



2010-2011 ARCHIVE

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

ROOT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2010-2011

Root Elementary School, a community of learners comprised of dedicated staff, parents, and students, will maintain high levels of achievement by challenging all students to attain their maximum learning potential in a safe, nurturing environment through innovative teaching strategies, open lines of communication, and community support.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Not Applicable

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Improving Literacy

Goal: All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to literary and content reading passages, and style and content writing domains. 100% of all students will meet or exceed their expected growth in Literacy

Priority 2: Improving Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve in mathematic skills and respond to constructed response questions with additional attention to 'data analysis and probability' and 'measurement' mathematic strands.

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 collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Priority 4: Title III/ELL

Goal: All ELL students will improve in reading comprehension, written expression, and mathematic skills and respond to constructed response questions with proficiency.

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 will work to improve in the area of Literacy

1. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 90 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 91 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 79 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified

areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

1. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 82 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 82 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 68 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical (multiple choice) and literary (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

1. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 83 students were tested and 88% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 79 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 84 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and practical (multiple choice) and practical (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style.

1. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010 fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 10 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 14 students were tested and 57% scored proficient or advanced.

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010 fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 14 students were tested and 57% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007 and 2008 fewer than 10 students were tested in Grade 4.

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 10 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2008, fewer than 10 students were tested.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

1. Limited English Proficient (LEP): In 2008, 2009 and 2010 fewer than 10 students were tested in Grades 3, 4, and 5.

1. SES:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 16 students were tested and 57% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 17 students were tested and 65% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 16 students were tested and 47% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 15 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 16 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 12 students were tested and 83% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified

areas are: practical(multiple choice) and literary (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 15 students were tested and 57% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 20 students were tested and 48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 70% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and practical (multiple choice) and practical (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style.

1. Caucasian:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 74 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 76 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 73 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 68 students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 77 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 65 students were tested and 83% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical(multiple choice) and literary (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 80 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 75 students were tested and 77% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 92% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and practical (multiple choice) and practical (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style.

1. African Americans: In 2008, 2009, and 2010 fewer than "10" students were tested in Grades 3, 4 and 5.

1. Hispanics, Native American and Asian/Pacific Islander: In 2008, 2009, and 2010 fewer than "10" students were tested in Grades 3, 4, and 5.

1. Attendance Rate:

In 2008, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2009, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2010, the attendance rate was 96%.

1. Grade K-Iowa SAT 10 2008:

We don't have this data due to the loss of materials by UPS truck. The State Department will verify.

Grade 1-SAT 10:

Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 49% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 77 students were tested and 51% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 10 students were tested and 10% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 13 students were tested and 30% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 63% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 67 students were tested and 66% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 14 students were tested and 36% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 79 Students were tested and 67% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 73 students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 44% scored above the 50th percentile.

Students with Disabilities: 16 students were tested and 38% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 65 students were tested and 82% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 12 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 84 Students were tested and 88% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 75 students were tested and 92% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 10 students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile.

Students with Disabilities: 10 students were tested and 60% scored above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade K-Iowa MAT -8 2009:

Combined Population: 85 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 77 students were tested and 79% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 10 students were tested and 10% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1-SAT 10:

Combined Population: 93 Students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 84 students were tested and 44% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 15 students were tested and 8% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 19 students were tested and 26% scored above the 50th percentile.

Supporting
Data:

Grade 2-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 90 Students were tested and 54% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 78 students were tested and 56% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 44% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 91 Students were tested and 56% in Reading and 56% in Language scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 76 students were tested and 59% in reading and 61% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 17 students were tested and 12% in reading and 28% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 10 students were tested and 31% in reading and 59% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 81% in reading and 56% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 77 students were tested and 80% in reading and 56% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 14 students were tested and 50% in reading and 37% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 50% in reading and 25% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 80 Students were tested and 81% in reading and 62% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 69 students were tested and 84% in reading and 68% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 22 students were tested and 65% in reading and 31% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade K-Iowa MAT -8 2010:
Combined Population: 86 Students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 75 students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 17 students were tested and 77% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1-SAT 10:
Combined Population: 99 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 85 students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 16 students were tested and 19% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 18 students were tested and 28% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2010:
Combined Population: 91 Students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 78 students were tested and 56% scored above the 50th

percentile.

SES: 20 students were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 13 students were tested and 0% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2010:
 Combined Population: 90 Students were tested and 60% in Reading scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 74 students were tested and 61% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 44% in reading and 28% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2010:
 Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 92% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 68 students were tested and 93% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 15 students were tested and 73% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2010:
 Combined Population: 83 Students were tested and 84% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 80 students were tested and 86% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 63% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 13 students were tested and 69% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

Goal All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to literary and content reading passages, and style and content writing domains. 100% of all students will meet or exceed their expected growth in Literacy

Benchmark The Combined Population and each Subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 64% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 78.4% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. The Economically Disadvantaged sub population did NOT meet standards in Literacy and did NOT reach the AMO percentage Proficient or Advanced of 64.0%, therefore has a status of ALERT. It is expected that all sub populations will meet or exceed the 2011 AMO of 78.4% Proficient or Advanced in Literacy.

