



2010-2011 ARCHIVE

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

VANDERGRIFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2010-2011

The mission of Vandergriff Elementary School is to help all students reach high levels of learning and become responsible citizens in a changing world.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Not Applicable

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will improve reading comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary skills. 80% of students below the 50th percentile will meet or exceed their growth increment with regard to MAP testing in Literacy.

Goal: All students will improve writing skills especially with respect to content and style.

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to Geometry and Measurement.

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 students will improve in reading familiar text and learn strategies to comprehend and build their vocabulary bank.

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: Improving Literacy

1. 2010 Grade 3 Benchmark Exam (Literacy) 115 students were tested and 91% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced. 17 students were tested and 77% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored proficient or advanced; There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school; 11 students were tested and 54% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced; There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school; There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school; 104 students were tested and 92% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population Students in the five writing domains were content and style. The lowest identified

areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is practical and open response is content. 2010 Grade 4 Benchmark Exam (Literacy) 119 students were tested and 95% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced; 17 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced; There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school; 10 students were tested and 70% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced; There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school; There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school; 104 students were tested and 95% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area for the Combined Population Students in the five writing domains is in mechanics. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response is practical. 2010 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam (Literacy) 125 students were tested and 90% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced. 17 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced; There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school; 12 Students with Disabilities (IEP) were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school; There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school; 112 students were tested and 90% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population Students in the five writing domains are content and style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is content and open response are practical and content.

2. 2009 Grade 3 Benchmark Exam (Literacy)

112 students were tested and 91% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
11 students were tested and 45% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
98 students were tested and 89% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

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

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

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

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

2009 Grade 4 Benchmark Exam (Literacy)

123 students were tested and 91% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced;
13 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students were tested and 54% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
13 students were tested and 61% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;

There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
108 students were tested and 93% of the Caucasian Students scored
proficient or advanced.

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

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

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

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

2009 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam (Literacy)

110 students were tested and 90% of the Combined Population Students
scored proficient or advanced.
There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested
in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested
in our school;
10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) were tested and 70% scored proficient
or advanced.
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
99 students were tested and 90% of the Caucasian Students scored
proficient or advanced.

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

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

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

1. 2008 Grade 3 Benchmark Exam (Literacy)

119 students were tested and 88% of the Combined Population Students
scored proficient or advanced.
10 students were tested and 50% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES)
students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested
in our school;
13 students were tested and 46% of the
Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
109 students were tested and 89% of the Caucasian Students scored
proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified areas for the Combined Population Students in the

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

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

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

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

2008 Grade 4 Benchmark Exam (Literacy)

107 students were tested and 93% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
13 students were tested and 84% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
96 students were tested and 94% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

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

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

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

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

2008 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam (Literacy)

128 students were tested and 92% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
15 students were tested and 67% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
110 students were tested and 91% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

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

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

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

1. MAT K 2010 Literacy data:

Combined Population: 104 students were tested and 90% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

MAT K 2009 Literacy data:

Combined Population: 86 students were tested and 87% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

MAT K 2008 Literacy data:

Combined Population: 116 students were tested and 86% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian students: 111 students were tested and 85% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

Supporting Data:

1. Grade 1- SAT-10 2010: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: 90 students were tested and 80% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 1- SAT-10 2009: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: 119 students were tested and 74% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 1- SAT-10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: In 2008, 108 students were tested and 63% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 18 students were tested and 50% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 12 students were tested and 50% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 102 students were tested and 64% had an NPR

score of 50, or above.

1. Grade 2- SAT 10 2010: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: 122 students were tested and 78% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 2- SAT 10 2009: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: 110 students were tested and 65% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 2- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: In 2008, 108 students were tested and 76% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 12 students were tested and 33% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 10 students were tested and 40% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students: In 2008, 10 students were tested and 80% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 94 students were tested and 75% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

1. Grade 3- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: In 2008, 120 students were tested and 73% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 10 students were tested and 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 15 students were tested and 40% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 109 students were tested and 74% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 111 Students were tested and 81% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Reading Comprehension. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

19 Students were tested and 73.7% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Comprehension.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

1. Grade 4- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Reading

Comprehension: In 2008, 107 students were tested and 93% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 13 students were tested and 85% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 96 students were tested and 93% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 122 Students were tested and 82% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Reading Comprehension. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary and Spelling.

16 students were tested and 62.5% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary and Spelling.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

13 students were tested and 69.3% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Comprehension and Spelling.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school. There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

104 students were tested and 87.5 % of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above in Reading Comprehension. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Comprehension and Spelling.

1. Grade 5- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension: In 2008, 129 students were tested and 88% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 15 students were tested and 73% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 110 students were tested and 86% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 97 Students were tested and 80% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Reading Comprehension. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Spelling.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested

in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

12 students were tested and 41.6% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Spelling and Comprehension.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

96 students were tested and 81.3 % of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above in Reading Comprehension. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Comprehension.

1. 9) Attendance Rate: In 2010, the attendance rate for the building was 96%. In 2009, the attendance rate for the building was 96.4%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 96%.
1. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ACSIP leadership teams met and analyzed the test scores from the 2009 administration of the Augmented Benchmark exam. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness.

Throughout the year, instructional teams will meet to analyze formative and summative assessments, as well as data regarding attendance and discipline. Teams will meet specifically to disaggregate data to best plan for student learning. Analysis of formative assessments developed by our own teachers will allow us to better identify specific needs of students. BASED ON OUR SUMMATIVE DATA, THE GREATEST NEEDS ARE IN CONTENT AND STYLE IN WRITING, AND OPEN RESPONSE WRITING TO PRACTICAL (FUNCTIONAL) READING PASSAGES. We will select interventions for team time and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas.

Grade level teams, along with specialty staff, meet weekly to review data from formative and summative assessments. Data is also analyzed in all-faculty meetings and used to make decisions regarding instructional priorities and professional development. We will select interventions and coordinated our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas.

