



2010-2011 ARCHIVE

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

BUTTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2010-2011

At Butterfield Trail Elementary we are setting the climate for developing responsible citizens and lifelong learners by involving the students in the core curriculum, arts and technology.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: T

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: 100% of all students will meet or exceed their expected Literacy growth increment with regard to MAP testing.

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to number sense, properties and operations, geometry and spatial s

Priority 3: Wellness Priority

Goal: Provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaborat

Priority 4: English Language Learners (ELL)

Goal: All English Language Learners (ELL) students will improve in literacy skills and responding to constructed response questions.

Priority 5: Prevent Disproportionate Representation (Over-identification) of African American Students

Goal: Reduce the relative proportion of African American students to students of other ethnicity identified as Mentally Retarded.

Priority 1:

We expect all students to become proficient in literacy.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam

Report Created: Sep 2, 2008

2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

68 Students:	83.8% of Combined Students
52 Students:	90.3% of Caucasian Students
19 Students:	52.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
10 Students:	50% of Students with Disabilities
11 Students:	63.6 % of African American Students

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of Limited English Proficient (LEP), Hispanic and Asian.

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is content.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are content and style.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

Students with Disabilities Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

African American Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

59 Students:	84.7% of Combined Students
45 Students:	86.7% of Caucasian Students
21 Students:	76.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is content.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of IEP, LEP, Asian Pacific Islander, African Americans, Hispanic, and Native American.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

2007-# Tested & Percent
of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

64 Students:	43.8% of Combined Students
10 Students:	30% of African American Students
47 Students:	51.1% of Caucasian Students
19 Students:	31.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

43% of the Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 29% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored, at or above, Proficient; 49% of the Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP, African American and Hispanic.

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is content.

The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged Students (SES) in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response questions is content.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response questions is content.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Benchmark-4th Grade Literacy Exam

Report Created: Sep 2, 2008

2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

61 Students:	89% of Combined Students
48 Students:	91.8% of Caucasian Students
25 Students:	85.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is literacy.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of IEP, LEP, African American and Hispanic.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Literacy Passage and

Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Literacy Passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

55 Students:	78.2% of Combined Students
10 Students:	60% of African American Students
39 Students:	89.7% of Caucasian Students
15 Students:	80% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is content.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of IEP, LEP, and Hispanic.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

African American Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Style Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

70 Students:	85.7% of Combined Students
57 Students:	89.5% of Caucasian Students
18 Students:	66.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

83% of the Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 68% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored, at or above, Proficient; 88% of the Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP, African American, and Hispanic.

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response questions is content.

The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged Students (SES) in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response questions is content.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response questions is content.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam

Report Created: Sep 2, 2008

2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

53 Students:	78.5% of Combined Students
--------------	----------------------------

38 Students: 87.5% of Caucasian Students
16 Students: 55.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is content.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of African American, IEP, LEP, and Hispanic.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area(s) is Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) are Content and Style.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

69 Students: 85.5% of Combined Students
58 Students: 86.2% of Caucasian Students
22 Students: 77.3% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

The lowest identified areas for the combined population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response questions is literacy.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of African American, IEP, LEP, and Hispanic.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Literary Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content Passage, Literary Passage and Practical Passage. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are Content and Style.

2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

59 Students: 69.5% of Combined Students
49 Students: 73.5% of Caucasian Students
21 Students: 52.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

68% of the Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 52% of the Economically Disadvantaged Students (SES) students scored at, or above, Proficient; 72% of the Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP, African American, and Hispanic.

The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content/practical and open response questions is content.

The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged Students (SES) in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is literary and open response questions is practical.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response questions is practical.

1. Grade MAT-8 (08): Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade K:

In 2008, 80 students were tested and 76% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Supporting Data:

Economically disadvantaged students: 33 students were tested and 64% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian students: 54 students were tested and 85% scored above the 50th percentile.

African American students: 15 students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of Hispanic, LEP, Asian/Pacific Islander and IEP.

Grade K-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:
Combined Population: 93 Students were tested and 68% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

LEP students: 10 Students were tested and 30% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Economically disadvantaged students: 36 Students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Hispanic students: 12 Students were tested and 17% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Caucasian students: 67 Students were tested and 79% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of IEP and African American.

