



[District Menu Page](#) | [Work On Your ACSIP](#) | [Reports](#) | [Federal/State Budgets](#) | [School Completion Status](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Feedback](#) | [Logout](#)

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2013-2014

The vision of Springhill Elementary school is to prepare our students to be life-long, independent learners active in their own success. With the support of our parents and community, we will foster positive social behavior and nurture the emotional needs of each child. We will uphold high academic expectations for all students through effective instructional methods and strategies. We will ensure the best education for all Springhill Elementary students.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Not Applicable

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: To improve literacy skills for all students with emphasis on Practical Passage Open-Response reading subtest and Content and Style in the Writing Open Response subtest.

Priority 2: Math

Goal: To improve math skills for all students with an emphasis in the Geometry Multiple Choice and Open Response subtests.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: To reduce obesity levels of our students.

Priority 4: TITLE III/ELL

Goal: Provide Improvement in the Reading and Content Skills for Identified ELL students.

Priority 5: Needs Improvement School

Goal: To meet or exceed AMO math standards set by the State Department of Education for all students and our Targeted Achievement Gap Group, with an emphasis in the Measurement Multiple Choice and Open Response subtests.

Priority 1: Springhill Elementary will improve literacy performance to meet or exceed AMO Standards developed by the Arkansas Department of Education.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2011 ACTAAP 5th Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

105 students: 89.5% of Combined students

6 students: 83.3% of African American students

4 student: 75.0% of Hispanic students

90 students: 90.0% of Caucasian students

36 students: 80.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged students

0 students: LEP students

12 students: 41.6% of Students with disabilities

2012 ACTAAP 5th Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

95 students: 92.0% of Combined students

2 students: 100.0% of African American students

4 students: 75.0% of Hispanic students

88 students: 92.0% of Caucasian students

20 students: 80.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged students

1 student: 0% of LEP students

5 students: 20% of Students with disabilities

2013 ACTAAP 5th Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

88 students: 94% of Combined students

2 students: 100.0% of African American students

11 students: 82% of Hispanic students

71 students: 95% of Caucasian students

19 students: 84% of Econ. Disadvantaged students

8 students: 88% of LEP students

4 students: 0% of Students with disabilities

2. Three-year trend analysis:

In 2011, 89% of fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced in literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Literary Passage in Reading, Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

In 2012, 92% of fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced in literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Writing Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary Reading, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

In 2013, 94% of fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced in literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Practical Open Response in Reading, Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

Over three years the Targeted Achievement Gap Group showed the following areas of weakness: Multiple Choice in Practical Reading; Open Response in Practical Reading; Multiple Choice in Writing, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

3. ACSIP CRT Data Source for SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2011 ACTAAP 4th Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

83 students: 93.9% of Combined students

2 students: 50.0% African American students

3 students: 66.6% of Hispanic students

77 students: 96.1% of Caucasian students

14 students: 78.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged students

1 students: 0% of LEP students

5 students: 40% of Students with Disabilities

2012 ACTAAP 4th Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

93 students: 99.0% of Combined students

2 students: 100.0% African American students

2 students: 50.0% of Hispanic students

82 students: 100.0% of Caucasian students

18 students: 100.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged students

2 students: 50.0% of LEP students

1 students: 100% of Students with Disabilities

2013 ACTAAP 4th Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

108 students: 92% of Combined students

2 students: 100% African American students

19 students: 79% of Hispanic students

86 students: 94% of Caucasian students

41 students: 81% of Econ. Disadvantaged students

10 students: 70% of LEP students

11 students: 64% of Students with Disabilities

4. Three-year trend analysis:

In 2011, 93% of fourth grade students scored proficient or advanced in literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Writing Multiple Choice, Open Response in Practical Reading, Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

In 2012, 99% of fourth grade students scored proficient or advanced in literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Writing Multiple Choice, Open Response in Practical Reading, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

In 2013, 92% of fourth grade students scored proficient or advanced in literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Literary Open Response in Reading, Multiple Choice in Writing.

Over three years the Targeted Achievement Gap Group showed the following areas of weakness: Multiple Choice in Content Reading; Open Response in Practical Reading; Multiple Choice in Writing, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

5. ACSIP CRT Data Source for SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2011 ACTAAP 3rd Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

Supporting
Data:

89 students: 93.2% of Combined students
 2 students: 100% of African American students
 0 students: N/A of Hispanic students
 83 students: 93.9% of Caucasian students
 22 students: 86.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 0 student: N/A of LEP students
 0 students: N/A% of Students with Disabilities

2012 ACTAAP 3rd Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

109 students: 94.0% of Combined students
 2 students: 100% of African American students
 5 students: 100% of Hispanic students
 94 students: 94% of Caucasian students
 26 students: 81% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 0 student: N/A of LEP students
 12 students: 75% of Students with Disabilities

2013 ACTAAP 3rd Grade Literacy Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

93 students: 92% of Combined students
 1 student: 0% of African American students
 12 students: 75% of Hispanic students
 76 students: 95% of Caucasian students
 25 students: 68% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 4 students: 50% of LEP students
 9 students: 78% of Students with Disabilities

6. Three-year trend analysis:

In 2011, 93% of third grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Open Response in Practical Reading, Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

In 2012, 94% of third grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Writing Multiple Choice, Open Response in Practical Reading, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

In 2013, 92% of third grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Multiple Choice, Open Response in Practical Reading, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

Over three years the Targeted Achievement Gap Group showed the following areas of weakness: Multiple Choice and Open Response in Practical Reading, and Content & Style in Writing Open Response.

7. Three-year trend analysis:

On the 2011 ITBS, 79.6% of second grade students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: vocabulary.

On the 2012 ITBS, 71.2% of second grade students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: vocabulary.

On the 2013 ITBS, 68% of second grade students scored above the 50th percentile in Literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Vocabulary in Reading and Spelling in Language.

8. Three-year trend analysis:

On the 2011 ITBS, 74.4% of first grade students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: vocabulary.