1. Vandergriff's AYP Status for the 2010 year was: Achieving;
Vandergriff's AYP Status for the 2009 year was: Achieving; Vandergriff's AYP Status for the 2008 year was: Meets Standards

Goal All students will improve reading comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary skills. 80% of students below the 50th percentile will meet or exceed their growth increment with regard to MAP testing in Literacy.

Benchmark The Combined Population and each subgroup MET the 2010 AYP target of 64% scoring Proficient/Advanced. The status of the school for 2010 is achieving. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP target of scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Faculty and staff will receive quality professional development and collaborative time that will promote and enhance achievement for all students.				
Scientific Based Research: "Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development", Joellen Killion, 2002, www.nsd.org; "Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work- New Insights for Improving Schools", Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, 2008.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The following professional development will be provided: All teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the school and district professional development plan. Teachers will use a formative evaluation developed by the	Bert Stark, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>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 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 feedback on needed changes. Faculty members will collaborate to improve their grade level literacy instruction with twelve hours of specific work in word study. (National Staff Development Council Standards, 2001)</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Improved access to a district literacy specialist, a specialist in resource strategies, an interventionist, and an in-building literacy specialist will improve our ongoing professional development as faculty members put to practice research-based programs, assessments and interventions.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM: A representative group of faculty will steer alignment of literacy curriculum with the input of district literacy specialists and attention to Rigor, Relevance and Relationships training.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: An analysis of data from the Benchmark exam 2010 shows that while we are high-achieving, we still are in danger of not making adequate yearly progress in subgroups of free/reduced lunch population and</p>	Andrea Segó, assistant principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

students with IEPs. As we seek to reach our goal of success in literacy for all of our students, we will evaluate during the year with teacher-made formative assessments, MAPs data and Benchmark 2011 data. We will modify instruction and seek to implement various strategies to achieve success for all students. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Administrators and faculty will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parent involvement strategies and the importance of setting expectations and creating a climate conducive parental participation. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marci Tate	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff School Library Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Vandergriff Staff will continue to receive training through outside consultants, materials and a variety of PD workshops that focus on the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) model and Rigor, Relevance and Relationships. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	Title II-A - Purchased \$6900.00 Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$6900
Total Budget:				\$6900

Intervention: Teachers will improve implementation of a comprehensive, balanced, literacy program with the addition of model classrooms and in-house, "real-time" professional development and resources provided by district literacy specialists.

Scientific Based Research: Allington, R., Classrooms that Work: They Can All Read and Write 1999, Longman.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
District literacy specialists will provide support as needed to implement and improve phonemic awareness instruction and intervention as needed in the comprehensive literacy program.	MeMe Hagers, music teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
District literacy specialists will provide support and training for teachers to improve fidelity to the comprehensive literacy model with focus on word study and small group instruction. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	April Miller, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Demonstrate fidelity to district adopted comprehensive literacy programs and suggested schedules for instruction. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Brandy Vann, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Instruct students in their instructional reading level through guided reading groups. Action Type: Equity	Sherri Wheeler, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Purchase guided reading books and other supplies for implementation within classrooms.	Lori Sherman,	Start: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff 	

Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	second grade teacher	End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Grade level teachers will meet to review student data, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students to achieve proficiency in literacy skills through "TEAM TIME". Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Andrea Segó, assistant principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Study MAPs data, formative classroom assessments, Dibels, as well as NRT/CRT data to evaluate student progress in literacy. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lora Horne, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve literacy skills. A specifically targeted group of at-risk students will be placed in the Barton program with an interventionist. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff School Library Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
District literacy specialists will meet with grade level groups during plan time and/or after school during collaborative hours to provide professional development and resources. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
District literacy specialists will provide faculty with training in using Mondo, an oral language and comprehension screening tool. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Lora Horne, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
One class per grade level will serve as a "model classroom," working closely with the district literacy specialist to improve instruction. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will partipate in Comprehensive Literacy training: ELLA and ELF. All teachers are expected to complete two years of specialized training for grade levels with which they work. Action Type: Professional Development	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT summative assessments, local formative assessments 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, yet causes us to look more closely at this intervention in order to increase student achievement at higher levels: An average of 79% of the 1st and 2nd grade students had an NPR of 50, or above. During	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol, but include Dibels scores in evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. 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.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

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

Intervention: Improve use of a variety of reading and higher-level thinking strategies across the curriculum

Scientific Based Research: Allington, R., Classrooms that Work: They Can All Read and Write 1999, Longman.; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T., Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions Across Reading and Writing 1998, Stenhouse Publishers. Living in Quadrant D, Willard R. Daggett, Ed.D, CEO and Raymond J. McNulty, President International Center for Leadership in Education

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Provide access to a rich collection of diverse resources through the school library.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity</p>	Marci Tate, media specialist	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p> <p>End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● District Staff ● School Library ● Teachers 	<p>—————</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Faculty will collaborate to specifically address holes in the curriculum and our instruction that affect content and practical reading.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	Andrea Sego, assistant principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p> <p>End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<p>—————</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies using Reading 180 and Lexia in the computer lab and on classroom computers.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Bert Stark, principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p> <p>End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teaching Aids 	<p>—————</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Develop formative assessments that allow students more practice and teachers more opportunities for assessment of written responses to reading passages.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Holly Smith	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p> <p>End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers 	<p>—————</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Share information from workshops and conventions during faculty meetings and in-service days, quarterly.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Brandy Vann, kindergarten teacher	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p> <p>End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<p>—————</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Incorporate reading comprehension skills and strategies from the Arkansas Frameworks into</p>	Julie Ramsey, ESL	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff 	<p>—————</p>