Intervention: Root School will comply with the Parental Engagement requirements as outlined in ACT 307 of 2007. The Parental Involvement Plan will include the following: parent/teacher conferences twice annually, a parent advisory committee, parent center, teacher/administrator training, informational packet and timely information as needed, parent involvement meetings, and a volunteer resource book.				
Scientific Based Research: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, (http://www.sedl.org/connections/), 2002, "A new wave of evidence. The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement.", Henderson, A., & Mapp, K.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
We will continue to schedule two parent teacher conferences per school year. These conferences will be widely advertised and scheduled in such a manner that as many parents as possible may visit our campus and interact with their	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

student's faculty. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement				
The school will have a designated area to be used as the Parent Center. Parenting books, magazines and other informative material regarding responsible parenting will be available for parents to borrow for review in each building. Parent Center material, which may include, but not limited to brochures, pamphlets, computers for use on site, or laptops to be checked out will be designated by each building. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Melinda Jorn	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • School Library 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parental involvement strategies. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Shannon Nickell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Administrators will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parent involvement strategies and the importance of setting expectations and creating a climate conducive to parental participation. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
In order to encourage communication with parents our school will prepare an INFORMATIONAL PACKET to be distributed annually to the parents of each child in the school. These packets will describe: The school's parental involvement program; The recommended role of the parent, student, teacher and school; Ways for parents to become involved in the school and their child's education; A survey for the parent regarding their interests concerning volunteering at the school; A schedule of activities planned throughout the school year to encourage parental involvement; and Procedures to allow the parents and teachers to communicate in a regular, two-way, and meaningful manner with the child's teacher and principal. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
To help our parents in assisting their children our school shall: Schedule PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT MEETINGS at which parents are given a report on the state of the school and an overview of: A. What students will be learning. B. How students are assessed. C. What parents should expect for their child's education and D. How a parent can assist and make a difference in their child's education. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marie Walden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
In order to welcome parents our school shall compile a VOLUNTEER RESOURCE BOOK listing the interests and availability of volunteers so that school staff may determine how frequently	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>a volunteer would like to participate; including options for those who are available to help at home and help match school needs with volunteer interests. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: surveys (both oral and written) as well as sign-in data from parental involvement activities and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The following EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrate that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning that are part of this program: parents and staff reported back through parental engagement activities, they feel informed about all curricular matters in terms of frameworks/standards, expectations, how to support student learning, and how to access information about school. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: surveys (both oral and written) and sign-in data from parental engagement events. 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 the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>The Principal shall designate one certified staff member who is willing to serve as a PARENT FACILITATOR in order to help organize meaningful training for staff and parents; promote and encourage a welcoming atmosphere to foster parental involvement in the school and to undertake efforts to ensure that parental participation is recognized as an asset to the school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>In order to encourage parents to participate as a full partner in the decisions that affect their child and family, our school will include in our district's student handbook the SCHOOL'S PROCESS FOR RESOLVING PARENTAL CONCERNS, including how to define a problem, who to approach first and how to develop solutions. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Parental Engagement				
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. This planning time will be provided during the course of the day. Administrators, teachers and parents of the identified students will complete the actual plan (IRI, AIP) for the child. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Cindy Ratcliff	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
An opportunity for giving formative feedback is offered to all parents through the Parent Advisory Council. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Work with Root PTO members/leadership to continue the Watch D.O.G.S. program (Dads Of Great Students). Formative assessments are derived from the goal of having 1 Watch D.O.G. Dad per school day. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with and support Root PTO Safety Committee and Parent Advisory Council. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Utilize volunteers as role models and classroom helpers in all classes. Summative evaluation will show an increase of volunteers.	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
A PARENT TEACHER ORGANIZATION exists to foster parental and community involvement within the school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Rita Savage	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Community Leaders Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Standards-based Writing: Literacy Lab, ELLA, Effective Literacy, and Harcourt Language Series				
Scientific Based Research: Mann, D., et. al, A Research Study, West Virginia Story: Achievement Gains from a Statewide Comprehensive Instructional Technology Program, 1999. Cooper, H., & Hedges, L. v. (1994) The handbook of research synthesis, New York: Russell Sage Foundation				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Summative evaluations include developing student AIP's or IRI's for any student scoring below proficient on state mandated criterion referenced exams. Other students exhibiting at-risk performance will also have an AIP or an IRI developed by parents and teachers. Action Type: AIP/IRI	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

Implement research-based writing strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of all students, including but not limited to the step-up-to-writing program. This program will require professional development across grade levels to ensure implementation with fidelity. Action Type: Equity	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	Title II-A - Purchased \$685.00 Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$685
Formative performance assessments and writing prompts with rubrics enable all students to assess and revise their own work and demonstrate proficiency in writing and responding in writing to literary, practical and content passages. Action Type: Equity	Shirley Walker	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in district level vertical and horizontal learning teams to review student work, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students in obtaining writing proficiency in all content areas. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Lindsay Sloan	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide access to a rich collection of diverse writing and reading resources through the school library. Action Type: Equity	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Library Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide opportunities for independent and group library research projects using various media resources that are integrated with classroom instruction and demonstrate an ability to communicate content knowledge through writing skills, as well as reading comprehension skills. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Melinda Jorn	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers School Library Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use technology to access reference information, collect research data, and publish student work. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shannon Nickell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in ongoing professional development in literacy skills, including training in programs such as: Effective Literacy, Literacy Lab, Dibels and Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated writing strategies for all students - particularly those with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve writing skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration	Cindy Ratcliff	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education				
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through ACTAAP and the writing continuum on K-1 and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Total Budget: \$685

