambert
April 2008	18 hours	Creating a Literacy-Rich School;
		Dr. Rosemarye Taylor,
		University of Central Florida
June 2007	24 hours	21st Century Instructional Technology
	24 hours	Using Data to Build Classroom Learning Communities

Total 228 hours

2008-2009 Twenty-first Century Literacy Coaches Training

The Teacher Academy is providing the following Year III training for the literacy coaches hired in 2006-07(cohort 1). Each component of training requires an additional product for completion. At the conclusion of the third year of training, the State Board of Education has approved Licensure for Middle School Literacy Coaching for the literacy coaches who have successfully completed the entire training cycle.

Total	108 hours	
March 2009	24 hours	Marzano Classroom Strategies that Work
February 2009	24 hours	21st century skills, Metiri Group
January 2009	24 hours	Building Professional Learning Communities
December 2008	18 hours	Teacher Leadership
September 2008	18 hours	Rosemayre Taylor

The Teacher Academy is also providing the following Year II training for the literacy coaches hired in 2007-08 (cohort 2). Each component of training requires an additional product for completion.

October 2008	18 hours	English as a Second Language training
January 2009	18 hours	Brain research
	18 hours	Cooperative Learning

Total	144 hours	
	24 hours	Cooperative Learning or Learning Styles
June 2009	24 hours	Portable Computing and Digital Story Telling
April 2009	18 hours	Coaching for Transfer, Robin Fogarty
February 2009	24 hours	Marzano Classroom Strategies that Work

The Teacher Academy is also providing the following Year I training for the literacy coaches hired in 2008-09 (cohort 3). Cohort 3 is composed of literacy coaches who have replaced personnel in schools that were previously selected for a literacy coach. Each component of training requires an additional product for completion.

September 2008	18 hours	Early Literacy
October 2008	12 hours	Coaching Skills
	18 hours	Reading in the Content Areas strategies
November 2008	24 hours	Reading in the Content Areas strategies
January 2009	18 hours	Reading in the Content Areas strategies
	18 hours	Classroom Management
February 2009	12 hours	Coaching Skills
	6 hours	The Roles of the Literacy Coach and the Principal
March 2009	18 hours	Literacy training, Rosemayre Taylor
	18 hours	Early literacy
June 2009	24 hours	21st Century Instructional Technology
	24 hours	Using Data to Build Classroom Learning Communities
Total	210 hours	

2007-2008 School Growth for Cohort 1 Schools

District	School	EOG Growth 2007 (NC ABC performance)	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	QRI (Qual Reading In Growth 20 % increase	ventory)* 08
Alamance/Burlington	Broadview Middle	No Recognition	High	54%	10%
Alamance/Burlington	Graham Middle	High	No Recognition		
Alexander County	East Alexander Middle	Expected	High	No Data	
Anson County	Anson Middle	Expected	Expected	42 %	1%
Asheboro City	North Asheboro Middle	Expected	High	100%	87%
Beaufort County	P. S. Jones Middle	High	High	79%	50%
Beaufort County	S. W. Snowden Elementary		Expected	62%	46%
Bertie County	Bertie Middle	No Recognition	High	91%	7%
Bladen County	Elizabethtown Middle	Expected	Expected	84%	59%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Albemarle Road Middle	Expected	No Recognition	84%	13%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Cochrane Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	89%	33%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Coulwood Middle	Expected	Expected	63%	24%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Eastway Middle	Expected	Expected	72%	48%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	J. T. Williams Middle	No Recognition	Expected	No Data	
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Kennedy Middle	Expected	No Recognition	64%	34%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	McClintock Middle	Expected	High	39%	30%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Northridge Middle	No Recognition	High	59%	16%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Ranson Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	75%	28%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Sedgefield Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	85%	41%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Spaugh Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	96%	11%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Wilson Middle	No Recognition	Expected	74%	22%
Columbus County	Boys and Girls Home	No Recognition	High	75%	50%
Columbus County	Fair Bluff Elementary	No Recongition	NA	NA	
Columbus County	Tabor City Middle	Expected	Expected	100%	39%
Cumberland County	Jeralds Middle	High	High	69%	17%
Cumberland County	Spring Lake Middle	No Recognition	High		
Cumberland County	Westover Middle	Expected	Expected	67%	23%
Duplin County	Beulaville Elementary	No Recognition	High	63%	38%
Duplin County	Charity Middle	Expected	High	31%	0%
Duplin County	E E Smith Middle	Expected	High		