1. SAT-10 (08): Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 1:

In 2008, 87 students were tested and 56.3% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 1-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:
Combined Population: 86 Students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

LEP students: 10 Students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Economically disadvantaged students: 36 Students were tested and 61% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Hispanic students: 12 Students were tested and 33% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Caucasian students: 60 Students were tested and 90% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

African American students: 11 Students were tested and 64% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation group of Students with Disabilities.

1. SAT-10 (08): Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 2:

In 2008, 64 students were tested and 59.4% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 2-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 67 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Economically disadvantaged students: 27 Students were tested and 63% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Caucasian students: 46 Students were tested and 93.5% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in word analysis.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of African American, Hispanic, LEP, and IEP.

1. SAT-10 (09): Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 3:

In 2009, 68 students were tested and 65.1% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 3-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2008:

64 students were tested and 71.9% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 3-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 72 Students were tested and 66% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in word analysis.

Economically disadvantaged students: 24 Students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Caucasian students: 53 Students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in word analysis.

African American students: 11 Students were tested and 64% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation group of LEP, IEP and Hispanic.

1. SAT-10 (09): Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 4:

In 2009, 64 students were tested and 74.4% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 4-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2008:

58 students were tested and 79.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 4-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 79 Students were tested and 86% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Economically disadvantaged students: 24 Students were tested and 75% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Caucasian students: 63 Students were tested and 87.3% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in vocabulary.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP, Hispanic and African American.

1. SAT-10 (09): Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 5:

In 2009, 56 students were tested and 68.2% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2008:

76 students were tested and 84.2% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 71 Students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in comprehension.

Caucasian: 55 students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Reading subtests revealed weaknesses in comprehension.

Economically Disadvantaged: 29 students were tested and 68% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading comprehension.

Few than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of LEP, IEP, African American and Hispanic.

1. Attendance Rate: In 2009, the attendance rate was 95.7%. In 2008, the attendance rate was 91.13%. In 2007, the attendance rate was 95.2%.

Goal
Benchmark

100% of all students will meet or exceed their expected Literacy growth increment with regard to MAP testing.
The Combined Population, and each Subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 71.20% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of the

Intervention: Parental Engagement

Scientific Based Research: Parent Involvement; National PTA Standards 1998.

Actions

The building principal will designate one certified staff member to serve as a parent facilitator to organize meaningful training for staff and parents and to undertake efforts to ensure that parental p
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

The school will have newly constructed designated areas to be used as the Parent Center and the counseling suite. Furnishings will be purchased and parenting books, magazines and other informat
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers and administrators will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parental involvement strategies.
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

All parents will receive informational packets that include: *School Calendar Information *A system encouraging the home and school connection *Information addressing the school's process for re
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Administrators, teachers and parents will develop a volunteer resource book including: a parent interest survey, an option for parents to designate how frequently they would participate in the prog
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Administrators, teachers and parents will develop a parental involvement plan addressing the diverse needs of the students and their parents to increase the school's ability to provide for the educa
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

All parents and students will be mailed reminders to come to a "Back to School Bash" to welcome them to our school, to meet the faculty and staff, to be introduced to PTO board members, to have
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

"Open House" will be held at the beginning of the year to discuss with parents what students will be expected to learn, how that learning will be addressed and how parents can assist to make a diff
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

The district will designate two Parent/Teacher Conferences each school year.
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers and other staff members will use Star Reading test scores and Augmented Benchmark scores as a summative evaluation to determine which students need support with Title I activities. P
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

The school will continue to hire and maintain "highly qualified" teachers and support staff. All instruction will be given by "highly qualified" staff. Teachers will work closely with Title I staff to imple
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers are provided with instructional meeting time in order to plan for the implementation of best practices chosen to help improve student achievement at each student's readiness level. Time
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

An alumni advisory committee will be formed to help do a formative evaluation of academic progress, the amount of parental participation within the school and identification of barriers that exist t
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: the number of items checked out via counselor and
We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaini
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

ANNUAL TITLE ONE MEETING: Our school will host an annual community meeting to discuss the Title 1 program. This meeting will be scheduled during the fall of each school year. A sign-in sheet w
formed for the purpose of, annually, revising our school parental involvement policy.
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Two Parent Involvement Meetings will be held each year.
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement

School's process for resolving parental concerns is currently in the elementary district handbook.
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Counselor will provide academic parenting classes to provide instruction to parents on how to incorporate developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment. Internet safety cl
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

School will provide activities to help assist parents in his or her child's learning.
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Total Budget:

Intervention: Step Up to Writing.