Intervention: Writing Across the Curriculum

Scientific Based Research: Calkins, L., The Art of Teaching Writing; Gere, A. R. (ed.), Roots in the Sawdust: Writing to Learn Across the Disciplines; Martin, N. (ed.), Writing Across the Curriculum, 1986.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Incorporate writing skills and strategies from the Arkansas Content Frameworks into the curriculum of all content areas and vertically align Fayetteville's curriculum K-5. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Integrate writing instruction into all content areas with the help of technology. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lindsay Sloan	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
A formative evaluation will require all students to write to demonstrate their learning in all content areas, using the Arkansas Writing Rubric for scoring, and emphasizing content in non-language arts curriculum. Action Type: Equity	Melinda Jorn	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
A summative evaluation for each student includes the 4 writing assessments. Action Type: Collaboration	Shannon Nickell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through examination of lesson plans, EM open ended response items on unit tests, science and social studies open ended writing prompts, and learning notebooks used in all subject areas and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
We have been notified by the Arkansas Department of Education that our school has been granted "Safe Harbor" status with respect to literacy gains for the economically disadvantaged subpopulation during the 2009/2010 school year. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Rhonda Moore	Start: 08/01/2010 End: 07/31/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the K-5 grades Augmented Benchmark, MAT 8 and SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Disciplinary, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, and norms 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 various populations. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Literacy Priority: content and style within our writing and practical reading. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. IN addition, we meet in grade level teams, biweekly and as an entire faculty bimonthly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

Total Budget:	\$0
---------------	-----

Intervention: Reading Fluency and Comprehension Strategies

Scientific Based Research: Scott Foresman, Soar to Success; Center for Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First: The Research Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read, 1999.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Map reading instruction and collaborate to evaluate alignment with district curriculum and Arkansas Content Frameworks. Set training as needed for staff using this formative evaluation.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Julie Ogden	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Implement research-based reading strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of students using student assessment folders.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity</p>	Sarah Roberts	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Identify areas of weakness and gaps in the aligned reading curriculum by analyzing the summative evaluations of literacy scores on the CRT and NRT scores.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment</p>	Rhonda Moore	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through performance assessments and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding to</p>	Marjo Burk	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Performance Assessments Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>literature and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Participate in grade-level learning teams, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instruction to assist students in achieving reading proficiency in all content areas.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Susan O'Meara	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated reading strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve reading skills. Closing the Achievement Gap (Literacy): Regular biannual meetings of our (Literacy) ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building capacity within our school. Each meeting agenda will include the following Core Principles: A. The selection, and continuous evaluation, of research-based, scientifically validated, Interventions designed to improve our ability to improve student performance on the Literacy portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along 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 so that those strategies that prove ineffective can be revised or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each</p>	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

spring and fall in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education				
Use a variety of media to motivate students to read. Integrate technology, software, and visits to the school media center to give students access to varied selections of materials. Use flexible scheduling to allow children multiple weekly visits to the library and for library skills instruction. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Rita Savage	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • School Library • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Communicate literacy and content area expectations and student progress to parents through classroom curriculum nights, assignment sheets, graded work with accompanying rubric, parent-teacher conferences, report cards, newsletters, Web access to the curriculum and SchoolCenter. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Designated certified and classified personnel will be trained annually at both in district and out of district sites with the intended outcome of gaining differentiated and intervention strategies. Trainings will include literacy lab, ELLA, effective literacy, and response to intervention (RTI). Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas (ELLA), Effective Literacy, and Literacy Lab				
Scientific Based Research: Adams, M., Beginning to Read; Clay, M., Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T., Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions in Reading and Writing, 1994. Cunningham, P. and Allington, R., Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write; Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S., Guided Readers and Writers for Grades 3-6, 1999.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Implement balanced-literacy skills and strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of students. Action Type: Equity	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Instruct students in their "Zone of Proximal Development" utilizing formative evaluation tools including Developmental Spelling Analysis (DSA), DIBELS, and Phoenetic Connections. Action Type: Equity	Susan O'Meara	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through summative evaluations such as performance assessments, SAT 10 standardized tests, CRT benchmark assessments, observation surveys, and developmental reading assessments are used to	Marjo Burk	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>evaluate student progress in literacy learning skills and formative assessments such as progress monitoring in DIBELS and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Participate in grade-level learning teams to share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students in achieving literacy learning skills and proficiency.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to support balanced literacy strategies, and implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve literacy learning skills.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Use the district selection policy to purchase guided reading books, and other materials, to support literacy skills and strategies.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment</p>	Rita Savage	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Use the district selection policy to purchase well-reviewed trade books, and other materials, for the library to support literacy skills and strategies.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment</p>	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● Computers ● District Staff ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Use technology such as cloud-computing (websites, Wikis, blogs, Me21C), MS Office, Mecc, etc. to support literacy skills and strategies, and to publish student work.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● Computers ● District Staff ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>Kindergarten students, who score delayed in both written and oral communication on the Qualls Early Learning Inventory (QELI), and first and second grade students, who score "below basic" in reading on the SAT 10, will be considered to have a substantial reading deficiency. These children will be provided intensive reading instruction utilizing Phonetic Connection, a scientifically-based word study program. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) will be administered to all K-5 students and those who are shown to have a substantial reading deficiency will be progressed monitored. The DIBELS will be used as: A) The evaluation instrument to determine which areas of reading the child is deficient, B) The progress-monitoring instrument to document progress toward grade level proficiency, and C) The assessment instrument used for discontinuing services. Intensive reading interventions will be comprehensive in nature and will be targeted to remediate the area of deficiency. For those affected students, school personnel will develop an Intensive Reading Improvement Plan (IRI) that will describe our intervention program. Intervention will be provided in the form of additional teacher instruction time. These intervention strategies and methods will continue until each student has reached grade level proficiency in all essential areas of reading. Student achievement in each of the essential elements shall be monitored bi-weekly until proficiency occurs. Students who are not meeting current expectations shall be provided additional interventions. Each parent or guardian will be notified in writing when their child has been identified with a substantial reading deficiency. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Instruct students in their "Zone of Proximal Development" through formative evaluations of guided reading groups. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity</p>	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to support Effective Literacy and Literacy Lab strategies and implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve literacy skills Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity</p>	Sarah Roberts	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Library Media Program				
Scientific Based Research: Clyde, L. A. (ed.). Sustaining the Vision: A Collection of Articles and Papers on Research in School Librarianship; McQuillan, J. and Au, J., The Effect of Print Access on Reading Frequency; Lance, K., The Impact of School Library Media Centers on Academic Achievement, 1981.				
		Person	Source of	