District	School	EOG Growth 2007 (NC ABC performance)	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory)* Growth 2008 % increase % 2+yrs	
Duplin County	Warsaw Middle	No Recognition	High	81%	53%
Durham County	Chewning Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition		
Durham County	Lowe's Grove Middle	Expected	No Recognition	86%	70%
Durham County	Neal Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	34%	3%
Durham County	Sherwood Githens Middle	Expected	Expected	91%	63%
Edgecombe County	C. B. Martin Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	43%	6%
Edgecombe County	Phillips Middle	No Recognition	High	15%	0%
Franklin County	Cedar Creek Middle	Expected	High		
Franklin County	Terrell Lane Middle	High	High	90%	44%
Gaston County	Bessemer City Middle	No Recognition	Expected	69%	9%
Gaston County	Grier Middle	No Recognition	Expected	60%	26%
Gaston County	Southwest Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	65%	16%
Gaston County	York Chester Middle	Expected	High	63%	50%
Guilford County	Ferndale Middle	Expected	No Recognition	58%	13%
Guilford County	Jackson Middle	No Recognition	High	74%	32%
Guilford County	Otis Hairston Middle	High	Expected	16%	0%
Guilford County	Welborn Middle	Expected	No Recognition	80%	47%
Halifax County	Brawley Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	56%	8%
Halifax County	Eastman Middle	No Recognition	Expected	95%	62%
Halifax County	Enfield Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	25%	0%
Halifax County	William R. Davie Middle	No Recognition	Expected	78%	31%
Hertford County	Hertford County Middle	Expected	Expected	57%	9%
Hoke County	West Hoke Middle	Expected	No Recognition	32%	27%
Jackson County	Smokey Mountain Elem	No Recognition	High	100%	82%
Lee County	East Lee Middle	No Recognition	Expected	100%	57%
Lenoir County	Rochelle Middle	No Recognition	High	53%	12%
Lexington City	Lexington Middle	Expected	High	No Data	
Montgomery County	East Middle	No Recognition	Expected	93%	67%
Nash-Rocky Mount	Nash Central Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	71%	23%
Nash-Rocky Mount	Southern Nash Middle	Expected	High	35%	16%
New Hanover County	DC Virgo Middle	No Recognition	High	92%	0%

District	School	EOG Growth 2007 (NC ABC performance)	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	QRI (Qual Reading In Growth 20 % increase	nventory)* 08
Northampton County	Conway Middle	High	High	83%	34%
Northampton County	Gaston Middle	Expected	Expected	80%	20%
Randolph County	Randleman Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	89%	54%
Richmond County	Ellerbe Junior High	No Recognition	No Recognition	78%	0%
Richmond County	Hamlet Junior High	No Recognition	No Recognition	50%	11%
Robeson County	Fairgrove Middle	Expected	No Recognition	79%	54%
Robeson County	Fairmont Middle	No Recognition	High	88%	76%
Robeson County	Littlefield Middle	Expected	High	93%	41%
Robeson County	Lumberton Jr. High	Expected	Expected	74%	21%
Robeson County	Magnolia Elementary	No Recognition	High	100%	88%
Robeson County	Orrum Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	92%	20%
Robeson County	Parkton Elementary	Expected	High	50%	33%
Robeson County	Red Springs Middle	No Recognition	Expected	75%	21%
Robeson County	Rowland Middle	No Recognition	High	82%	36%
Robeson County	St Pauls Middle	Expected	High		
Robeson County	Townsend Middle	High	High		
Rowan-Salisbury	Knox Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	100%	43%
Scotland County	Carver Middle	Expected	High	82%	41%
Thomasville City	Thomasville Middle	Expected	Expected	No I	Data
Union County	Monroe Middle	Expected	Expected	93%	72%
Vance County	Eaton Johnson Middle	Expected	High	71%	29%
Wake County	North Garner Middle	Expected	High	100%	44%
Warren County	Warren Co. Middle	Expected	Expected	37%	25%
Washington County	Creswell High	Expected	No Recognition	86%	86%
Washington County	Wash. Co. Union	Expected	Expected	93%	35%
Wayne County	Brogden Middle	Expected	High	No I	Data
Wayne County	Dillard Middle	Expected	High	43%	29%
Wayne County	Mount Olive Middle	High	High	56%	28%
Weldon City	Weldon Middle	Expected	Expected	59%	18%
Whiteville City	Central Middle	Expected	High	57%	3%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Hanes Middle	High	High	100%	68%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Hill Middle	No Recognition	High	96%	46%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Mineral Springs Middle	No Recognition	Expected	72%	19%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Philo Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	No I	Data