Scientific Based Research: Marzano, Robert J.; Norfold, Jennifer S.; Paynter, Diane E.; Pickering, Deborah J.; and Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). A Handbook for Classroom Instruction That Works. Alex

Actions

All teachers will participate in ongoing professional development in writing, including training in programs such as Step Up to Writing, ELLA, Effective Literacy, and Literacy Lab--all of which include
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

All students will use technology to access information, develop writing skills, and publish student work.

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Provide all students with access to a rich collection of diverse resources (to include, but not be limited to books, videos, tapes, and other media materials) through the school library.

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

As a formative evaluation, a schedule of writing prompts (to be done each quarter) will be established for the year, with each grade level choosing a prompt to be done by all the students and grade

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Communicate writing expectations and student progress in writing to parents through classroom assignment sheets, parent-teacher conferences, graded work, newsletters, and Web access to the c

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

TRANSITION: Transition from Pre-School to Kindergarten Action: (Pre-K) Kindergarten teachers will collaborate to incorporate research/best practices related to early childhood development so that

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Benchmark test scores will be used as a summative evaluation of student progress in writing.

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009 -2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: pre/post testing, CRT/NRT assessments, and local

We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaini

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Total Budget:

Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy Model: Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas (ELLA);Effective Literacy; Phonetic Connections; Word Study; and Literacy Lab

Scientific Based Research: Adams, M., Beginning to Read; Allington, R., Classrooms That Work (1999).

Actions

Plan, prepare and implement district ELLA/Effective Literacy/Literacy Lab professional development. Full implementation of these programs will ensure that all students are fluent readers and able to

Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

All classroom teachers will be trained in the use of Accelerated Reader as part of the ongoing reading instruction for all students in the classroom.

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Purchase leveled reading books, well reviewed library books, AR software, LCD projectors, Interwrite Pads, voice amplification systems or other interactive technologies and other supplies for impl

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Instruct K-3 special education and ESL students in their Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky) through guided reading groups and the use of STAR Reading software.

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers will utilize appropriate technology programs to integrate technology into literacy instruction for all students. This will provide students with additional reinforcement for the standards-base

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

As a summative evaluation, we will use achievement test results and district K-1 assessment results to annually evaluate implementation of ELLA/Effective Literacy balanced literacy strategies in K-

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Coordination and integration of programs and student identification for services: All teachers will be encouraged to attend the state, regional or national reading conferences. Training provides teach

Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Individual and classroom group AR data, as well as state and local mandated testing data will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the AR program.

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Instructional assistants will be employed to support and supplement instructional strategies, perform assessments, and collect and disaggregate data with students and teachers in grades K-5 in rea

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

K-1 teachers will utilize the Phonetic Connection program as a daily part of literacy instruction. This provides systematic instruction focused on research-based instructional methods.

Action Type: Alignment
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers in grades 2-4 will utilize the Word Study program for explicit word study/spelling instruction.

Action Type: Alignment
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers and staff will utilize individual AR test scores as a formative evaluation, as well as other information, to create a prioritized list of students in need of intervention services. This assessment

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Kindergarten students who score delayed in both written and oral communication on the QELI, and 1st and 2nd grade students who scored "below basic" in reading on the SAT 10 will be provided I

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Strategies will be developed in conjunction with the central office staff for attracting highly qualified teachers to the Fayetteville school district.

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

In our school Title I resources are used to help children achieve our annual Adequate Yearly Progress targets by supporting, and supplementing, the implementation of a tightly aligned instructional

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

The methods and strategies we use have scientifically based research that shows they have been effective. The use of "differentiated and cognitively guided instruction" is but one example of the kir

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

We use Title I funds to support and supplement the regular education programs.

Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

School Leadership Team: Closing the Achievement Gap(Literacy): Regular quarterly meetings of our (Literacy) ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on bu along with a sing-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention, and Action, is carefully monitored...through the collection of Formative and Summative

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009 -2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: pre/post testing, CRT/NRT assessments, and local

We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaini

2010 Kindergarten MAT8 literacy data reported 34% of Butterfield students scored below basic, 19.4% of Butterfield students scored basic, 15.5% of Butterfield student

2010 First grade SAT 10 literacy data reported 2.3% of Butterfield students scored below basic, 7% of Butterfield students scored basic, 29.1% of Butterfield students

2010 Second grade SAT 10 literacy data reported 2.7% of Butterfield students scored below basic, 12.3% of Butterfield students scored basic, 26% of Butterfield studen

MAP literacy data identified these areas of concern regarding Butterfield's 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students: 28% of current 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders were below the 5

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Rosetta Stone ---IMPLEMENTATION YEAR 2: "During the 2010-2011 school year we will evaluate Rosetta Stone through pre/post testing, CRT/NRT assessments, and local summ

We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was acheived and whether it has been successful in attaining the

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 5th grade Augmented Benchmark and SAT 10 exams in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction. We chart progress on our "Assessment/Intervention" wall.

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the state curriculum.

Action Type: Alignment
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

We are continually planning for how best to serve our students. Our staff meets on a regular basis for the purpose of reviewing the results from our formative assessments. Those interventions that

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

A summer AR program will be offered for all students that will give them access to library materials and AR testing to promote reading at home during the summer. The program will be available 2

Total Budget:

Priority 2:

Improve Mathematics

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Benchmark-3rd Grade Mathematics Exam

Report Created: Sep 2, 2008

2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

68 Students:	92.6% of Combined Students
52 Students:	98% of Caucasian Students
19 Students:	73.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
10 Students:	80% of Students with Disabilities
11 Students:	81.8% of African American Students

Combined Population: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Number Operations. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability .

Student with Disabilities (IEP) Subpopulation: The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability .

African American Subpopulation: The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability .

2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

59 Students:	89.8% of Combined Students
45 Students:	91.1% of Caucasian Students
21 Students:	90.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

Combined Population: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Geometry.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement .

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement .

2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

64 Students:	81.3% of Combined Students
--------------	----------------------------

10 Students: 50% of African American Students

47 Students: 87.2% of Caucasian Students

19 Students: 73.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

80% of the Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 71% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored at, or above, Proficient; 54% of the African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 86% of the Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP and Hispanic.

The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged Students (SES) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the African American students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Number Sense and Operations and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability and Measurement.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Benchmark-4th Grade Mathematics Exam

Report Created: Sep 2, 2008

2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

61 Students: 92.1% of Combined Students

48 Students: 95.9% of Caucasian Students

25 Students: 88.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

Combined Population: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

55 Students: 85.5% of Combined Students

10 Students: 80% of African American Students

39 Students: 84.6% of Caucasian Students

15 Students: 80% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

Combined Population: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Geometry.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement .

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement .

2007-# Tested &Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

70 Students:	87.1% of Combined Students
57 Students:	91.2% of Caucasian Students
18 Students:	66.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

85% of the Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 68% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored, at or above, Proficient; 88% of the Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP, African American and Hispanic.

The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Geometry.

The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Geometry.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Geometry.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Supporting Data:

Benchmark-5th Grade Mathematics Exam

Report Created: Sep 2, 2008

2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

53 Students:	76.7% of Combined Students
38 Students:	80% of Caucasian Students
16 Students:	66.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

Combined Population: The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Geometry.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement .

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation:
The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area(s)(based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Number Operations .

2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

69 Students:	85.5% of Combined Students
58 Students:	87.9% of Caucasian Students
22 Students:	81.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

Combined Population: The lowest identified area (s)(based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified

area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Numbers and Operations.