Actions	Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Funds
Teach the ethical use of information to all students through technology instruction and library media skills. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Susan O'Meara	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Performance Assessments School Library Teachers Teaching Aids 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Develop lessons that integrate classroom learning with information so that students can access, evaluate and use information in any subject area. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with special and classroom teachers to develop lessons that integrate classroom instructional units with research-based information literacy strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Rita Savage	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with teachers to analyze summative assessments of student performance on the Benchmark Exam and SAT 10 in terms of information skills performance. Action Type: Collaboration	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with teachers to use performance assessments and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding to practical, content, and literary passages. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Formative evaluations include: participation in grade level meetings to share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and alignment of instructional objectives to assist all students in achieving informational literacy proficiency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Sarah Roberts	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated reading strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve information literacy skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Susan O'Meara	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide all students the opportunity for a variety of reading experiences like library instructional units, story times, shared reading experiences, reading motivation programs, reading contests, and sustained silent reading. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Library Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use the district selection policy to purchase and maintain audio visual equipment that supports reading instruction.	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers School Library 	————— ACTION \$

Action Type: Technology Inclusion		06/30/2011		BUDGET:
Maintain open times in the library schedule so to provide opportunities for independent and group library research projects that are integrated with classroom instruction and that result in student work that shows skill and knowledge in reading comprehension, written expression, content knowledge, and information literacy. Action Type: Equity	Rita Savage	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Library 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in ongoing professional development in information skills and library services. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Library 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide professional development and assistance to teachers in information access and use. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • School Library 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Communicate information literacy expectations to parents through special programs, newsletters, and Web access to the curriculum. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Leaders • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through the integration of library skills taught collaboratively with classroom teachers and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Marjo Burk	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • School Library • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Professional Development				
Scientific Based Research: National Staff Development Council, Standards for Staff Development; NSDC, Learning Teams; Nave, B., National School Reform Faculty Program Evaluation, 1990.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Marjo Burk	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Develop faculty-wide consensus on areas of focus for building-level professional development. Summative evaluations would designing and offering courses based on data.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Maintain a professional development committee that offers broad representation of teachers throughout the school.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School Library ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Use student Academic Improvement Plans, and identified special needs of students, to assess professional development needs of certified and classified staff. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Support the formation and ongoing work of Learning Teams as they collaborate share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist students in achieving reading proficiency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Sarah Roberts	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Coordinate building-level professional development with the district professional development steering committee (PDSC), and collaborate to build connections among schools. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Susan O'Meara	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Use community resources and outside consultants to provide additional expertise in meeting the professional development needs of certified staff. Training will take place throughout the school year at Root Elementary. The grade levels involved are K-5. The approximate number of teachers will be 40 with 2 administrators attending as well. The K-3 teachers are attending the arkansas reading association conference. k-1 teachers will be trained in ELLA and 2-5 teachers will be trained in ELF. The 4-5 teachers will attend the young authors conference series. All grade levels will engage in peer observation and training with the literacy coach, within-school, and within-district. School teams will attend trainings to refine and enhance the positive behavior support plan which supports academic instruction and other trainings as necessary. All teachers and administrators will participate in additional training focused on closing the achievement gap. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Community Leaders ● Computers ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Public Library ● Teachers 	<hr/> Title II-A - Materials & Supplies: \$1655.00 Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$2250.00 Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$750.00 Title II-A - Purchased Services: \$3400.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$8055
<p>All teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the school and district professional development plan.</p>	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Teachers will use an instrument developed by the district professional development committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the professional development plan, the course offerings and the effectiveness of the knowledge gained. Annually, upon review of the test data, the professional development committee, working under the guidelines of the district professional development plan, will develop a professional development plan for the school and individual teachers based on information obtained through data analysis. All new teachers and teachers in need of assistance will be assigned a mentor to assist them in reaching their 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 will no less than 60 hours of professional development including 6 hours of technology and 2 hours of parental involvement development (3 hours of Parental Involvement for Administrators) and for those who teach Arkansas History, 2 hours of training in that subject. Teachers will have the opportunity to evaluate the benefit of the professional development activities and provide formative feedback on needed changes. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>		06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	
<p>Lead teachers may have the opportunity to develop knowledge on district wide initiatives through the model schools conference, pending annual funding. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		Title II-A - Purchased \$2000.00 Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$2000
Total Budget:				\$10055
Intervention: Comprehensive System of Professional Development for Special Education Needs				
Scientific Based Research: Caldwell, S. Staff Development: A Handbook of Effective Practices, National Staff Development Council, 1989.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Assess professional development needs in the targeted areas of pre-referral interventions, positive behavioral supports, integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms (general curriculum content, modifications, differentiated instruction,	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

multiple intelligences, and co-teaching), conflict resolution and negotiation skills, assistive technology, and learning disabilities. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education				
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with teachers to enable them to identify their own needs in relation to the targeted special education areas and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Marjo Burk	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use professional development needs assessment information and special education targeted areas to plan, design, and implement building-level professional development activities. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● Computers ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use varied instructional methodologies, techniques, and resources in the classroom to address the needs of all students, including those with disabilities. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Formative evaluations include the delivery of	Elizabeth	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office 	—————

instruction to meet the special learning needs of students with disabilities based on weekly special education staffing meetings. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mitchell	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluate the implementation of the professional development plan by assessing its involvement of teachers and its focus on teacher and student needs and outcomes. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Sarah Roberts	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Summative evaluations include the designing of annual professional development for all faculty. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Rita Savage	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: School Wide Positive Behavior Support Plan