On the 2012 ITBS, 68.7% of first grade students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: vocabulary.

On the 2013 ITBS, 70% of first grade students scored above the 50th percentile in Literacy. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Vocabulary in Reading.

9. Three-year trend analysis:

On the 2009 ITBS, 85% of kindergarten students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Grapheme Relationships.

On the 2010 ITBS, 72.2% of kindergarten students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Phoneme-Grapheme Relationships.

On the 2011 ITBS, 94.9% of kindergarten students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis showed the following areas of weakness: Vocabulary.

10. For the year 2012 - 2013 the attendance rate was 96.86%.

Goal

To improve literacy skills for all students with emphasis on Practical Passage Open-Response reading subtest and Content and Style in the Writing Open Response subtest.

Benchmark

At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 92.66% were proficient or advanced. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 89.04% must be proficient or advanced. By the end of the 2017-2018 school year, 92.7% must be proficient or advanced.

Intervention: Implement a balanced comprehensive literacy program to improve student achievement.

Scientific Based Research: Irene C. Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell, "When Readers Struggle: Teaching that Works," Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH, USA, 2009.
 Irene C. Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell, "The Continuum of Literacy Learning: A Guide to Teaching," Heinemann, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH, USA, 2011.
 Richard L. Allington, "What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research-Based Programs," Pearson, Boston, MA, USA, 2012.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>All teachers including special education teachers, staff, and parents, have reviewed, researched and decided to implement the following instructional strategies and resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Use of paraprofessionals (K – 5) ·Daily 5 (K – 3) ·Writer's Workshop (K-5) ·Benchmark Phonics (1) ·Literary rotation (4) ·Fluency cards (5) ·Center-based Literacy (5) ·District Literacy specialist ·ELLA (K) ·Teacher Modeling ·Computer-assisted instruction ·Use of iPods, iPads, mimio, chrome lab (K – 5) ·Correlate literacy strategies with music, art, and physical education instruction <p>These strategies and programs have been aligned to the AR state frameworks and Common Core. They will also be used to reduce the disparity between our subpopulations. Emphasis will be placed on those strategies and programs that will improve achievement in Practical Passage Open-Response reading subtest and Content and Style in the Writing subtest.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Chelsea Mansfield, Kindergarten Belinda Moore, 3rd grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the following strategies and programs at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Regular inclusion and evaluation of open response in the classroom. ·Co-teaching (1-5) ·Guided Reading Plus (K-1) ·Non-fiction Writing (K-5) ·Comprehensive Literacy including Ella, Literacy Lab, Effective Literacy, Writer's Workshop ·Technology-assisted instruction (Chrome lab, Accelerated Reader, iPod, iPad, mimio) ·Teacher Modeling ·Special education strategies <p>Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Celest Pritchett, 1st Grade Leigh Hooton, 4th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Formative Assessments (K-5) ·Teacher observations of students ·Classroom Walkthroughs ·DRA tests (K-5) ·QUALLS Learning Inventory (K) ·DIBELS tests (K-5) ·DSA tests (K-5) ·Running Records (K-5) ·Anecdotal records (K-5) ·ELDA Reports (K-5) ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) <p>·Norm-referenced tests (1-5)</p> <p>The school leadership team in an analysis of CWT and teacher lesson plans found all teachers were providing instruction on a daily basis. An analysis of teacher tests and interim assessments showed a majority of students improved from test to test. An analysis of DRA, DSA, and DIBELS tests showed most students improved in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and phonics.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Kathy Crosset, 2nd grade Lisa Childress, 5th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>National School Lunch Act (NSLA) restricted state categorical funding will be used to pay for supplemental classroom materials and supplies (including chromebooks) and a chromecart (capital outlay) for RTI and PARCC, provide a Before/After School Tutoring Program (approx. 2 teachers, 1 hour per day, 3 days per week for 24 weeks), hire a 1.00 fte Literacy Instructional Specialist (Paula Schaffer) and a .069 fte School Social Worker (Lisa McNeely). Included in this budget will be salaries, benefits, materials and supplies, (aligned to the AR Frameworks), capital outlay (laptop), registration, travel, and other necessary materials to implement successful programs in these areas to help reduce the achievement disparities among student subgroups.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Russ Sherrill, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$3600.00</p> <p>NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$35.00</p> <p>NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$8935.00</p> <p>NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$17709.00</p> <p>NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$69934.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$100213</p>
<p>Special education teachers have researched and decided to implement the following strategies for IEP students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Benchmark Phonics (K) ·Daily small groups to reinforce reading skills ·One-on-one instruction from a certified 	<p>Kristin Reynolds, Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>special education teacher to provide repeated practice of skills and immediate feedback to student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Differentiated instruction in literacy ·No more than 8 students in a small group ·Providing extra time for students to attain skills ·Co-teaching (3-5) ·Special Education Push-in (1) ·PCI (1, 2, 5) ·Earobics (K, 2) ·Fluency cards (3-5) ·STAR (K-5) ·Sight word-based reading program (K-5) ·Individualized or small group testing ·DIBELS progress monitoring (K-5) ·Hampton Brown Multi-Cultural Books (K,1) ·Carousel Ideas (2-5) ·95% Group (K-2) ·Barton (K-2) <p>These strategies have been aligned to the AR state frameworks, Common Core, and Bryant curriculum. They will be used to reduce the disparity between our combined and IEP populations. Emphasis will be placed on those strategies that will improve achievement in Practical Passage Open-response reading subtest and Content & Style in the Writing subtest.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