Caucasian Subpopulation: The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement.

Economically Disadvantaged Subpopulation:
The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Number Operations.

2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

59 Students:	71.2% of Combined Students
49 Students:	69.4% of Caucasian Students
21 Students:	61.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

69% of the Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient; 59% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored at, or above, Proficient; 70% of the Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulation groups of LEP, IEP, African American and Hispanic.

The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area in the analysis of the multiple choice questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

1. MAT-8 (08): Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade K

In 2008, 80 students were tested and 73% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian students: 54 students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile.

Economically disadvantaged students: 33 students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile.

African American students: 15 students were tested and 60% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of: Hispanic, LEP, Asian/Pacific Islander and IEP.

Grade K-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 93 students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 67 students were tested and 77.6% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Economically Disadvantaged: 36 students were tested and 58.3% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Hispanic: 12 students were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

LEP: 10 students were tested and 58.3% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of: IEP and African American.

1. SAT-10 (08): Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 1:

In 2008, 87 students were tested and 62.1% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 1-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 86 Students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 60 students were tested and 88.3% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Economically Disadvantaged: 36 students were tested and 61.1% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Hispanic: 12 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

African American: 11 students were tested and 63.6% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

LEP: 10 students were tested and 60% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of IEP.

1. SAT-10 (08): Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 2:

In 2008, 64 students were tested and 76.6% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 2-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 67 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 46 students were tested and 87% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Economically Disadvantaged: 27 students were tested and 77.8% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of LEP, IEP, Hispanic and African American.

1. SAT-10 (09): Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 3:

In 2009, 68 students were tested and 86.8% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 3-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2008:

64 students were tested and 79.7% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 3-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 72 Students were tested and 66% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 53 students were tested and 67.3% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

African American: 11 students were tested and 45.5% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Economically Disadvantaged: 24 students were tested and 56.5% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of LEP, IEP, and Hispanic.

1. SAT-10 (09): Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 4:

In 2009, 64 students were tested and 86.8% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 4-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2008:

58 students were tested and 86.2% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 4-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 79 Students were tested and 86% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 63 students were tested and 90.5% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the subtests, weaknesses were revealed in math computation.

Economically Disadvantaged: 24 students were tested and 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of subtests revealed weaknesses in math computation.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of LEP, IEP, Hispanic and African American.

1. SAT-10 (0): Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 5:

In 2009, 56 students were tested and 74.4% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2008:

76 students were tested and 84.2% had a NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:

Combined Population: 71 Students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in problem solving and data interpretation.

Caucasian: 55 students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in math computation.

Economically Disadvantaged: 29 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in math computation.

Fewer than 10 students were tested in the subpopulations of: IEP, LEP, African American, and Hispanic.

1. Attendance Rate: In 2009, the attendance rate for the building was 95.7%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 91.13%. In

Goal
Benchmark

All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to number sense, The Combined Population, and each Subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 70% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these

Intervention: Technology Software: an individual academic plan for all students.
Scientific Based Research: West Virginia Story: Achievement gains from a statewide comprehensive instructional technology program. Mann, D., Shakeshaft, C., Becker, J., and Kotthamp, R. 1998.
Actions
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate monthly to review student achievement and to discuss the implementation of differentiated strategies, includ
Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Teachers and other support personnel will use MAPS scores, along with other pertinent information, as a formative evaluation to determine which students are in need of support with Title I activitie
Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
NEEDS ASSESSMENT: NRT, CRT, local achievement assessments and other relevant summative evaluations will be analyzed by the faculty at each grade level with consideration to the combined pc
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: pre/post testing, CRT/NRT assessments, and local
We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaini
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Total Budget:
Intervention: Everyday Mathematics: A Research-Based Curriculum
Scientific Based Research: The Research Foundations for the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell. 2002
Actions
Purchase materials to be used to implement activities and assessments that compliment lessons for Everyday Mathematics in regular classrooms, special education resource room and the computer
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Grade level teachers will meet to review student work, share effective teaching and assessment strategies (including technology), and align instructional objectives to assist all students to achieve p
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Use SAT 10 scores(Grades 1-5), the state Benchmark Exams, MAPS and other teacher-made or program specific assessments as both a formative and summative evaluation of student progress in i
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Instructional assistants will be employed to support identified students in all 1st grade students during regular math instruction, in 2nd-5th grade classes during intervention time and in K classes o
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: pre/post testing, CRT/NRT assessments, and local