Scientific Based Research: Irvin, L.K., Horner, R.H., Ingram, K., Todd, A.W., Sugai, G., Sampson, N., & Boland, J. (2006). Using office discipline referral data for decision-making about student behavior in elementary and middle schools: An empirical investigation of validity. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8(1), 10-23.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Develop and implement universal School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) expectations, protocols, and interventions. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide professional development in the SWPBS Model. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with all stakeholders to evaluate, support and provide interventions for social competency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Community Leaders ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Develop ongoing instruction for program expectations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through conducting an individualized needs assessment with teachers to enable them to identify student needs in relation to the targeted behavior supports, an evaluation of office discipline referral data, daily classroom behavior data, and parental involvement survey. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student social competencies and academic achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged.</p>	<p>Elizabeth Mitchell</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>

Priority 2: We will work to improve mathematics.

1. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 90 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 91 students were tested and 93% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 79 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement and data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

1. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 82 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 82 students were tested and 93% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 68 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

1. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 83 students were tested and 83% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 79 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 84 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and data analysis and probability (open-response).

1. IEP Students: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 10 students were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 14 students were tested and 57% scored proficient or advanced.

IEP Students: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 14 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008 fewer than "10" students were tested on the Grade 4

Benchmark Exam.

IEP Students: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 13 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008 and 2009 fewer than 10 students were tested.

1. LEP Students: In 2008, 2009 and 2010 fewer than "10" students were tested in Grades 3, 4, and 5.
1. SES:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 16 students were tested and 69% were proficient or advanced. In 2009, 17 students were tested and 88% were proficient or advanced. In 2008, 16 students were tested and 57% were proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement and data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 15 students were tested and 86% were proficient or advanced. In 2009, 16 students were tested and 69% were proficient or advanced. In 2008, 12 students were tested and 83% were proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 16 students were tested and 44% were proficient or advanced. In 2009, 20 students were tested and 64% were proficient or advanced. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 70% were proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice and open-response) and data analysis and probability (open-response).

1. Caucasian: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 74 students were tested and 91% were proficient or advanced. In 2009, 76 students were tested and 92% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 73 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement and data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

1. Caucasian: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 68 students were tested and 95% were proficient or advanced. In 2009, 77 students were tested and 95% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

1. Caucasian: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 80 students were tested and 85% were proficient or advanced. In 2009, 69 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and data analysis and probability (open-response).

1. Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, African American, and Native American fewer than "10" students were tested in 2008, 2009 and 2010.
1. Attendance Rate:
In 2008, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2009, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2010, the attendance rate was 96%.
1. Grade K-Iowa SAT 10 2008:

We don't have this data due to the loss of materials by UPS truck. The State Department will verify.

Grade 1-SAT 10:
Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 77 students were tested and 77% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 10 students were tested and 30% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 13 students were tested and 54% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 85% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 67 students were tested and 87% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 14 students were tested and 64% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 79 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 73 students were tested and 73% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 31% scored above the 50th percentile.

Students with Disabilities: 16 students were tested and 38% scored above the 50th percentile.

**Supporting
Data:**

Grade 4-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 84% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 65 students were tested and 85% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 12 students were tested and 67% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 884 Students were tested and 82% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 75 students were tested and 87% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 10 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

Students with Disabilities: 10 students were tested and 60% scored above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade K-Iowa MAT -8 2009:
Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 78 students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 11 students were tested and 27% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 93 Students were tested and 67% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 84 students were tested and 73% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 15 students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th

percentile.

SES: 19 students were tested and 32% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 90 Students were tested and 69% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 78 students were tested and 72% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 38% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 91 Students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 76 students were tested and 79% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 17 students were tested and 65% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 10 students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 77 students were tested and 84% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 14 students were tested and 56% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 47% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 80 Students were tested and 72% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 69 students were tested and 77% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 22 students were tested and 47% scored above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade K-Iowa MAT -8 2010:

Combined Population: 86 Students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 75 students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 17 students were tested and 65% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1-SAT 10 2010:

Combined Population: 99 Students were tested and 83% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 85 students were tested and 88% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 16 students were tested and 56% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 18 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2010:

Combined Population: 91 Students were tested and 75% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 78 students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 20 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 13 students were tested and 31% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2010:
 Combined Population: 90 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 74 students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 38% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2010:
 Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 84% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 68 students were tested and 85% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 15 students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2010:
 Combined Population: 83 Students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 80 students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

SES: 16 students were tested and 38% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: 13 students were tested and 62% scored above the 50th percentile.

Goal All students will improve in mathematic skills and respond to constructed response questions with additional attention to 'data analysis and probability' and 'measurement' mathematic strands.