Total Budget:	\$100213
---------------	----------

Intervention: Curriculum Alignment and Mapping

Scientific Based Research: Richard L. Allington, "What Really Matters in Response to Intervention: Research-Based Designs," Pearson, Boston, MA, USA, 2009.
Linda J. Dorn, "Interventions That Work: A Comprehension Intervention Model for Preventing Reading Failure in Grades K-3", Pearson, Boston, MA, USA, 2012.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Grade level teachers and school specialists will meet throughout the year in school-based or district-wide PLC meetings to align curriculum to the district, state, and Common Core frameworks.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Debbie Huddleston, Kindergarten Janet Patton, Kindergarten</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>All teachers, including special education, will update curriculum maps to correlate with Common Core and Pacing Guides.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Debbie Huddleston, Kindergarten Janet Patton, kindergarten</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Formative Assessments(K-5) 	<p>Kathy Crossett, 2nd grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End:</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·PLC meetings ·TLI reports (1-5) ·Lesson plans referencing Common Core ·Teacher Observations of students ·Classroom Walkthroughs ·DIBELS tests ·DSA tests (K-4) ·District-adopted interim assessments (1 - 5) <p>·Norm-referenced tests</p> <p>The school leadership team in an analysis of CWT and teacher lesson plans found all teachers were providing instruction according to their curriculum maps. An analysis of teacher tests and interim assessments showed that most students were applying knowledge from daily classroom instruction. An analysis of DRA, DSA, and DIBELS tests showed most students improved in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and phonics. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	Lisa Childress, 5th Grade	06/30/2014		
All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the following strategies and programs at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Regular inclusion and evaluation of open response in the classroom. ·Comprehensive Literacy including Ella, Literacy Lab, Effective Literacy, Writer's Workshop ·Technology-assisted instruction ·Teacher Modeling ·Special education strategies ·Common Core ·PLCs <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Celest Pritchett, 1st Grade Leigh Hooton, 4th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Placement of students on an Academic Improvement Plan (AIP)/ACT 999 of 1999.

Scientific Based Research: Dorn, L. J., & Soffos, C. (2012). Interventions That Work, a Comprehensive Intervention Model for Preventing Reading Failure in Grades K-3. Boston: Pearson.
Johanson, P., & Keier, K. (2010). Catching Readers Before They Fall. Portland Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will notify parents of placement and refer them to the District Parent Resource Center. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Tara Efirid, Counselor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Public Library • School Library • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will place students on an Academic Improvement Plan/Intensive Reading Intervention according to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·DRA tests (K-5) ·DIBELS tests (K-5) ·QUALLS Inventory (K) ·Teacher Observation of students (1) ·ITBS test (2) ·Benchmark Exam (3-5) Action Type: AIP/IRI	Russ Sherrill, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students identified as below grade level will be remediated through one or more of the following programs:	Elizabeth Hoofman, 1st Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Extended Day Enrichment ·Small group instruction ·Re-teaching ·Peer tutoring ·Differentiated instruction ·Individualized instruction and practice using technology including mimio, iPods, iPads, document cameras/projectors, chrome lab, and netbooks. ·Leveled readers ·Co-Teaching (3-5) ·Special Education Push-in (1) ·Teacher led intervention group ·Use of Paraprofessionals <p>These strategies and programs have been aligned to the AR state frameworks and Common Core. They will also be used to reduce the disparity between our subpopulations.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>		06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	BUDGET:
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Teacher Observations of students ·Teacher Lesson Plans highlighting AIP Strategies ·Formative Assessments ·Report card checklists (K-2) ·AIP Round Table notes and recommendations ·Classroom Walkthroughs ·DRA tests (1-4) ·DIBELS tests ·DSA tests ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) ·Norm-referenced tests <p>The school leadership team in an analysis of CWT and teacher lesson plans found all teachers were providing individualized instruction based on student need. An analysis of ACTAAP scores showed 96.6% of AIP students improved skills throughout the year. An analysis of DRA, DSA, and DIBELS tests showed most students improved in the areas of fluency, comprehension, literary and practical content, and vocabulary development.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Kathy Crossett, 2nd grade Lisa Childers, 5th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the above strategies at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Effective use and evaluation of Open Response questions in the classroom •Differentiated Instruction •Technology-assisted instruction <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Celest Pritchett, 1st Grade Leigh Hooton, 4th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>To evaluate student progress and proficiency teachers, including special education, will review AIPs/IRIs throughtout the year using information from:</p>	Elizabeth Hoofman, 1st Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·DIBELS test data (grades K – 5) ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5). ·DRA tests (K-4) ·Small group monitoring ·Frequent observations of students ·Report card checklists (K-2) <p>An analysis of interim assessments, DRA, DSA, and DIBELS tests showed most students improved in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and phonics.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement Parent Involvement Activities.

Scientific Based Research: El Nokali, Nermeen E.; Bachman, Heather J.; Votruba-Drzal, Elizabeth. (2010) Parent Involvement and Children's Academic and Social Development in Elementary School. Child Development, Volume 81 (3) p988-1005. Is Parent Involvement Still Important?, *Principal*, Vol. 56, Issue 4, p. 6. Retrieved September 9, 2010 from <http://www.naesp.org/resources/2/Principal/2007/M-Ap8.pdf>

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>All teachers including special education teachers, staff, and parents, have reviewed, researched, and decided to implement parental involvement activities to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Utilize a Parent Facilitator •Parents will be notified of upcoming interim assessment dates and test results (1 – 5) •Host a Parent Bookfair night to motivate parents to encourage their child to read (K-5) •Host Parent Involvement Meetings in which parents will receive information on the literacy program and ways to help their child at home, what students will be learning, how students will be assessed, what parents should expect for their child's education, and how parents can assist and make a difference in their child's education. •Provide instruction to a parent on how to incorporate developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment •Implement the Watchdog Dads program to provide positive role models during the school day. •Enable the formation of PTO <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education</p>	Holly Majors, Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Outside Consultants • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in programs at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in parental involvement.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	Diana Lewis, Art Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Create a parent center in the school library and make available parenting books and other informative resources regarding responsible parenting. Inform all parents of the availability of these materials in the informational packets, on the school web site, and through the PTO newsletter. Provide resources through a variety of media in order to address the needs of all sub-</p>	Holly Majors, Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • Computers • School Library • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