the curriculum of every content area and align vertically from kindergarten through fifth grade. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	teacher	End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Highly qualified teachers will collaborate with parents to develop student IRIs. Students who scored below proficient on state mandated criterion and norm referenced exams and any other students identified by classroom teachers through screening assessments will have an IRI. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Integrate available technology to increase rigor and relevance of reading curriculum for our students. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Darla Livermore, fourth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● School Library ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Clarify reading expectations of students for parents by communication through classroom newsletters, class websites, conferences, and curriculum nights. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Improve use of volunteers to tutor students. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Karen Wikholm, third grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Map classroom instruction in reading to evaluate alignment with district curriculum and Arkansas Content Frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	April Miller, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The QELI will be administered to all kindergarten students and first graders who are new to FPS in the fall. The SAT 10 will be administered to all kindergarten and first graders in the spring to identify those students who are on track for reading success as well as those who may be at risk for reading difficulties. Additional formative diagnostic assessments will be administered to those students shown to be at risk of reading failure. Progress will be monitored using classroom running records and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). DIBELS will be administered to all K-5 students in order to depict those who have a substantial reading deficiency. The formative DIBELS assessment will be used as: A. An 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. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Kathy Butler, third grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students identified with reading difficulty will receive additional phonemic awareness instruction and intensive reading interventions in small groups. Teachers will develop an	Lora Horne, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Intensive Reading Improvement Plan (IRI) that describes the intervention program. Intensive reading interventions will be comprehensive in nature and will be targeted to remediate the area of deficiency. Parents or guardians will be notified in writing when their child has been identified with a substantial reading deficiency. Progress will be monitored bi-weekly until expectation is met and maintained. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	
<p>Provide Team Time interventions for those students who are not meeting proficiency in literacy using DIBELS, Benchmark, SAT 10, MAPS and common formative assessment data. Action Type: AIP/IRI</p>	<p>Andrea Segó, assistant principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT summative assessments, local formative assessments 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. During the 2009-2010 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. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Bert Stark, principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Instructional teams will use research based strategies in intervention groups with ELL students to maximize and increase proficiency in literacy. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Julie Ramsey, ESL teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ACSIP leadership teams met and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the Augmented Benchmark exam. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. We've studied the last three years to determine the literacy needs in our building. Throughout the year, instructional teams will meet to analyze formative and summative assessments. Teams will meet specifically to disaggregate data to best plan for student</p>	<p>Bert Stark, principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

learning. Analysis of formative assessments developed by our own teachers as well as our new MAPs data will allow us to better identify specific needs of students. We will select interventions for team time and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. Grade level teams, along with specialty staff, meet weekly to review data from formative and summative assessments. Data is also analyzed in all-faculty meetings and used to make decisions regarding instructional priorities and professional development. We will select interventions and coordinated our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Teachers will read and discuss Rigor, Relevance and Relationships and challenge themselves to plan instruction in "quadrant d." Action Type: Professional Development	Teresa Cornett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Teachers will use interventions and strategies that best improve reading fluency and decoding skills.				
Scientific Based Research: National Reading Panel Report (2000), The Fluent Reader (2003), Strategies That Work (2000).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will participate in Comprehensive Literacy training to learn about fluency instruction (Literacy Lab). Teachers will receive training throughout the year and participate in study groups to read, study, and learn to utilize the text, The Fluent Reader. Action Type: Professional Development	Robin Yoakum, fifth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students will receive explicit instruction in fluency as a part of the core reading program. The teacher will monitor the level of implementation in classrooms according to the observation protocol. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Sherman, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Formative reading assessments will be administered to identify students who are on track for reading success as well as those who may be at risk for reading difficulties. Additional diagnostic assessments will be administered to those students shown to be at risk of reading failure. Progress will be monitored until the student reaches expected levels of performance within AIPs. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Kathy Butler, third grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use Team Time and other opportunities for "double doses" of reading interventions. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration	Andrea Sego, assistant principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	—————

<p>Intervention through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT summative assessments, local formative assessments 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: 92% of the 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. 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. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>		End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Faculty will participate in onsite training aided by district literacy specialists regarding the six syllable types that are useful for decoding. Instruction of these types will be implemented in whole-group and intervention instruction as needed.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Kathy Butler	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Faculty and administration will encourage the communication and use of technology and other resources that will assist parents in working with their children on literacy achievement.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Kathy Butler	Start: 07/30/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal All students will improve writing skills especially with respect to content and style.

Benchmark

Intervention: Students will be given multiple opportunities to write for a variety of purposes and audiences as writing is integrated with other subject matter for rigor and relevance.				
Scientific Based Research: Auman, M., Step Up to Writing 1999, Sopris West.; Calkins, L., The Art of Teaching Writing 1986, Heinemann.; McTighe, J., and Wiggins, G., Understanding by Design 1999, ASCD.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Provide access to a rich collection of diverse, current resources on curriculum topics through the school library.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity</p>	Marci Tate, media specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Review student work, share effective	Kelli Stull,	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative 	

teaching and assessment strategies to assist all students to achieve proficiency in writing. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	fourth grade teacher	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Integrate literacy strategies with content areas to enable students to find, access, evaluate, use and write about information in any subject area. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Marci Tate, media specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Computers ● School Library ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Share information from workshops and conventions during faculty meetings and on in-service days. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Christye Hudson, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Outside Consultants ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implement writing workshop as a daily portion of the comprehensive literacy program and check curriculum maps for alignment with district and state K-5 curriculum. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Mary E. Gibbs, special education	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implement research-based writing strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of students. Action Type: Equity	Teri Eklund, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Require students to demonstrate their learning by writing across the curriculum while using the Arkansas Scoring Guide. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Susan Wizer, fourth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for all students, as well as those with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve writing skills through differentiated instruction and team time intervention and enrichment groups. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity	Teresa Cornett, third grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Communicate writing expectations and student progress in writing to parents through classroom assignment sheets, parent-teacher conferences, graded work, newsletters, Web access to the curriculum and parent curriculum nights. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mary Ann Frankenberger, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Incorporate writing skills and strategies from the Arkansas Frameworks into the curriculum of every content area and align vertically from kindergarten through fifth grade. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Sandy Jordan, fifth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
District literacy specialists will share Good	Jessica	Start:	● Computers	

Habits Great Writers program at grade level professional meetings. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Thornton, third grade teacher	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff School Library Teaching Aids 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use formative classroom assessments and district writing prompts with rubrics quarterly to enable students to assess and revise their own work and demonstrate proficiency in writing. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Kelli Stull, fourth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT summative assessments, local formative assessments 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. During the 2009-2010 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. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2010/2011 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will learn how to integrate science into the literacy model through the use of "science notebooking", other strategies, and the use of a variety of technologies. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Brandy Vann, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Continue to implement and refine practices of collaborative teaming to impact student success in writing.