Benchmark "The Combined Population and each Subpop MET the 2010 AYP target. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (McGraw-Hill)				
Scientific Based Research: Isaacs, A., Carroll, W., and Bell, M., A Research-Based Curriculum: The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum; Mann, D., et. al, A Research Study, West Virginia Story: Achievement Gains from a Statewide Comprehensive Instructional Technology Program, 1998.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Implement Everyday Mathematics lessons and formative assessments according to district curriculum and identified needs of students in K-5 classrooms. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity	Nicky Anderson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in learning teams to share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students in achieving mathematics proficiency. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Brittany Scism	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve mathematics	Patty Poore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>skills. Closing the Achievement Gap (Math): Regular biannual meetings of our (Math) ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building capacity within our school. Each meeting agenda will include the following Core Principles: A. The selection, and continuous evaluation, of research-based, scientifically validated, Interventions designed to improve our ability to improve student performance on the Math portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along 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 so that those strategies, which prove ineffective, can be revised, or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each spring, and fall, in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>Analyze student summative performance on the Benchmark and SAT 10 exams in terms of student mathematics achievement and progress.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Brittany Scism	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Communicate mathematics expectations and student progress to parents through classroom assignment sheets, parent-teacher conferences, graded work, report cards, newsletters, and Web access to the curriculum.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through ACTAAP, SAT 10, EM unit tests and formatively through EM games and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether</p>	Rusty Folsom	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the K-5 grades Augmented Benchmark, MAT 8 and SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Disciplinary, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, and norms 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 various populations. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Math Priority: data analysis and probability and measurement. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. IN addition, we meet in grade level teams, biweekly and as an entire faculty bimonthly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Computation and Procedural Fluency				
Scientific Based Research: Standards in Classroom Practice - USDE, McRel, OERI 2201, 2001.				
Actions	Person	Timeline	Resources	Source of

	Responsible			Funds
Integrate supplemental computational strategies and materials into the daily math program. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Elizabeth Hatfield	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Using summative evaluations of performance assessments and quarterly assessments to determine effectiveness of supplemental computation strategies in improving overall mathematics achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Rusty Folsom	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Designated certified personnel will be trained annually at both in district and out of district sites with the intended outcome of gaining differentiated and intervention strategies. Trainings will include Everyday Math, Mastery Math Facts, CBM and Response to Intervention (RTI). Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Open-Response Problem Strategies				
Scientific Based Research: Smart Start; Smart Step; NCSI-performance assessments; Reeves, Doug. Making Standards Work, 1998				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Train certified staff on the use of formative and summative performance assessments, scoring guides (rubrics), and Benchmark open-response scoring. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Susie Parham	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	
Review student performance on open-response problems as part of curriculum mapping and implementation of existing programs. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Gayle O'Donnell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluate teacher and student achievement gains in improving open-response performance, and determine effectiveness in reducing achievement gaps. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Summative evaluations such as performance assessments, SAT 10 standardized tests, CRT benchmark assessments and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Rusty Folsom	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Math Curriculum Mapping and Alignment				
Scientific Based Research: Heide Hayes Jacobs-"Mapping the Big Picture" NSCI, 1997.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Participate in weekly grade level meetings to compare current curriculum map to students' areas of strengths and weaknesses. Formative evaluations include adjusting pacing and changing focus as a result of this collaboration. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Patty Poore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Do professional development, curriculum alignment, and test data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Mapping classroom and grade level curriculum for comparison to District Math Curriculum and identify areas of weakness in summative assessments of SAT 10 and Benchmark Exam scores and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Rusty Folsom	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Request professional development opportunities that address areas of concern determined in the curriculum mapping process. Action Type: Professional Development</p>	John Griesse	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: School Wide Positive Behavior Support Plan				
<p>Scientific Based Research: Irvin, L.K., Horner, R.H., Ingram, K., Todd, A.W., Sugai, G., Sampson, N., & Boland, J. (2006). Using office discipline referral data for decision-making about student behavior in elementary and middle schools: An empirical investigation of validity. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8(1), 10-23.</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Develop and implement universal School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) expectations, protocols, and interventions. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Elizabeth Mitchell	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Provide professional development in the SWPBS Model. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Mindy Duell	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Collaborate with all stakeholders to evaluate,	Elizabeth	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative 	

support and provide interventions for social competency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Mitchell	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	Staff ● Community Leaders ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Develop ongoing instruction for program expectations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Julie Ogden	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through conducting an individualized needs assessment with teachers to enable them to identify student needs in relation to the targeted behavior supports, an evaluation of office discipline referral data, daily classroom behavior data, and parental involvement survey. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student social competencies and academic achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations including economically disadvantaged. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 3: To increase student awareness and knowledge of the effects of good nutrition and physical activity.

1. Body Mass Index Data 2007-2008: of the 217 student population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Grade K: Males 26.0%, 32.6%Females Grade 1: NA Grade 2: Males 22.2%, 31.7% Females Grade 3: NA Grade 4: Males 30.6%, 29.2% Females Grade 5: NA
2. Body Mass Index Data 2008-2009: of the 277 student population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Grade K: Males 35.0%, 26%Females Grade 1: NA Grade 2: Males 26%, 30% Females Grade 3: NA Grade 4: Males 35%, 32% Females Grade 5: NA
3. National Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS):2005 The percentage of 9-12 grade students that did not participate in any vigorous or moderate physical activity has not significantly changed since 1999.

The number of students who attended physical education classes on one or more days in an average week when they were in school has not significantly changed since 1995.

The number of students who watched television on an average school day for three or more hours per day has significantly decreased (5.6%) since 1999.

1. Free/Reduced Rate (SES): In 2008 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 17%. In 2007 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 17%.
1. The 2007-2008 School Health Index Survey indicates that Module 2 Health Education and Module 8 Family and Community Involvement are the two areas of concern.
1. The 2008-2009 School Health Index Survey indicates that Module 7 Health Promotion for Staff and Module 8 Family and Community Involvement are the two areas of concern.

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 increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.
- Benchmark** To decrease the number of students at risk of overweight and students overweight by 1/2% annually.

Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of physical activity for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: George, MA.,and Sellers, W. (Eds). (1993) The Michigan model for comprehensive school health education. Central Michigan Univeristy.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Within a 6 day rotation cycle our students are participate in 3 60 minute Physical Education classes. Our teachers also will provide a 15 minutes of physical activity per day. Action Type: Wellness	Bright Bullard	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk of overweight or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Sharon Hanby	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implement and encourage participation in physical education program taught by a highly qualified teacher that supports physical activity. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Cheri Murphy	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Promote reduction of time children spend engaged in sedentary activities such as watching television and playing video games by sending home informational packages that include tips for parents/caregivers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Ashley Parette	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Encourage participation in family oriented, community-based physical activity program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Elizabeth Mitchell</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through a student and parent survey and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Tony Bishop</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Wellness Leadership Team and analyzed 2010 BMI data and health index surveys from families, students, faculty and staff. We examined the results from both the combined population for grades K, 2 and 4 (BMI data) and male/female subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. We examined our routines, customs, and norms in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Wellness Priority: Module 7 (Health Promotion for staff) and Module 8 (Family and Community Involvement). We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Rhonda Moore</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>
<p>Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of sound nutritional practices for lifelong health and wellness.</p>				

Scientific Based Research: George, MA.,and Sellers, W. (Eds). (1993) The Michigan model for comprehensive school health education. Central Michigan Univeristy.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Implement Kids for Health, Farm to School, offering nutritional choices to students daily on the lunch line, and overall emphasis on good nutrition to parents and students. Action Type: Wellness	Cathy VonHatten	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Student BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk of overweight or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Sudie Henderson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through a student and parent survey and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Tony Bishop	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4: We will work to improve our scores within our ELL population.

1. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 91 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 79 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 67 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

1. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 82 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 68 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 84 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical(multiple choice) and literary (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

1. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 79 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 84 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 83 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and practical (multiple choice) and practical (open-response) passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style.

1. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 91 students were tested and 93% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 79 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 67 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement and data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

1. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 82 students were tested and 93% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 68 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 84 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response).

1. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 79 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 84 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 83 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice and open-response)and data analysis and probability (open-response).

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

Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 76% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed a weakness in vocabulary.

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

Combined Population: 85 Students were tested and 59% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed a weakness in vocabulary.

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

Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed a weakness in vocabulary.

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

Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed a weakness in

comprehension.

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

Combined Population: 85 Students were tested and 87% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed a weakness in comprehension.

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

Combined Population: 83 Students were tested and 86% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed a weakness in comprehension.

1. Grade K-Iowa SAT 10 2008:

We don't have this data due to the loss of materials by UPS truck. The State Department will verify.

Grade 1-SAT 10:

Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 49% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 63% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 79 Students were tested and 67% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 84 Students were tested and 88% scored above the 50th percentile.

**Supporting
Data:**

1. Grade K-Iowa MAT -8 2009:

Combined Population: 85 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1-SAT 10:

Combined Population: 93 Students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 90 Students were tested and 54% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 91 Students were tested and 56% in Reading and 56% in Language scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 81% in reading and 56% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 80 Students were tested and 81% in reading and 62% in language scored above the 50th percentile.

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

Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed a weakness in problem solving.

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

Combined Population: 85 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed a weakness in math problems.

Grade 2-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:
Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 77% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed a weakness in problem solving.

Grade 3-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:
Combined Population: 67 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed a weakness in math computation.

Grade 4-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:
Combined Population: 85 Students were tested and 84% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed a weakness in math computation.

Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007:
Combined Population: 83 Students were tested and 88% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the math subtests revealed a weakness in Problem Solving and Data Interpretation and math computation.

1. Grade K-Iowa SAT 10 2008:

We don't have this data due to the loss of materials by UPS truck. The State Department will verify.

Grade 1-SAT 10:
Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 85% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 79 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 84% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 884 Students were tested and 82% scored above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade K-Iowa MAT -8 2009:

Combined Population: 87 Students were tested and 74% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 93 Students were tested and 67% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 90 Students were tested and 69% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 91 Students were tested and 78% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 5-SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 80 Students were tested and 72% scored above the 50th percentile.

Goal All ELL students will improve in reading comprehension, written expression, and mathematic skills and respond to constructed response questions with proficiency.

Benchmark The non-reported subpopulation of ELL met the 2009 AYP target of 64% in literacy and 62.5% in math scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected thatt this subpopulation will meet, or exceed, the 2010 AYP target of 71.2% in literacy and 70% in math scoring proficient/advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: We will employ Highly Qualified Instructors.				
Scientific Based Research:				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
We will employ a highly qualified ELL teacher (.50 FTE) to provide instruction and intervention for those sudents identified by ELDA for service. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through CRT, NRT and ELDA assessments and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will report these results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: a percentage gain was made across this subpopulation. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the K-5 grades Augmented Benchmark, MAT 8 and SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Disciplinary, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines,	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>customs, and norms 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 various populations. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Literacy Priority: content and style within our writing and practical reading. In the Math Priority: data analysis and probability and measurement. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. IN addition, we meet in grade level teams, biweekly and as an entire faculty bimonthly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 5:

1. An analysis of the 2009-2010 data for Fayetteville suggests that there is a possible disproportionate representation of Black students (overrepresented) and White students (underrepresented) within the category of mental retardation. A district identified for disproportionality must under Federal regulations ensure that its current policies, procedures and practices used to identify students for SPED are sound and free of bias with regard to a student's race, ethnicity or linguistic diversity.
 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 students are African American. 66% of placed students are 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 school year