population groups. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Communicate with parents the importance of their involvement in the education of their child(ren) in order to insure student success by providing informational packets which include: ·An outline of the school's parental involvement program ·Recommendations concerning the role parents, students, teachers, and the school play in collaboration for academic success ·Suggestions for ways parents can become involved in the school and the education process ·A schedule of activities planned throughout the year in which parents are encouraged to participate ·Statements attesting to the school district's commitment to parental involvement ·School's process for resolving parental concerns in handbook ·A list of options available to parents and teachers for the purpose of ongoing two-way communication including but not limited to: school address, phone, and fax numbers, staff e-mail addresses, the PTO Newsletter, Bryant PS smartphone app, and the district and school web-sites. ·A survey for parents regarding their interest in volunteering at the school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Tara Efird, Counselor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Schedule two parent-teacher conferences to communicate student progress toward reaching curriculum goals. Additional conferences may be scheduled upon the request of parents, teachers and other faculty, or students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Russ Sherrill, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Survey parents regarding their interests and publish a volunteer resource book listing the interests and availability of parent volunteers to help match school needs with volunteer interests. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Tara Efird, Counselor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • School Library • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of this intervention will be evaluated through: · Student attendance rate · Percentage of attendance at Parent/Teacher conferences · Parent Volunteer Log An analysis of parent attendance at conferences showed 88% participation in the fall 2012 and 84% participation in the spring 2013. An analysis of volunteer sign-in sheets showed a monthly average of 59% parent participation for the 2012-2013 school year. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Diana Lewis, Art Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school will designate one certified staff member to serve as a parent involvement facilitator to coordinate with other school programs/personnel/parents to provide training for staff and parents promoting and encouraging parental involvement.	Russ Sherrill, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Parental Engagement				
Schedule an annual review conference with parents of students in the special education program to discuss goals and progress of students, update IEP, and complete Parent Satisfaction Survey from AR Department of Education. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education	Daphne Crider, Speech	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement Response to Intervention program for at-risk students.

Scientific Based Research: Institute of Education Sciences (2009). *Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades*. ERIC No. ED504264. Oqocki, G. (2013) *The Common Core Writing Book, K-5, Lessons for a Range of Tasks, Purposes, and Audiences*. Heinemann Educational Books. Stead, T. and Hoyt, L. (2012) *Explorations in Non-Fiction Writing, Grade 3*. Heinemann Educational Books.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All teachers including special education will be trained at local, state, and national conferences in Response to Intervention for at-risk students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Celest Pritchett, 1st Grade Leigh Hooton, 4th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Develop a site-based intervention team to prescribe an individualized plan of action for student achievement to be evaluated through: ·95% Group (K-2) ·Barton (K-2) ·LLI (K-5) ·Kagan Cooperative Learning (K-5) ·Comprehensive Literacy (K-5) ·Non-fiction Writing (K-5) ·Teacher-led Intervention Groups ·Close reading strategies ·Extended Day Enrichment ·Summer School ·Guided Reading ·Writing Conferences These strategies and programs have been aligned to the AR state frameworks and Common Core. They will also be used to reduce the disparity between our subpopulations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Paula Schaffer, Learning Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by: ·Teacher Observations of students (K-5) ·Anecdotal records (K-5) ·Classroom Walkthroughs ·DIBELS progress monitoring ·DRA (K-5) ·Lesson plans for RTI instruction ·RTI Round Table monitoring ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) ·Formative Assessments ·Norm-referenced tests (2-5) An analysis of Scaled Benchmark scores showed	Kathy Crossett, 2nd Grade Lisa Childress, 5th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office Computers District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

86.8% of students had growth after participating in the RTI program during 2012-2013. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 2: Springhill Elementary will improve math performance to meet or exceed AMO Standard developed by the Arkansas Department of Education.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2011 ACTAAP 5th Grade Math Exam
#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:
 105 students: 85.7% of Combined students
 7 students: 66.6% of African American students
 4 student: 75% of Hispanic students
 90 students: 86.6% of Caucasian students
 36 students: 69.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 0 students: LEP students
 12 students: 33.3% of Students with Disabilities
2012 ACTAAP 5th Grade Math Exam
#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:
 95 students: 94% of Combined students
 2 students: 0% of African American students
 4 student: 100% of Hispanic students
 88 students: 96% of Caucasian students
 20 students: 85% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 1 student: 100% of LEP students
 5 students: 60% of Students with Disabilities
2013 ACTAAP 5th Grade Math Exam
#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:
 88 students: 92% of Combined students
 2 student: 100% of African American students
 11 students: 82% of Hispanic students
 71 students: 93% of Caucasian students
 19 students: 84% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 8 student: 88% of LEP students
 4 students: 50% of Students with Disabilities
2. Three-year trend analysis:
In 2011, 85% of fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Geometry.
In 2012, 94% of fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Data Analysis and Probability.
In 2013, 92% of fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Data Analysis and Probability Multiple Choice; Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability Open Response. Over three years the Targeted Achievement Gap Group showed the following areas of weakness: Data Analysis and Probability Multiple Choice and Geometry Open Response.
3. ACSIP CRT Data Source for SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2011 ACTAAP 4th Grade Math Exam
#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:
 83 students: 96.4% of Combined students
 2 students: 0% of African American students
 3 students: 100.0% of Hispanic students
 76 students: 98.6% of Caucasian students
 14 students: 92.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 1 students: 100.0% of LEP students
 5 students: 80.0% of Students with Disabilities
2012 ACTAAP 4th Grade Math Exam
#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:
 87 students: 96% of Combined students
 2 students: 100% of African American students
 2 students: 100.0% of Hispanic students
 82 students: 98% of Caucasian students
 18 students: 94% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 2 students: 50% of LEP students
 1 student: 100% of Students with Disabilities
2013 ACTAAP 4th Grade Math Exam
#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

108 students: 87% of Combined students
 2 students: 50% of African American students
 19 students: 68% of Hispanic students
 86 students: 92% of Caucasian students
 41 students: 68% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 10 students: 50% of LEP students
 11 students: 36% of Students with Disabilities

4. Three-year trend analysis:

In 2011, 95% of fourth grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Number & Operations.