Scientific Based Research: Loucks-Horsley, S., Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics 2001, National Institute for Science Education.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Develop faculty wide consensus on areas of focus for building-level professional development and provide diverse professional development opportunities to offer teachers a balanced approach to enhanced knowledge and skills. Action Type: Collaboration	Teresa Cornett, third grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office Outside Consultants Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development				
Coordinate building-level professional development with district professional development steering committee (PDSC) and build connections among schools. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Susan Wizer, fourth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use community resources and outside consultants to provide additional expertise in meeting the professional development needs of teachers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Conduct a summative evaluation of the implementation of the professional development plan based on teacher and student needs. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sandy Jordan, fifth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use student Academic Improvement Plans and identified special needs of students to assess professional development needs of teachers. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Mary Ann Frankenger, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Conduct an individualized needs assessment with teachers to enable them to identify their own needs in relation to student achievement. Action Type: Professional Development	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in ongoing professional development in writing, including training in using the Arkansas Scoring Guide, exploration of National Writing Project Support Sites on the web, and Arkansas I Tunes University lessons. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Jessica Thornton, third grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in ongoing professional development in ELLA, Effective Literacy, and Literacy Lab programs. Action Type: Professional Development	Christye Hudson, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, paraprofessional teachers, and administrators will share information regarding autism spectrum disorders that impact students' ability to write in length about a given subject. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
The SST committee will meet regularly to discuss the needs of our students. This committee will continue to receive training as they learn to work through the process of RtI (Response to Intervention). Action Type: AIP/IRI	Andrea Segó, assistant principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development				
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this PD Intervention through continual dialogue within grade level and data meetings 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use teacher surveys and weekly monitoring during grade level meetings to evaluate and adjust programs, processes, and activities needed to achieve the action descriptions within this intervention. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Team meetings will address analysis of student data from formative and summative assessments in writing and team members will share strategies that impact success, as well as plan interventions and enrichments based on professional strengths. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will plan and coordinate specific instructional units, as well as identify "power standards" in their core subjects that are aligned with the Arkansas Frameworks to meet all students' needs.	Teresa Cornett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Faculty and administration will communicate district literacy and writing content and achievement standards to families in order to improve success for students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Teresa Cornett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Continue to enhance parent involvement in our school.				
Scientific Based Research: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, "A New Wave of Evidence. The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement", Henderson, A., & Mapp, K.2002				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Administrators and teachers will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parent involvement strategies and the importance of setting expectations and creating	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

a climate conducive to parental participation. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development				
All parents will receive "Informational Packets" that include: Parent Involvement Plan School Calendar, a tool encouraging the home/school connection. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Parent Involvement Meetings (Parent Curriculum Nights) will be held at the beginning of the year to welcome parents and students to our school, go over grade level curriculum, share student expectations, and provide ways parents can assist in their child's education. The school's process for resolving parental concerns will be discussed at this meeting. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Through our PTA a volunteer resource book will include: parent interest survey, an option for parents to designate how frequently they would participate in the program, as well as a list of opportunities for parents to assist at school and from home. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
The building principal will designate one certified staff member to serve as a parent facilitator. The district will pay the parent facilitator a stipend for assuming duties as required by ACT 307 of 2007. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school library will have a designated area to be used as the Parent Library. Parenting books, magazines and other informative material regarding responsible parenting will be available for parents to borrow for review. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school will provide parent resources on our school website with links on information about the parent center and library, as well as important meetings. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Our school has a very active, award winning Parent Teacher Association that fosters parental and community involvement in over 30 committees. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Community Leaders 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this intervention through parent interest surveys, parent curriculum nights, PTA board members, parent/teacher conferences and teacher input and determined it to be valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. The following EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrate that the intervention is valid. 100% of our parents attended parent/teacher conferences in support of their child's education. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP plan and use those results to impact our future program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Provide instruction to parents on how to incorporate developmentally appropriate learning activities at home through curriculum nights, parent/teacher conferences, and regular weekly newsletters. For example, parents are given a password for Everyday Math computer games to be practiced at home. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Marci Tate, Parent Involvement Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 2: Improving Mathematics

1. 2010 Grade 3 Benchmark Exam (Math)

115 students were tested and 95% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
17 students were tested and 82% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
11 Students with Disabilities (IEP) were tested and 72% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
104 students were tested and 95% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students are Measurement and Geometry. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Algebra.

2010 Grade 4 Benchmark Exam (Math)

119 students were tested and 93% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced;
17 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
10 students were tested and 60% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school; 104 students were tested and 93% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students is Geometry & Number and Operations. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.

2010 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam (Math)

125 students were tested and 90% of the Combined Population Students

scored proficient or advanced.

17 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students were tested and 59% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
12 Students with Disabilities (IEP) were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
112 students were tested and 92% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students is Measurement. The lowest identified area in open response is Geometry.

1. 2009 Grade 3 Benchmark Exam (Math)

112 students were tested and 94% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
11 students were tested and 81% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
98 students were tested and 93% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students are Measurement and Data Analysis & Probability. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Numbers & Operations.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students are Measurement and Geometry. The lowest identified areas in open response are Measurement and Geometry.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Students with Disabilities (IEP) are Data and Probability and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Numbers & Operations.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Caucasian Population Students are Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Measurement.