We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining

2010 MAT8 Kindergarten math data reported 24.3% of Butterfield students scored below basic, 27.2% of Butterfield students scored basic, 20.4% of Butterfield students scored advanced

2010 SAT10 First grade math data reported 2.3% of Butterfield students scored below basic, 12.8% of Butterfield students scored basic, 43% of Butterfield students scored advanced

2010 SAT10 Second grade math data reported 2.7% of Butterfield students scored below basic, 13.7% of Butterfield students scored basic, 21.9% of Butterfield students scored advanced

MAP math data identified these areas of concern regarding Butterfield's 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students: 21% of current 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders were below the 50th percentile

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT: Grade level CRT & NRT scores will be compared on an individual basis. Individual student AIPs will address deficiencies in the area of critical/creative thinking and problem solving

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Alignment
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Parents will be informed at Curriculum Night and Parent/Teacher conferences of the use of Homelinks, a parent/child math activity based on skills being taught in class. Homelinks are sent home regularly

Action Type: AIP/IRI
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 5th grade Augmented Benchmark and SAT 10 exams in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction. We chart progress on our "Assessment/Intervention" wall.

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

School Leadership Team: Closing the Achievement Gap(Math): Regular quarterly meetings of our (Math) ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building with a sign-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention, and Action, is carefully monitored...through the collection of Formative and Summative Data

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Total Budget:

Intervention: Professional Development Design--a plan for all teachers.

Scientific Based Research: Loucks-Horsley, S., Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics 1998, National Institute for Science Education.

Actions

Plan, design, purchase materials/equipment for implementation of professional development activities for school areas of focus, using district guidelines for design, content, implementation, and resources

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Provide diverse professional development opportunities to offer teachers a balanced approach to enhanced knowledge and skills (deep teacher knowledge of content, strong foundation in pedagogy, and differentiated instruction)

Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Use community resources and outside consultants to provide additional expertise in meeting the professional development needs of teachers.

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: All teachers and paraprofessionals will have the opportunity to participate in the school and district professional development plan. Teachers will use a formative evaluation to assess their own professional development goals and needs. All teachers will have the opportunity to have input on the district and building level professional development plan. The district will provide all teachers and administrators with professional development opportunities

Action Type: Alignment
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Teachers are provided with weekly instructional meeting time in order to plan for the implementation of best practices chosen to help improve student achievement at each student's readiness level

Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: summative evaluations and a local formative evaluation

We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining

Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide

Total Budget:

- Priority 3:** To increase student awareness and knowledge of the effects of good nutrition and physical activity.
1. Body Mass Index Data 2009-2010: of the 504 student population, 216 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of Grade K: Males 33.3%, 35% Females Grade 1: Males N/A, N/A Females Grade 2: Males 36%, 35% Females Grade 3: Males N/A, N/A Females Grade 4: Males 36%, 35% Females
 2. The 2009-2010 School Index indicated that the 2 areas of need were Health Promotion for Staff and Family and Community Involvement. The 2008-2009 School Index indicated that the 2 areas of need were Health Promotion for Staff and Family and Community Involvement. The 2007-2008 School Index indicated that the 2 areas of need were Health Promotion for Staff and Family and Community Involvement.
 3. Free/Reduced Rate: In 2009-2010 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 43%. In 2008-2009 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 40%. In 2007-2008 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 40%.
- Supporting Data:**
- Goal:** Provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and

Benchmark The number of students being considered overweight or at risk of overweight, according to their BMI, will decrease by 1/2% during the 2009-2010 school year when cor

Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of physical activity for lifelong health and wellness.	
Scientific Based Research: Let's Get Physical--Promotion and Education Strategies by Dr. Hal Wechsler http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/menu/NNEC/Files/2003/LetsGetPhysical.pdf	
Actions	
Certified PE teachers will be employed by the district for PE instruction. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: teacher observation and the School Health Index M	
We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaini	
Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
Girls On The Run: Butterfield 3rd, 4th and 5th grade girls will participate in the Girls On The Run curriculum program after school led by Girls On The Run trained certified Butterfield teachers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	

Total Budget:	
Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of sound nutritional practices for lifelong health and wellness.	
Scientific Based Research: Kids for Health, 2006.	
Actions	
The school based nutrition committee will do a formative evaluation of various school activities to ensure compliance with state child nutrition laws. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
Student BMI assessments will be analyzed annually as a summative evaluation to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk of overweight or overweight. Interventi	
Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
School nurse or other appropriate personnel will provide information and training to staff regarding health issues related to asthma, first aid and food emergencies. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: the school based nutrition committee formative ev	
We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective(s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaini	
Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 5th grade Augmented Benchmark and SAT 10 exams dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2009 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our various po	
Instruction. We chart progress on our "Assessment/Intervention" wall. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	
Total Budget:	

Priority 4:	We expect all English Language Learners (ELL) to become proficient in literacy.
Supporting Data:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam 2009-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. 2008-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. 2007-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Benchmark-4th Grade Literacy Exam 2009-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. 2008-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. 2007-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. ACSIP CRT Data Source for BUTTERFIELD TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam 2009-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. 2008-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. 2007-Fewer than 10 students were tested in the English Language Learner (ELL) subpopulation. Aggregate Data: 2009-# Tested and Percent of 3rd, 4th & 5th Grade Students Scoring Proficient/Adva 10 Students Tested: 8 Students Scored Proficient/Advanced in Math (80%) 10 Students Tested: 5 Students Scored Proficient/Advanced in Literacy (50%)
Goal	All English Language Learners (ELL) students will improve in literacy skills and responding to constructed resp
Benchmark	Due to the fact that fewer than 10 English Language Learners (ELL) students were tested the past 4 years in

Intervention: On Our Way to English: Oral Language Development Newcomer Kit	
Scientific Based Research: Educational Research Institute of America (2004)	
Actions	
The certified English Language Learner (ELL) teacher will use the On Our Way to English: Oral Language Development Newcomer Kit to meet the differing rates at which English Language Learners	
Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 5th grade Augmented Benchmark and SAT 10 exams to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2009 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our various focus, of our Classroom Instruction. We chart progress on our "Assessment/Intervention" wall. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2010-2011 school year, we will evaluate this Intervention/Program: On Our Way to English: Language Development Newcomer Kit through: pre/po	
Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	
Total Budget:	

Intervention: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model	
Scientific Based Research: The SIOP Institute (Guarino, Echubarria, Short, Schick, Forbes, & Rueda, 2001)	
Actions	
The certified English Language Learner (ELL) teacher will use the SIOP model as a system that provides a concrete structure to plan and implement Sheltered Instruction in the content areas.	
Action Type: Collaboration	

Persc
Kay I

Action Type: Equity
 Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
 Total Budget:

Priority 5:

1. An analysis of the 2009-2010 data for Fayetteville suggests that there is a possible disproportionate representation of Black students (overrepresented) &
2. The comparison between risk rates of African American SPED students to Caucasian students who are labeled Mentally Retarded:
 African American:
 2007-2008 5.21% 2008-2009 5.33% 2009-2010 5.21%
 Caucasian:
 2007-2008 .34% 2008-2009 .27% 2009-2010 .21%
3. African American Students Labeled MR: 20/50 or 40%. All other ethnicity: 30/50 or 60%.
4. Referrals 2009-2010: 15% of students referred are African American. 66% of students referred are Caucasian. Placements 2009-2010: 16% of placed st
5. Currently served students in early-intervention district-wide:
 11/99 = 11% African American
 53/99 = 54% Caucasian

Supporting Data:

Goal

: Reduce the relative proportion of African American students to students of other ethnicity identified as Mentally Retarded.