In 2012, 96% of fourth gradestudents scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Geometry.

In 2013, 87% of fourth grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Geometry Multiple Choice and Measurement Open Response.

Over three years the Targeted Achievement Gap Group showed the following areas of weakness: Geometry and Measurement Multiple Choice and Measurement Open Response.

5. ACSIP CRT Data Source for SPRINGHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2011 ITBS 3rd Grade Math Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

89 students: 98.8% of Combined students
 2 students: 100% of African American students
 0 students: N/A Hispanic students
 84 students: 98.8% of Caucasian students
 22 students: 100.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 0 student: N/A LEP students
 0 students: N/A Students with Disabilities

2012 ACTAAP 3rd Grade Math Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

109 students: 96% of Combined students
 2 students: 100% of African American students
 5 students: 100% of Hispanic students
 100 students: 96% of Caucasian students
 26 students: 85% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 0 students: N/A% of LEP students
 12 students: 67% of Students with Disabilities

2013 ACTAAP 3rd Grade Math Exam

#Tested & Percent of students scoring proficient/advanced:

93 students: 94% of Combined students
 1 student: 0% of African American students
 12 students: 75% of Hispanic students
 76 students: 99% of Caucasian students
 25 students: 80% of Econ. Disadvantaged students
 4 students: 50% of LEP students
 9 students: 67% of Students with Disabilities

6. Three-year trend analysis:

In 2011, 99% of third grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Data Analysis & Probability.

In 2012, 96% of third grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Geometry and Measurement.

In 2013, 94% of third grade students scored proficient or advanced. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Geometry Open Response.

Over three years the Targeted Achievement Gap Group showed the following areas of weakness: Measurement Multiple Choice and Geometry Open Response.

7. Three-year trend analysis:

On the 2011 ITBS, 72.4% of second grade students scored above the 50th percentile in math. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: mathematics concepts.

On the 2012 ITBS, 81.6% of second grade students scored above the 50th percentile in math. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: mathematics concepts.

On the 2013 ITBS, 72% of second grade students scored above the 50th percentile in math. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Problems and Data Interpretation.

8. Three-year trend analysis:

On the 2011 ITBS, 87.2% of first grade students scored above the 50th percentile in math. Analysis showed the following area of weakness: problems & data interpretation.

On the 2012 ITBS, 79.8% of first grade students scored above the 50th percentile in math.

Supporting
Data:

Analysis showed the following area of weakness: concepts.

On the 2013 ITBS, 81% of first grade students scored above the 50th percentile in math.

Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Concepts and Estimation.

9. Three-year trend analysis:

On the 2009 ITBS, 77.5% of kindergarten students scored above the 50th percentile in math.

Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Problem solving and Measurement.

On the 2010 ITBS, 69.6% of kindergarten students scored above the 50th percentile in math.

Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Problem Solving Skills.

On the 2011 ITBS, 83.5% of kindergarten students scored above the 50th percentile in math.

Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: problem solving.

10. For the year 2012 - 2013 the attendance rate was 96.86%.

Goal To improve math skills for all students with an emphasis in the Geometry Multiple Choice and Open Response subtests.

Benchmark At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 91.61% were proficient or advanced. By the end of the 2013 - 2014 school year, 95.06% of the combined population must be proficient or advanced in Mathematics. By the end of the 2017-2018 school year, 96.71% of the combined population must be proficient or advanced.

Intervention: Implement a standards based mathematics model.				
Scientific Based Research: Lannin, J. K., Ellis, A. B., & Elliott, R. (2011). Developing Essential Understanding of Mathematical Reasoning for Teaching Mathematics in Prekindergarten-Grade 8. National Council of Teachers of English. Caldwell, J. H. (2010). Developing Essential Understanding of Addition and Subtraction for Teaching Mathematics in Prekindergarten-Grade 2. National Council of Teachers of English. Dougherty, B. J. (2010). Developing Essential Understanding of Number and Numeration for Teaching Mathematics in Prekindergarten--Grade 2. Otto, A. D. (2011). Developing Essential Understanding of Multiplication and Division for Teaching Mathematics in Grades 3-5. National Council of Teachers of English. Barnett-Clarke, C. (2010). Developing Essential Understanding of Rational Numbers for Teaching Mathematics in Grades 3/5. National Council of Teachers of English. Blanton, M. L. (2011). Developing Essential Understanding of Algebraic Thinking for Teaching Mathematics in Grades 3-5. Cholmsky, Paul; (March 2011) From Acquisition to Automaticity: The Reflex Solution for Math Fact Mastery. Charlottesville, VA				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the following strategies and programs at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in: ·Technology-assisted instruction ·CGI (K-3) ·Teacher Modeling ·Assessing Math Concepts (K) ·Reflex (2-5) ·Thinking Mathematically (4, 5) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kim Whittaker, 1st Grade Jessica Catlett, 3rd Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All teachers including special education teachers, staff, have reviewed, researched and decided to implement the following instructional strategies and resources: ·Supplemental Drill for the acquisition of basic concepts ·Teacher Modeling ·Computer-assisted instruction, including, but not limited to, Reflex (1-5) ·Use of Paraprofessionals (K – 5) ·Thinking Mathematically (4,5) ·District Math Specialist	LeeAnn McDaniel, K Meryl Vaughn, 3rd Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Assessing Math Concepts (K) ·Everyday Math (K,1) ·Number Talks (K-5) ·Developing Number Concepts ·Standards-based Supplemental materials ·Implement various types of Open Response questions ·Implement the use of standardized assessments to teach and practice district math standards. ·Calendar Math (2) ·Morning Math (3-5) ·Mountain Math (3) ·Math journal Open Response (K-2) ·Use open response questions with math units, tests, and/or journals. (2nd – 5th grades, including special education) ·CGI (K-3) ·Correlate standards for mathematical practice with music, art, and physical education instruction <p>These strategies have been aligned to Common Core and Bryant curriculum. They will also be used to reduce the disparity between our subpopulations. Emphasis will be placed on those strategies that will improve achievement in the Open Response Math subtest.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>NSLA funds will be used to provide for materials and supplies and capital outlay (laptop computer) for a Math Specialist to help reduce the achievement disparities among student subgroups.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Russ Sherrill, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff 	<p>NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$2000.00</p> <p>NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$2500</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Formative Assessments ·Teacher Lesson Plans that include real-world problem solving activities, manipulatives, and tools.(K-5) ·Classroom Walkthroughs(K-5) ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) ·PLCs ·Norm-referenced tests <p>The school leadership team in an analysis of CWT and teacher lesson plans found all teachers were providing instruction on a daily basis. An analysis of teacher tests and interim assessments showed that a majority of students</p>	<p>Deborah Coles, 2nd Grade Tracey Wilson, 5th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>improved from test to test. An analysis of Norm-referenced tests showed most students improved from year to year. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Special education teachers have researched and decided to implement the following strategies for IEP students: ·Co-teaching for math (3, 5) ·Special Education Push-in (1) ·Technology-assisted instruction ·Daily small groups to reinforce math skills ·One-on-one instruction from a certified special education teacher to provide repeated practice of skills and immediate feedback to student ·No more than 8 students in a small group ·Providing extra time for students to attain skills ·Individualized or small group testing</p> <p>These strategies have been aligned to Common Core and Bryant curriculum. They will be used to reduce the disparity between our combined and IEP populations. Emphasis will be placed on those strategies that will improve achievement in the Open Response Math test. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Keasha Mosley, Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Title IIA funds will be used to hire a 1.00 fte Math Instructional Facilitator (Debbie Goble), to conduct professional development activities on effective instructional strategies for all teachers that are aligned to the AR Frameworks and Common Core, including special education teachers to help reduce the achievement disparities among student subgroups. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Pam Kenney, Director of Instruction</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>Title II-A - Employee \$15695.00 Benefits: Title II-A - Employee \$61110.00 Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$76805</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$79305</p>