2009 Grade 4 Benchmark Exam (Math)

123 students were tested and 95% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced;
11 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
13 students were tested and 77% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school; 108 students were tested and 97% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students is Geometry & Data Analysis & Probability. The lowest identified areas in open response are Measurement and Numbers & Operations.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for

the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students is Geometry & Data Analysis & Probability. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Measurement.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Students with Disabilities (IEP) is Geometry and Data Analysis & Probability. The lowest identified areas in open response is Measurement.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Caucasian Population Students is Geometry and Data Analysis & Probability. The lowest identified areas are Measurement and Numbers & Operations.

2009 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam (Math)

110 students were tested and 94% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
92 students were tested and 93% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students is Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Data Analysis & Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Students with Disabilities (IEP) is Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Data and Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Caucasian Population Students is Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Data Analysis & Probability and Measurement.

1. 2008 Grade 3 Benchmark Exam (Math)

119 students were tested and 94% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
10 students were tested and 70% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
13 students were tested and 69% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
109 students were tested and 96% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students are Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students are Measurement and Geometry. The lowest identified areas in open response are Measurement and Geometry.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Students with Disabilities (IEP) are Data and Probability and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Measurement

and Geometry.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Caucasian Population Students are Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Measurement.

2008 Grade 4 Benchmark Exam (Math)

107 students were tested and 95% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
13 students were tested and 84% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
96 students were tested and 96% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students is Geometry. The lowest identified areas in open response are Measurement and Data and Probability.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Students with Disabilities (IEP) is Geometry. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Measurement.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Caucasian Population Students is Geometry. The lowest identified areas are Measurement and Data and Probability.

2008 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam (Math)

128 students were tested and 92% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced.
15 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested and 73% scored proficient or advanced;
There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 African American students tested in our school;
There were fewer than 10 Hispanic Students tested in our school;
110 students were tested and 90% of the Caucasian Students scored proficient or advanced.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Combined Population Students is Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Geometry and Numbers and Operations.

The lowest identified areas in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students is Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas in open response are Numbers and Operations and Data and Probability.

The lowest identified area in multiple choice in the five math strands for the Caucasian Population Students is Measurement. The lowest identified areas in open response are Numbers and Operations and Geometry.

1. MAT K 2010 Math data:

Combined Population: 104 students were tested and 92% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

MAT K 2009 Math data:

Combined Population: 86 students were tested and 85% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

MAT K 2008 Math data:

Combined Population: 116 students were tested and 83% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian students: 111 students were tested and 83% had an NPR score of 50 or above.

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

Combined Population: 98 students were tested and 82% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

13 students were tested and 69.3% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

91 students were tested and 82.4% of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above.

The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

1. Grade 1- SAT-10 2010: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: 91 students were tested and 87% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 1- SAT-10 2009: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: 119 students were tested and 82% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 1- SAT-10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: In 2008, 108 students were tested and 72% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 18 students were tested and 56% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 12 students were tested and 50% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 102 students were tested and 73% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Supporting
Data:

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

Combined Population: 100 Students were tested and 89% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

88 students were tested and 92% of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above.

The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

1. Grade 2- SAT 10 2010: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: 122 students were tested and 91% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 2- SAT 10 2009: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: 110 students were tested and 83% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Grade 2- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: In 2008, 108 students were tested and 87% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 12 students were tested and 58% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 10 students were tested and 40% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Limited English Proficient (LEP): In 2008, 10 students were tested and 100% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 94 students were tested and 86% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 112 Students were tested and 91% had an NPR scored of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Problems.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

13 Students were tested and 69.2% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

104 students were tested and 92.3% of the Caucasian students scored an NPR

of 50, or above.

The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving.

1. Grade 3- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: In 2008, 120 students were tested and 84% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 10 students were tested and 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 15 students were tested and 40% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 109 students were tested and 86% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 111 Students were tested and 83% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weakness in Math Computation.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

19 Students were tested and 84.2% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weakness in Problem Solving & Data Interpretation.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school. There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

99 students were tested and 86.9 % of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weakness in Math Computation.

1. Grade 4- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: In 2008, 107 students were tested and 91% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

Students with Disabilities (IEP): In 2008, 13 students were tested and 69% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 96 students were tested and 92% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 122 Students were tested and 89% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving & Data Interpretation.

16 students were tested and 81.3% of the Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Concepts and Estimation.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

13 students were tested and 100% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Computation.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school. There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

104 students were tested and 96.2 % of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving & Data Interpretation.

1. Grade 5- SAT 10 2008: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math: In 2008, 129 students were tested and 88% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES) Students: In 2008, 15 students were tested and 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Students with Disabilities (IEP) tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

Caucasian Population: In 2008, 110 students were tested and 86% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

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

Combined Population: 97 Students were tested and 87% had an NPR score of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Problem Solving & Data Interpretation.

There were fewer than 10 Economically Disadvantaged (SES) students tested in our school.

There were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in our school.

12 students were tested and 50% of the Students with Disabilities (IEP) had an NPR score of 50, or above. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Computation.

There were fewer than 10 African-American students tested in our school. There were fewer than 10 Hispanic students tested in our school.

96 students were tested and 85.4 % of the Caucasian students scored an NPR of 50, or above in Total Math. The analysis of the math subtests revealed weaknesses in Computation.

1. 8) Attendance Rate: In 2010, the attendance rate for the building was 96%. In 2009, the attendance rate for the building was 96.4%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 96%.
1. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ACSIP leadership teams met and analyzed the test scores from the 2009 administration of the Augmented Benchmark exam. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness.

Throughout the year, instructional teams will meet to analyze formative and summative assessments, as well as data regarding attendance and discipline. Teams will meet specifically to disaggregate data to best plan for student learning. Analysis of formative assessments developed by our own teachers will allow us to better identify specific needs of

students. BASED ON OUR SUMMATIVE DATA, THE GREATEST NEEDS ARE IN MEASUREMENT OPEN RESPONSE PROBLEMS AND DATA AND PROBABILITY MULTIPLE CHOICE AND OPEN RESPONSE PROBLEM SOLVING. We will select interventions for team time and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas.