District	School	EOG Growth 2007 (NC ABC performance)	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	QRI (Quali Reading In Growth 200 % increase	ventory)*)8
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Wiley Middle	No Recognition	No Recognition	68%	23%
Yadkin County	East Bend Elementary	High	High	75%	0%

(*The QRI, Qualitative Reading Inventory, is an individual diagnostic reading assessment administered to every level 1 and level 2 student in the 8th grade by the literacy coach in order to help classroom teachers individualize instruction to low level readers.)

2007-2008 School Growth for Cohort 2 Schools

District	School	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	*QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory) Growth 2008 % increase % 2+yrs	
Alamance-Burlington	Turrentine Middle	High	76%	32%
Beaufort County	Chocowinity Middle	Expected	89%	22%
Bladen County	Tar Heel Middle	High	100%	70%
Brunswick County	Leland Middle	Expected	62%	8%
Brunswick County	Shallote Middle	No Recognition	42%	0%
Brunswick County	South Brunswick Middle	High		
Brunswick County	Waccamaw School	High	44%	0%
Buncombe County	A C Reynolds Middle	High	50%	11%
Buncombe County	Enka Middle	Expected	68%	44%
Buncombe County	North Buncombe Middle	High	32%	5%
Caldwell County	Gamewell Middle	Expected	85%	15%
Caldwell County	Hudson Middle	High	66%	29%
Catawba County	Maiden Middle	No Recognition	83%	25%
Catawba County	Harry Arndt Middle	High	54%	92%
Catawba County	River Bend Middle	High	85%	66%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	J M Alexander Middle	Expected	90%	54%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	Quail Hollow Middle	Expected	68%	40%
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	James Martin Middle	Expected		
Cherokee County	Andrews Middle	Expected	86%	57%
Cleveland County	Burns Middle	High	47%	20%
Clinton City	Sampson Middle	Expected	96%	38%
Columbus County	Chadbourn Middle	Expected	91%	0%
Columbus County	Cerro Gordo Middle	Expected	79%	14%
Craven County	H J MacDonald Middle	Expected	70%	56%
Cumberland County	Anne Chesnutt Middle	Expected	71%	20%
Cumberland County	Douglas Byrd Middle	High	96%	74%
Cumberland County	Gray's Creek Middle	High	72%	32%
Cumberland County	Lewis Chapel Middle	No Recognition	12%	0%
Cumberland County	Pine Forest Middle	High		
Davidson County	Central Davidson Middle	High	76%	17%
Davidson County	South Davidson Middle	High	61%	17%
Davie County	South Davie Middle	High	57%	10%
Durham County	Brogdan Middle	High	90%	72%
Durham County	George L Carrington Middle	Expected	93%	58%
Edenton-Chowan	Chowan Middle	High	85%	74%
Edgecombe County	South Edgecombe Middle	No Recognition	35%	2%