Intervention: Curriculum Alignment and Mapping

Scientific Based Research: Lannin, J. K., Ellis, A. B., & Elliott, R. (2011). Developing essential understanding of mathematical reasoning for teaching mathematics in prekindergarten-grade 8. National Council of Teachers of English. Caldwell, J. H. (2010). Developing essential understanding of addition and subtraction for teaching mathematics in prekindergarten-grade 2. National Council of Teachers of English. Dougherty, B. J. (2010). Developing essential understanding of number and numeration for teaching mathematics in prekindergarten--grade 2. Otto, A. D. (2011). Developing essential understanding of multiplication and division for teaching mathematics in grades 3-5. National Council of Teachers of English. Barnett-Clarke, C. (2010). Developing essential understanding of rational numbers for teaching mathematics in grades 3/5. National Council of Teachers of English. Blanton, M. L. (2011). Developing essential understanding of algebraic thinking for teaching mathematics in grades 3-5. Empson, S. B., Levi, L., & Carpenter, T. P. (2013). Extending children's mathematics: Fractions and decimals, innovations in cognitively guided instruction. Heinemann. Battista, M. T. (2012). Cognition-based assessment & teaching of place value, building on students' reasoning. Heinemann.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Grade level teachers and school specialists will meet throughout the year in school-based or district-wide PLC meetings to align curriculum to	Teri Henningsen, 4th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	ACTION \$

the district, state, and Common Core frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education		06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	BUDGET:
All teachers, including special education, will update curriculum maps to correlate with Common Core and Pacing Guides Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Debbie Goble, Learning Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher lesson plans referencing Common Core Formative Assessments PLCs Classroom Walkthroughs Checklists (K-2) District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) Norm-referenced tests <p>The school leadership team in an analysis of CWT and teacher lesson plans found all teachers were providing instruction according to their curriculum maps. An analysis of teacher tests and interim assessments showed that most students were applying knowledge from daily classroom instruction. An analysis of Norm-referenced tests showed 75% of students improved from year to year.</p> Action Type: Program Evaluation	Deborah Coles, 2nd Grade Tracey Wilson, 5th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the following strategies and programs at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology-assisted instruction CGI (K-3) Regular inclusion and evaluation of Open Response in the classroom Calendar Math Mountain Math (3) Teacher Modeling Thinking Mathematically(4,5) Common Core Math Standards Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kim Whittaker, 1st Grade Jessica Catlett, 3rd Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Academic Improvement Plan

Scientific Based Research: SEDL. (2013). Using Data to Guide Instructional Planning. Austin, TX: Lewis, Dale; Madison-Harris, Robyn; Muoneke, Ada; Times, Chris. Retrieved August 1, 2013 from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/sedl-letter/v22n02/using-data.html>
 Goertz, Margaret E.; Olah, Leslie Nabors; Riggan, Matthew (2009) Can Interim Assessments Be Used for Instructional Change? University of PA. ERIC NO.: ED536829