Grade level teams, along with specialty staff, meet weekly to review data from formative and summative assessments. Data is also analyzed in all-faculty meetings and used to make decisions regarding instructional priorities and professional development. We will select interventions and coordinated our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas.

1. Vandergriff's AYP Status for the 2010 year was: Achieving;
Vandergriff's AYP Status for the 2009 year was: Achieving; Vandergriff's AYP Status for the 2008 year was: Meets Standards

Goal All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to Geometry and Measurement.

Benchmark The Combined Population and each subgroup MET the 2010 AYP target of 62.5% scoring Proficient or Advanced. The status of the school for 2010 is achieving. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP target scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Implement Everyday Mathematics				
Scientific Based Research: Everyday Mathematics (McGraw-Hill): Bell, M., William, C., and Isaacs, A., The Research Foundation of the University of Chicago Math Project's Everyday Mathematics Curriculum 1998.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Evaluate implementation of Everyday Math program in classroom instruction using SAT 10, MAPs (Measures of Academic Progress), formative class assessments and/or performance assessments in kindergarten through fifth grade. Teachers will collaborate to incorporate research/best practices to support the implementation of this standards-based mathematics program. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Jennifer Page, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use data from SAT 10, Primary Benchmark Exam, MAP testing, targeted assessments, and various formative classroom assessments to evaluate student progress in math achievement and record on academic improvement plans. Teachers will review data for individual students in order to align lessons which meet the needs of all learners. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Charlene Daugherty, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Utilize parents in tutoring program called "Helping Hands". Teachers will identify needs of students who are at risk for not meeting benchmark standards. Teachers contact parent volunteers who act as helping hands to assist with remediation and reinforcement of standards-based lessons. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Leanne Deweese, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve mathematics skills.	Bonita Walters, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Individualized lessons will be assigned based on student need and students will work at their own pace through the curriculum. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching Aids 	
All students will be evaluated within each unit using formative and summative assessments such as Mastering Math Facts (MMF), MAP testing, CBM for K/1 students, and targeted assessments to drive instruction and determine learning gains for all students. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation	Blakely Stokenbury, fifth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development in Everyday Mathematics. Action Type: Professional Development	Barbara Kristoffersen, art teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
"TEAM TIME" will be implemented to provide interventions for those students who are not meeting proficiency in math, while providing enrichment for those who are. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Andrea Segó, assistant principal	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 through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT summative assessments, and local formative assessments 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark exam. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol and include data from quarterly assessments for first and second grades and MAP testing in 2nd-5th grades when evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide teachers and families with Everyday Math On-line Math Games to be used for differentiated instruction. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Rachel Smithson, fourth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ACSIP	Bert Stark,	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative 	

<p>leadership teams met and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the Augmented Benchmark exam. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. We've studied data from the last three years to determine the math needs in our building. Throughout the year, instructional teams will meet to analyze formative and summative assessments, as well as data regarding attendance and discipline. Teams will meet specifically to disaggregate data to best plan for student learning. Analysis of formative assessments developed by our own teachers will allow us to better identify specific needs of students. BASED ON OUR SUMMATIVE DATA, THE GREATEST NEEDS ARE IN MULTIPLE CHOICE WITH MEASUREMENT AND DATA ANALYSIS & PROBABILITY AND IN OPEN RESPONSE WITH MEASUREMENT AND NUMBERS & OPERATIONS. We will select interventions for Team Time and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. Grade level teams, along with specialty staff, meet weekly to review data from formative and summative assessments. Data is also analyzed in all-faculty meetings and used to make decisions regarding instructional priorities and professional development. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	principal	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement Problem-Solving Strategies				
Scientific Based Research: Standards in Classroom Practice Research Synthesis 2001, McREL.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Implement and evaluate the effectiveness of problem-solving strategies using formative performance assessment, open-ended math prompts. Teachers will align district curriculum with standards-based supplemental resources to incorporate a variety of problem solving methods, as well as enrich the overall curriculum.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Thelma Thomason, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>In our standards-based math curriculum, teachers will teach problem solving strategies and implement open response prompts. They will use rubric scoring congruent with the summative CRT and NRT exams.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Bert Stark, principal	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 through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>summative assessments, and local formative assessments 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol and include quarterly assessments for first and second grades and MAP testing in 2nd-5th grades when evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>		06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments Teachers 	
<p>Use the Rigor/Relevance Framework as a tool to develop instructional strategies for teaching problem-solving skills that will prepare students to solve complex real-world problems.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside Consultants Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Use of computation and procedural fluency strategies				
Scientific Based Research: Standards in Classroom Practice Research Synthesis 2001, McREL.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Evaluate effectiveness of Mastering Math Facts program in improving overall mathematics achievement by using CBM data (K/1), SAT 10, formative class assessments, and/or performance assessments.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Communicate progress and continuing areas of development for Everyday Math through orientation and instructional meetings through "parent curriculum nights".</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Bonita Walters, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Use grade level meetings to integrate and align supplemental computational strategies and materials into the daily math program.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education</p>	Blakely Stokenbury, fifth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Use pre- and post-testing to evaluate student progress in grade level appropriate computation and use informal formative assessments and CBM (K/1) to monitor progress throughout the</p>	Deonna Tucker, CBI teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

year. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Use Mastering Math Facts strategies and math materials for daily computation practice. Action Type: Alignment	Rachel Smithson, 4th grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching Aids 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through pre/post testing, CRT, NRT summative assessments, and local formative assessments 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol and include quarterly assessments for first and second grades and MAP testing in 2nd-5th grades when evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	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: Continue to be trained in Professional Development Design				
Scientific Based Research: Loucks-Horsley, S., Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics 2001, National Institute for Science Education.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Coordinate building-level professional development with district professional development steering committee (PDSC) and build connections among schools. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Charlene Daugherty, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use technology to plan and deliver professional development. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Leanne Deweese, kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use student Academic Improvement Plans and identified special needs of students using formative and summative assessments to assess professional development needs of teachers.	Bert Stark, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education				
Continue to strengthen our Professional Learning Community by collaborating in small and large groups to focus on results and ensure that all students learn. We will periodically review what it means to be a PLC, evaluate where we are on the path, and work to have all teachers trained as funds are available. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Closing the Achievement Gap for Math: The ACSIP Leadership committee will continue to meet to focus on core principles to help improve teaching and learning. The use of data, curriculum instruction, and professional development will help better meet the needs of all students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this PD Intervention through continual dialogue within grade level and data meetings 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: An average of 92% of our 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use teacher surveys and weekly monitoring during grade level PLC meetings to evaluate and adjust programs, processes, and activities needed to achieve the action descriptions within this intervention. We will continue to use formative and summative assessments to gain information regarding specific student needs. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan and use those results to impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Continue to build a culture based on	Bert Stark,	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative 	Title II-A -

<p>rigor, relevance, and relationships and strengthen our Professional Learning Community by collaborating, focusing on results and ensuring that all students learn. All teachers attended training in August 2010 and are working to design instruction that will prepare students for the future. The Vandergriff Staff will continue to receive training through outside consultants, materials and a variety of PD workshops that focus on the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) model and Rigor, Relevance and Relationships. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>principal</p>	<p>07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<p>Purchased Services: \$6900.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$6900</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$6900</p>

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

1. Body Mass Index Data 09-10: of the 319 student population assessed (K,2nd,4th) (169 males, 150 females), the following represents the percent of students overweight and at risk of being overweight: Grade K: Males 19.6%, 15.8% Females Grade 2: Males 23.2%, 16.4% Females Grade 4: Males 24.6%, 12.3% Females
2. Body Mass Index Data 08-09: of the 285 student population assessed (K,2nd,4th) (151 males, 134 females), the following represents the percent of students overweight and at risk of being overweight: Grade K: Males 39 tested, 35 Females tested (N/A) Grade 2: Males 24.1%, 25% Females Grade 4: Males 29.6%, 11.9% Females
3. Body Mass Index Data 07-08: of the 299 student population assessed (K,2nd,4th) (137 males, 162 females), the following represents the percent of students overweight and at risk of being overweight: Grade K: Males 24.5%, 10.9% Females Grade 2: Males 23.4%, 17.0% Females Grade 4: Males 36.6%, 18.5% Females
4. The 2007-2008 School Health Index (SHI) results stated Vandergriff scoring medium-high in Module 6 (Counseling, Psychological, and Social Services) and Module 8 (Family and Community Involvement). The 2006-2007 School Health Index (SHI) results stated Vandergriff scoring low in Module 7 (Health promotion for staff) and medium-high in Module 8 (Family and Community Involvement) and Module 4 (Nutrition Services).
5. 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.

Supporting Data:

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: In 2008 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 11%. In 2007 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 10%.

1. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ACSIP leadership teams met and analyzed the data from BMI testing and various physical fitness tests given in our P.E. program.

Third through fifth grade students will be given pre/post fitness tests using the FitnessGram and the Presidential Challenge. With the SPARK Physical Education, all students will be more active, developing social skills, and focusing on health-related fitness and skill development.

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 The number of students being considered overweight or at risk of overweight, according to their BMI, will decrease by 1/2% during the 2009-2010 school year. The tested population MET the 2009 target. It is expected that this population will meet, or exceed the 2010 target.

Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of physical activity for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: Kids for Health, 1995				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Students receive 195 minutes per week engaged in physical activity through our physical education program as well as recess. Action Type: Wellness	Ginger Campbell, Physical Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Formative BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of overweight or at risk of being overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide CPR and conflict resolution training for special education teachers, as well as, school nutrition/physical activity and crisis committees. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	<hr/> 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	Rebecca Wilbern, fourth grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> 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	Sheri Payton, second grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Encourage participation in family oriented, community-based physical activity program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Jill Goodwin, speech pathologist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
To assess Vandergriff Elementary School's physical education program, parents, students, or faculty members will be invited to participate in a survey. Action Type: Collaboration	Bert Stark	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness				
Create and promote participation in a variety of activities that develop a full range of life skills for all grade levels. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Kim Renner, counselor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through BMI, and physical fitness testing 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: Out of the 319 students assessed (K, 2nd, 4th) there were more males overweight and at risk of being overweight. 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. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention 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. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Ginger Campbell, Physical Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: The Health and Wellness Committee meets annually to discuss the BMI results and the health plan for the school. We examined the results by grade level and gender. We've studied the last three years to determine the health needs in our building. Teams will meet specifically to disaggregate data to best plan for student learning. Analysis of formative assessments developed by our own teachers will allow us to better identify specific needs of students. BASED ON OUR SUMMATIVE DATA, THE GREATEST NEEDS ARE IN OVERWEIGHT MALES IN 2ND AND 4TH GRADES. We will select interventions and coordinated our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Bert Stark, principal	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: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of sound nutritional practices for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: Kids for Health, 1995				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Kids for Health, a comprehensive health	Sara Hart,	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	

education program, provides the education and motivation for students to make a lifetime of healthy choices. Formative and summative assessments will be given to students. Students kindergarten through fifth grade learn about nutrition, personal hygiene, safety, and smoking, just to name a few. Action Type: Wellness	fifth grade teacher	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Formative BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of overweight and those at risk of being overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Bert Stark, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Educate parents on different parenting strategies through training when needed and obtaining a current Parent Center. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Karyn Koschel, first grade teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through BMI, and physical fitness testing 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: Out of the 319 students assessed (K, 2nd, 4th) there were more males overweight and at risk of being overweight. 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. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention 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. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Ginger Campbell, Physical Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