District	School	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	*QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory) Growth 2008 % increase % 2+yrs	
Edgecombe County	West Edgecombe Middle	Expected	81%	35%
Elizabeth	,, ost zagoome i mane	Expected	57%	21%
City/Pasquotank	River Road Middle	—F * * * * * *		
Gaston County	Holbrook Middle	High	55%	24%
Gaston County	William C Friday Middle	Expected	85%	49%
,	Southern Guilford	Expected	47%	10%
Guilford County	Middle	1		
Guilford County	Eastern Guilford Middle	No Recognition		
Guilford County	Kiser Middle	Expected	89%	55%
Harnett County	Coates-Erwin Middle	High	27%	8%
Harnett County	Dunn Middle	High		
Harnett County	Western Harnett Middle	High	18%	5%
Haywood County	Bethel Middle	No Recognition	18%	9%
Iredell Statesville	East Iredell Middle	High	66%	12%
Iredell Statesville	North Iredell Middle	Expected	80%	34%
Iredell Statesville	Statesville Middle	Expected	57%	40%
Iredell Statesville	West Iredell Middle	High	33%	14%
Johnston County	Selma Middle	High	95%	33%
Jones County	Jones Middle	High	45%	0%
Kannapolis City	Kannapolis Middle	High	91%	59%
Lenoir County	E B Frink Middle	Expected	76%	33%
Lenoir County	Savannah Middle	Expected	72%	56%
Lincoln County	Lincolnton Middle	Expected	53%	37%
Lincoln County	West Lincoln Middle	Expected	77%	50%
Madison County	Madison Middle	Expected	86%	64%
Martin County	Williamston Middle	High	54%	46%
McDowell County	East McDowell Jr High	No Recognition		
McDowell County	West McDowell Jr. High	No Recognition	54%	29%
Montgomery County	West Montgomery Middle	High	97%	78%
Nash Rocky Mount	J W Parker Middle	High	71%	19%
Nash Rocky Mount	Red Oak Middle	High	61%	2%
·	Charles P. Murray	High	82%	43%
New Hanover County	Middle	C		
Pender County	Cape Fear Middle	High	69%	27%
Perquimans County	Perquimans Middle	High	71%	61%
Pitt County	C M Eppes Middle	High	61%	8%
Pitt County	Bethel Elementary	High	61%	30%
Pitt County	Wellcome Middle	High	63%	4%
Randolph County	Archdale Trinity Middle	No Recognition	50%	24%

District	School	EOG Growth 2008 (NC ABC performance)	*QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory) Growth 2008 % increase % 2+yrs	
	Southeastern Randolph	No Recognition	55%	10%
Randolph County	Middle	1 to Recognition	3370	1070
The second secon	Southwestern Randolph	High	89%	46%
Randolph County	Middle			
Randolph County	Uwharrie Middle	High	50%	38%
Randolph County	Northeastern Randolph	Expected	80%	33%
Richmond County	Rockingham Junior High	No Recognition	72%	43%
Richmond County	Rohanen Junior High	No Recognition	93%	44%
Robeson County	Pemboke Middle	No Recognition		
Rockingham County	Reidsville Middle	Expected	60%	26%
	Western Rockingham	Expected	77%	2%
Rockingham County	Middle	-		
Rowan Salisbury	Corriher Lipe Middle	High	78%	56%
Rowan Salisbury	North Rowan Middle	High		
Rutherford County	Chase Middle	Expected	73%	29%
Rutherford County	East Rutherford Middle	Expected	86%	23%
Rutherford County	R S Middle	Expected	95%	74%
	Roseboro-Salemburg	Expected	88%	33%
Sampson County	Middle	_		
Sampson County	Union Middle	No Recognition		
Scotland County	Sycamore Lane Middle	High	38%	12%
Stanley County	Albemarle Middle	High	90%	60%
Surry County	Meadowview Middle	High	80%	75%
Union County	East Union Middle	Expected		
Union County	Sun Valley Middle	Expected	19%	5%
Vance County	Henderson Middle	Expected		
Wake County	East Garner Middle	No Recognition	79%	3%
Wake County	East Wake Middle	Expected	69%	29%
Wayne County	Norwayne Middle	High	78%	15%
Wayne County	Spring Creek High	High	76%	15%
Wilkes County	North Wilkes Middle	High	27%	5%
Wilson County	Speight Middle	No Recognition	38%	38%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Clemmons Middle	High	86%	64%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	Northwest Middle	High	69%	31%
Yadkin County	Yadkinville Elementary	High	57%	33%

(*The QRI, Qualitative Reading Inventory, is an individual diagnostic reading assessment administered to every level 1 and level 2 student in the 8th grade by the literacy coach in order to help classroom teachers individualize instruction to low level readers.