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will place students on an Academic Improvement Plan according to: *Norm-referenced test scores (2-5) *QUALLS Inventory (K) *Counting Objects Assessment (1) *Previous AIP (1) Action Type: AIP/IRI	Debbie Goble, Learning Specialist	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Teachers will notify parents of student placement on AIP and refer them to the District Parent Resource Center. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Teri Henningsen, 4th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Public Library • School Library • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Students identified as below grade level will be remediated through: ·After-school Enrichment (K-5) ·Small group instruction ·Re-teaching ·Peer tutoring ·Do the Math (2-5) ·Co-Teaching (3, 5) ·Special Education Push-in (1) ·Differentiated instruction ·Individualized instruction and practice using Reflex ·Teacher led intervention group ·Use of Paraprofessionals(K-5)</p> <p>These strategies and programs have been aligned to the AR state frameworks and Common Core. They will also be used to reduce the disparity between our subpopulations. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lee Ann McDaniel, Kindergarten Holly Aldridge 5th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the following strategies at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in: ·Differentiated Instruction ·PLCs ·Computer-assisted instruction ·Regular inclusion and evaluation of open response in the classroom.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Kim Whittaker, 1st Grade Jessica Catlett, 3rd Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>To evaluate student progress and proficiency, teachers, including special education, will review Academic Improvement Plans throughout the year using information from: ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) ·Small group monitoring ·Frequent observation of students ·Intervention Groups ·Report Card checklists (K-2)</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Teri Henningsen, 4th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by: ·Teacher Observations of students ·Formative Assessments ·Report card checklists (K-2) ·Teacher Lesson Plans highlighting AIP strategies ·AIP round table notes and recommendations ·Classroom Walkthroughs</p>	<p>Lee Ann McDaniel, Kindergarten Holly Aldridge 5th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) ·PLCs ·Norm-referenced tests <p>The school leadership team in an analysis of CWT, teacher observations, and teacher lesson plans found all teachers were providing individualized instruction based on student need. An analysis of interim assessments and teacher tests showed that a majority of AIP students improved skills throughout the year. An analysis of ACTAAP scores showed 95.8% of students improved from year to year. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement Response to Intervention program for at-risk students.

Scientific Based Research:

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>All teachers including special education will be trained at local, state, or national conferences in Response to Intervention for at-risk students. Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Kim Whittaker, 1st Grade Jessica Catlett, 3rd Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Develop a site-based intervention team to prescribe an individualized plan of action for student achievement to be evaluated through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·After-school Enrichment (K-5) ·Kagan Cooperative Learning ·Teacher observation of students ·Formative Assessments ·Teacher-led Intervention Groups <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Debbie Goble, Learning Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Teacher Observations of students ·Classroom Walkthroughs ·Lesson plans for RTI instruction ·RTI round table monitoring ·District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) ·Formative Assessments ·Norm-referenced tests <p>An analysis of Scaled Benchmark scores showed 83.7% of students showed growth after participating in the RTI program during 2012-2013. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Deborah Coles, 2nd Grade Tracey Wilson, 5th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>NSLA restricted state categorical funds will be used to purchase a class set of chrome books and chrome cart to be shared in second grade classrooms to help reduce the achievement disparities among student subgroups and improve student achievement in mathematics concepts. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Russ Sherrill, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 3: Wellness

Supporting Data:

1. For the year 2012-2013, according to BMI classification, 29.5% of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade males were overweight or obese; 22% of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade females were overweight or obese. 29.3% of kindergarten males were overweight or obese, 26.3% of second grade males were overweight or obese, and 32.6% of fourth grade males were overweight or obese. 31% of kindergarten females were overweight or obese, 19.4% of second grade females were overweight or obese, and 16.3% of fourth grade females were overweight or obese. Approximately 14.1% of all kindergarten, second, and fourth graders were in the overweight category, and 11.6% of all kindergarten, second, and fourth graders were identified as obese.
2. For the year 2011-2012, according to BMI classification, 22% of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade males were overweight or obese; 26.7% of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade females were overweight or obese. 20.5% of kindergarten males were overweight or obese, 20% of second grade males were overweight or obese, and 24.5% of fourth grade males were overweight or obese. 26.7% of kindergarten females were overweight or obese, 20% of second grade females were overweight or obese, and 33.3% of fourth grade females were overweight or obese. Approximately 13.9% of all kindergarten, second, and fourth graders were in the overweight category, and 10.1 % of all kindergarten, second, and fourth graders were identified as obese.
3. For the year 2010-2011, according to BMI classification, 15.5% of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade males were overweight or obese; 8.4% of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade females were overweight or obese. 29.7% of kindergarten males were overweight or obese, 33.3% of second grade males were overweight or obese, and 38.2% of fourth grade males were overweight or obese. 22.6% of kindergarten females were overweight or obese, 23.1% of second grade females were overweight or obese, and 28.0% of fourth grade females were overweight or obese. Approximately 17.1% of all kindergarten, second, and fourth graders were in the overweight category, and 12.3 % of all kindergarten, second, and fourth graders were identified as obese.
4. Three-year trend analysis:
From the 2010-2011 school year to the 2012-2013 school year, the overall number of overweight students dropped 3% and the overall number of obese students dropped .7%.

Goal To reduce obesity levels of our students.

Benchmark Annually, .5% of students will move from at risk for overweight or overweight to healthy.

Intervention: Implement a comprehensive school health program.				
Scientific Based Research: Barros, Romina, Silver, Ellen, & Stein, Ruth. (2009) School Recess and Group Classroom Behavior <i>Pediatrics</i> . doi: 10.1542/peds.2007-2825 Mahdavi, A.M., Subjective Global Assessment of nutritional status in children,(2010) <i>Maternal And Child Nutrition</i> . U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2013) Nutrition Basics Help Fight Child Obesity				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All teachers, including special education and physical education, will teach health and nutrition. Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness	Tara Efird, Counselor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each student will participate in 30 minutes daily physical activity to include soccer, running, walking, climbing, basketball, swinging, jumping rope and games. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Bobbie Morehart, Physical Education	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All teachers, including special education, staff, and parents have met and the following strategies to promote good nutrition have been implemented: ·No candy to be used as rewards for behavior or instruction ·No more than 9 events per school year which permits exceptions to the food and beverage limitations ·No student vending machines ·Abide by the current allowable food and beverage portion standards as defined by the	Hope Boone, Cafeteria Manager	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Students will have at least 10 minutes after sitting down to eat their breakfast meal and at least 20 minutes after sitting down to eat their lunch meal ·Students will have access to hand washing or sanitizing before meals and snacks ·Students will be discouraged from sharing food and beverages with one another during meal and snack times <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness</p>				
<p>All teachers, including special education, staff, and parents, have met and will implement the following strategies to keep parents informed of their child’s health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Vision screenings ·Hearing screenings ·BMI screenings (results are distributed to parents) ·Immunization updates ·Doctor referrals <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness</p>	Rachel Cobb, RN	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>All teachers including special education and staff will be trained in the above strategies at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Child nutrition ·Physical activity ·Health <p>Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness</p>	Bobbie Morehart, Physical Education	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>The advisory committee will annually review data and health & wellness modules to determine the effectiveness of this intervention. Administrative staff will also annually provide onsite review.</p> <p>Review of BMI data indicated 7% overall decrease in Overweight or Obese students from 2009-2011 for the same group of students.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Rachel Cobb, RN	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4: ELL and Title III funds will be used to support the goals of of the ELL Program.