Benchmark

Fayetteville Public Schools will reduce the risk ratio of African American students labeled as Mentally Retarded to below the state target for the 2010-2011 schoo

Intervention: Fayetteville Public Schools will monitor and maintain the number of African American students referred for special education services and identified as mentally retarded by using EARL
Scientific Based Research: RESEARCH For MAPS testing: Kingsbury Center at NWEA, State Standards and Student Growth: Why State Standards Don't Matter as Much as We Thought, Cronin, Dahli Learning in Secondary Schools, E. Sturtevant, Alliance for Excellent Education Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse Program Evaluation – ALL levels Data will be collected on Early Intervening Services f
Actions
IDEA Title VI-B CEIS funding will be used to partially pay for the LEAP AHEAD program at Owl Creek School. This 3-week summer program will target students who are at least one year behind gra
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Equity
Action Type: Parental Engagement
Action Type: Special Education
Fayetteville Schools will conduct a book study with CIAA staff exploring the issues related to cultural diversity and race in the educational realm. The book study will focus on targeted staff, and incl
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
BENCHMARK STATEMENT: The AYP targets for the 2010-2011 year in Literacy in Mathematics will be met by all Special Education Student Sub Populations in the Fayetteville Schools. The AMO targ
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
The district will implement K-2 MAP assessments in order to provide more targeted and explicit instruction in Literacy and all content areas. (Software and Hardware) These materials will be purcha
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Title I Schoolwide
Elementary, Middle School and Secondary teachers will receive training in core instruction to improve early-intervening Literacy strategies across the district. Elementary Literacy coaches will be inv
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who are evaluated for Special Education within the state established time line of 60 days (CHILD FIND) will be 100% for the overall district
Action Type: Special Education
Fayetteville Schools will purchase early intervention materials, including Read 180 and System 44 kits, that will be proactive in meeting the needs of all learners in hopes of preventing inappropria
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Fayetteville schools will employ a national consultant to provide training in improvement of our co-teaching model. These sessions will be aimed at both SPED and general education teachers.
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
Funding for Title VI, Coordinated Early Intervening Services will be used for the following initiatives at Butterfield Elementary: EnglishK/Primary Curriculum Oral Language Good Habits/Great Reader
Action Type: Collaboration
Action Type: Professional Development
Action Type: Special Education
Action Type: Technology Inclusion
Program Evaluation – ALL levels Data will be collected on Early Intervening Services provided to all students K-7 Individual Progress Monitoring by RTI teams and Literacy Coaches and analyzed.
Action Type: Program Evaluation
Action Type: Special Education
Total Budget:

• Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Allison Brockinton	5th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Andrea Lofton	3rd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Becky McCain	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Becky Shofner	2nd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Brandy Wingo	1st Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Brooks Anne Courtway	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Caryn Finney	Kindergarten Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Dena Griffin	Resource Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Dianne Gann	5th GradeTeacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Donna Modica	2nd Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jane Arnold	3rd Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Janette Cooper	CBI Teacher	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Condron	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jessica Byram	Kindergarten Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Karen Ervin	5th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lisa Snyder	4th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Margaret Connors	2nd GradeTeacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Megan Meggers	PreK Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Nancy Smith	Kindergarten teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Randi Dodson	1st Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Sherri Watson	2nd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Sherrie Lindsay	1st Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Stephanie Self	1st GradeTeacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Sue Conlee	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Susan Brown	3rd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Travis Shofner	PE Teacher	Wellness
District-Level Professional	Christie Jay	Federal Programs Coordinator	Literacy

Non-Classroom Professional Staff	April Herrin	Art Teacher	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Holly Smith	Literacy Coach	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	John Garner	Counselor	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kay Magness	ESL Teacher	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kelly Whittle	Music Teacher	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Laura Baxter	Speech Therapist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Rebecca Webb	Library Media Specialist	Literary
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Shirley Gorman	G/T Teacher	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Wendy Venable	School Nurse	Wellness
Parent	Cindy Caudle	Parent	Parent Involvement
Parent	Jennifer Vaughn	Parent	Literacy
Parent	Shanda Sloan	Parent Teacher Organization President	Parent Involvement
Principal	Heather Williams	Assistant Principal	ACSIP Leadership
Principal	Joey Folsom	Principal	ACSIP Leadership