<p>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 early intervention strategies, school-based intervention teams and early Literacy strategies.</p>
<p>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, Dahlin, Durant and Xiang, Feb. 1, 2010. Linking MAP to State Tests: Proficiency Cut Score Estimation Procedures, NWEA For Early Intervening: Early Intervening An Administrators Guide, National Alliance of Black School Educators, IDEA partnerships, IDEAS that Work, US Office of Special Education Programs, Council for Exceptional Children, ADE, Sped., Coordinated Early Intervening Services Workshop, Hardin, Watkins, Fields, and Smart. October 13, 2008. RTI Guide: Development of Response to Intervention Model in Your School, John McCook, 2006. Coordinated Early Intervention Policy, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, P. Burdette, 2008. For Lit Coaches: The Literacy Coach, A Key to Improving Teaching and 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 provided to all students K-7 Individual</p>

Progress Monitoring by RTI teams and Literacy Coaches and analyzed. Instruction and Interventions will be assessed and modified based on analysis of data. Data on Referrals, Evaluations, Disability Categories, and Placements including the race will be collected and analyzed. Curriculum department/Curriculum leaders will review district data routinely regarding progress in core curriculum and Interventions to assess progress. Lit Coaches will review data routinely to assess progress. Modifications to Professional Development plans, Intervention Plans and Intervention Team process will be identified in relation to progress on data and Referral data.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>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 grade-level in Reading. Students will receive targeted, intensive interventions in small groups. These students will be tracked to monitor progress. This is an early-intervention program meant to prevent students from being inappropriately placed in SPED programs and inappropriately labeled. Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>: Fayetteville Schools will conduct a book study exploring the issues related to cultural diversity and race in the educational realm. The book study will focus on targeted staff, and include "The Courageous Conversation about Race". These efforts will keep all CIAA staff aware of issues related to diverse cultural and ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Action 3: 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 targets are as follows: K-5: Literacy: 78.40% Math: 77.50% 6-8: Literacy: 75.70% Math: 73.41% 9-12: Literacy: 75.81% Math: 73.45% Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The Fayetteville School 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 purchased using IDEA title VI-B CEIS funds. Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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 involved with the training and coaching and this will be coordinated with SPED cultural diversity and learning environment awareness. Interventionists and Aides will also be involved. Kelly Brown, our specialist involved with coordinated early intervening services, will enhance and expand the problem solving teams work. Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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, the early childhood ages 3-5 and school age 5-21. In the 2009-2010 school year, the school age percentage was 100% which meets the goal from 2009 Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Fayetteville Schools will purchase early intervention materials, including Read 180 and System 44 kits, that</p>	Debra Wilson	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p>		<p>ACTION</p>

will be proactive in meeting the needs of all learners in hopes of preventing inappropriate SPED referrals. Action Type: Special Education		End: 06/30/2011		BUDGET: \$
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 inappropriate SPED referrals. Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
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: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
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: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
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: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Funding from Title VI, Coordinating Early Intervening Services will be used for the following initiatives: English K/Primary Curriculum Oral Language Good Habits/Great Readers Blend Charts/ABC Charts Word/Vocabulary Skills MAP testing licenses Total CEIS budget for Root Elementary: \$17,338.88 Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
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. Instruction and Interventions will be assessed and modified based on analysis of data. Data on Referrals, Evaluations, Disability Categories, and Placements including the race will be collected and analyzed. Curriculum department/Curriculum leaders will review district data routinely regarding progress in core curriculum and Interventions to assess progress. Lit Coaches will review data routinely to assess progress. Modifications to Professional Development plans, Intervention Plans and Intervention Team process will be identified in relation to progress on data and Referral data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

- Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Anne Garrett	Grade K	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Ashley Parette	Grade 3	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Bright Bullard	Grade 1	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Brittany Scism	Grade 2	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Cathy VonHatten	Art	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Cheri Murphy	PAC - 4	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Crissa Mitchell	Grade 1	ACSIP Co-Chair

Classroom Teacher	Delia Gorder	Grade 1	Title V, Literacy - Writing Chair
Classroom Teacher	Gayle O'Donnell	Gifted and Talented	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	John Griesse	Grade 3	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Julie Ogden	Grade 1	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Karen Rosso	Grade 1 and 2	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Lindsay Dees	Grade 2	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Marie Walden	Grade K	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Marjo Burk	Grade 5	ACSIP Co-Chair
Classroom Teacher	Melinda Jorn	Grade 3	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Nicky Anderson	Grade K	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Patty Poore	Grade 5	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Rita Savage	Music	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Rusty Folsom	Grade 3	Mathematics - Chair
Classroom Teacher	Sarah Roberts	Grade 4	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Shannon Nickell	Grade 4	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Sharon Hanby	Grade 2	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Shirley Walker	Grade 5	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Sudie Henderson	Gifted and Talented	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Susan O'Meara	Grade 4	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Tony Bishop	PE	Wellness-Chair
District-Level Professional	Christie Jay	Federal Programs Coordinator	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Lester Long	Mathematics Specialist	Mathematics
District-Level Professional	Linda Auman	Supt. Administrative Assistant	Mathematics, Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Cindy Ratcliff	Resource	Literacy - Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	D.J. Rush	Curriculum Technology Specialist	Mathematics
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Diane Carpenter	Librarian	Literacy - Reading
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Elizabeth Hatfield	Speech Pathologist	Mathematics
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Elizabeth Mitchell	ESL	Literacy - Reading
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mindy Duell	Special Education	Literacy - Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Susie Parham	Counselor	Mathematics
Parent	Anne Kathrine Jouett	PAC	Literacy - Reading
Parent	Cheryl Wiebe	Parent Advisory Council	Mathematics
Parent	Jim Price	PAC	Literacy - Reading
Parent	Kathy Wade	Parent Advisory Council	Literacy-Writing
Parent	Laura Lindsey	PAC - K	Wellness
Parent	Paul Wilson-Scott	PAC - 1	Mathematics
Principal	Rhonda Moore	Principal	ACSIP Leadership