- Priority 4: Improving ELL students
1. In 2010, there were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in each grade level in our school.
 2. In 2009, there were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in each grade level in our school.
 3. In 2008, there were fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students tested in each grade level in our school.
- Supporting Data:
- Goal: All students will improve in reading familiar text and learn strategies to comprehend and build their vocabulary bank.
- Benchmark: The 2008-2009 AYP status did not apply to our Limited English Population due to having fewer than 10 in the subpop. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the

2010 AYP target.

Intervention: Provide ELL students with core essential skills necessary for reading fluency, comprehension and language acquisition.				
Scientific Based Research: "Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development", Joellen Killion, 2002, www.nsd.org; "Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work- New Insights for Improving Schools", Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, 2008.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teacher-designed formative assessments will be used to identify students who have not gained mastery of skills. A variety of interventions will be used that will appeal to a variety of learning styles and impact language acquisition, including total physical response, computer-based instruction, integration of music, and use of graphic organizers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Teresa Cornett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Our analysis of formative data from quarterly target tests, teacher-designed core essential skills tests, DRA and DIBELS fluency testing have shown us the deficits of our ELL learners. It is our goal for all students at Vandergriff to achieve at high levels, so it is imperative that our instructional teams meet weekly to analyze and prepare for targeted, specific instruction that will best impact these learners. Our greatest need observed in these learners is reading fluency and responding in writing on open response questions.	Julie Ramsey	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2009		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
The LPAC committee (classroom teacher, ELL teacher, parent, counselor, and administrator) will meet periodically throughout the school year to discuss language assessment scores and determine how to meet their individual educational needs. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Julie Ramsey, ESL teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Professional Development will be provided across the district to help increase the necessary knowledge, skills, and teaching strategies to meet the needs of ELL students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Julie Ramsey, ESL teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: This is a new intervention. During the 2009-2010 school year, we will evaluate this intervention through the analysis of language proficiency test scores and Benchmark scores. We will expect to see the students that are served from the ELL program to achieve a 5% growth on the state exams. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Julie Ramsey, ESL teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

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

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 dis-

proportionality 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:

Supporting Data:

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.

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.

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.

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 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
IDEA Title VI-B, CEIS (Coordinated Early Intervening Services) 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: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
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: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The AYP targets for the 2010-2011 year in Literacy in	Debra	Start:		

<p>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%</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Wilson	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>The district will implement K-2 MAP assessments in order to provide more targeted and explicit instruction in Literacy and all content areas. (Software and Hardware) These materials will be purchased using IDEA title VI-B CEIS funds</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<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.</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<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.</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>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.</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Personnel will receive training on literacy strategies across the curriculum/content areas and differentiation for general education teachers and leadership team with Lin Kuzmich. This will improve core instruction for all students.</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>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.</p> <p>Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Fayetteville Schools will expand health and mental health resources for targeted populations at Owl Creek School</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010	

(Owl Creek Project). These services will eventually be available to students across the district. Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA Action Type: Special Education		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: \$
Funding allocated to Vandergriff Elementary will include the following expenditures: English/K Primary Curriculum Oral Language Good Habits/Great Readers Blends/ABC Charts Word/Vocabulary Skills MAP testing licenses The total for Vandergriff CEIS: \$21,138.71 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) 10-11 Action Type: SIF 1003(a) ARRA 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	April Miller	Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Blakely Stokenbury	Fifth Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Bonita Walters	First Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Brandy Vann	Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Charlene Daugherty	Second Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Cheri DeSoto	Fifth Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Christye Hudson	Third Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Darla Livermore	Fourth Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Page	First Grade	ACSIP Co-chair
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Page	First Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jessica Thornton	Third Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Karen Wikholm	Third Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Karyn Francis	First Grade	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Kathy Butler	Third Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Kelli Stull	Fourth Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Leanne Deweese	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Lora Horne	First Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lori Sherman	Second Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lori Sherman	Second Grade	ACSIP Leadership, Literacy Chair
Classroom Teacher	Marci Tate	Parent Engagement Coordinator	Parent Engagement
Classroom Teacher	Mary Ann Frankenberger	Kindergarten	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Rachel Smithson	Fourth Grade	Math

Classroom Teacher	Rebecca Wilbern	Fourth Grade	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Robin Yoakum	Fifth Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Sandy Jordan	Fifth Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Sara Hart	Fifth Grade	ACSIP Leadership, Wellness Chair
Classroom Teacher	Sara Hart	Fifth Grade	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Sheri Payton	Second Grade	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Sherri Wheeler	Second Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Susan Wizer	Fourth Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Teresa Cornett	Third Grade	ACSIP Co-chair
Classroom Teacher	Teresa Cornett	Third Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Teri Eklund	First Grade	ACSIP Leadership, Writing Chair
Classroom Teacher	Teri Eklund	First Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Thelma Thomason	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Tracey Gifford	Third Grade, Math Chair	ACSIP Leadership, Math Chair
Community Representative	Harry Vandergriff	Community Representative	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Christie Jay	Federal Programs Coordinator	ACSIP Leadership
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Amy Wood	Special Education	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Barbara Kristofferson	Art	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Deonna Tucker	CBI	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Ginger Campbell	Physical Education	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Holly Smith	Literacy Coach	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jill Goodwin	Speech Pathologist	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Julie Ramsey	ESL teacher	ELL Chair
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Julie Ramsey	ESL	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kelly Thomas	Special Education	Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kim Renner	Counselor	Parent Engagement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kim Renner	Counselor	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kim Renner	Counselor	ELL
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Marci Tate	Media Specialist	Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	MeMe Hagers	Music Teacher	Reading
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mitzi Delap	GT	Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sherry Wallis	Technology Specialist	Writing
Parent	Kathryn Renfro	Parent	Math
Parent	Wendy Moss	Parent	Literacy
Parent	Wendy Moss	Parent	Writing
Principal	Andrea Sego	Assistant Principal	ELL
Principal	Andrea Sego	Assistant Principal	Steering Committee
Principal	Bert Stark	Principal	Steering Committee