- 2012-2013 AMAO Literacy- The English Language Learner’s (ELLs) performance goal was 62.89 and district ELLs scored 67.55. Math- The ELL performance goal was 73.63 and district ELL’s scored 67.63. so it was not achieved in either performance or growth. Therefore ELL math district-wide is a target improvement area.
- 2011-12 AMO Literacy- The ELLs performance goal was 59.18 and the district ELLs scored 55.47. The math target was 70.99 and ELL’s scored 60.
- 2010-11 AMO Literacy- The ELLs district wide scored as follows: K-5 math--scored 86 and target was 77.50; K-5 Literacy--scored 66.7 and target was 78.40; 6-8 math-- scored 58.7 and target was 73.41; 6-8 literacy--scored 52.5 and target was 75.70; 9-12 math--scored 50 and target was 74.45; 9-12 literacy--scored 10 and target was 75.81.

Supporting Data:

Goal Provide Improvement in the Reading and Content Skills for Identified ELL students.

Benchmark In the 2013-14 School Year the district will show an increase of 1% toward AMAO.

Intervention: Provide support for the implementation of the district plan to increase English and Writing fluency. Double Blocking, Response to Intervention (Laptops, Rosetta Stone, Enchanted Learning, Vocabulary from A to Z.)

Scientific Based Research: Scientific Based Research: Scientific Based Research: “Content Area Reading”

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Richard T. Vacca, Jo Anne L. Vacca, Maryann Mraz (2011) Boston: Pearson; "Creating Literacy Instruction for All Students" Thomas Gunning (2012) Boston: Pearson; "Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for K-12 Teachers." Suzanne F. Peregoy, Owen F. Boyle (2012) New York: Addison Wesley Longman; "Contemporary Reading in Literacy Education" Marva Capello, Barbara Moss (2010) Thousand Oaks; Sage Publications, Inc.</p> <p>All ELL teachers received laptops, LCD projectors and document cameras. Earobics software for reading and spelling is used, along with Destiny, One More Story, Compass, Rosetta Stone, Reading Renaissance, STAR, and English in a Flash. An online subscription to Enchanted Learning and Vocabulary from A to Z was purchased for teachers.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Katrina Cox	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>English Language Development Assesment (ELDA), Language Assessment Scales (LAS), Benchmark (grades 3-5), Interim Assessments (TLI) and Nine Weeks Report Cards are used to evaluate the progress of ELL students.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Katrina Cox	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>ELL training will be provided to all content area teachers who are working with the identified students in the content area. Parental Involvement strategies specific to ELL students will be developed. Translated materials will also be provided for parents.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Katrina Cox	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Response to Intervention (RTI); the teachers are Double Blocking on-level ELL students in addition to the ESL pull-out program. There are scheduled ELL Team Meetings for planning and collaboration and an additional teacher was hired to reduce student class size.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity</p>	Katrina Cox	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) restricted categorical state funding will be used to pay for necessary materials and supplies to support the ELL program to implement a successful program in this area to help reduce the achievement disparities among student subgroups.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Katrina Cox	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Teachers 	<p>ELL (State-276) - Materials & Supplies: \$676.00</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$676</p>
<p>Title III funds will be used for general materials and supplies, and other necessary items to successfully implement the district ELL program to help reduce the achievement disparities among student subgroups. Funds will also be used to pay for subs, registration, and travel for professional development, salaries and benefits and purchased services for interpretation services, software (Rosetta Stone, Language Line, and Enchanted Learning A-Z), parental involvement supplies, and postage.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Katrina Cox	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Teachers 	<p>Title III - Purchased Services: \$2655.00</p> <p>Title III - Materials & Supplies: \$1845.00</p> <p>Title III - Employee Salaries: \$643.00</p> <p>Title III - Employee Benefits: \$143.00</p>

Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion				ACTION BUDGET: \$5286
Total Budget:				\$5962

Priority 5: Springhill Elementary will improve mathematics performance, especially in our targeted achievement gap group, to achieve AMO growth standards developed by the Arkansas Department of Education.

1. 2013 AR School ESEA Accountability Report

Math status: 178 of all students attempted, 58.43% met growth, with AMO at 79.87%
Math status: 59 students in Targeted Achievement Gap Group attempted: 35.59% met growth, with AMO at 66.35%.

2. Three-year trend analysis:

Literacy status: 529 of all students attempted, 89.22% met growth, with AMO at 87.83%.
151 students of Targeted Achievement Gap Group attempted, 76.82% met growth, with AMO at 77.57%.

Supporting Data:

Math status: 529 of all students attempted, 70.13% met growth, with AMO at 79.87%.
Math status: 151 students in Targeted Achievement Gap Group attempted, 50.33% met growth, with AMO at 66.35%.

The greatest areas of weakness for the Combined Population on the ACTAAP from 2011-2013 are Geometry Multiple Choice and Geometry Open Response. The greatest areas of weakness for the Targeted Achievement Gap Group on the ACTAAP from 2011-2013 are Measurement Multiple Choice and Geometry Open Response.

Goal To meet or exceed AMO math standards set by the State Department of Education for all students and our Targeted Achievement Gap Group, with an emphasis in the Measurement Multiple Choice and Open Response subtests.

Benchmark At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 91.91% of all students and 78.79% of Springhill's Targeted Achievement Gap Group were proficient or advanced in Math. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 94.20% of all students and 87.66% of Springhill's Targeted Achievement Gap Group must be proficient or advanced in Math. By the end of the 2017-2018 school year, 96.71% of all students and 91.77% of the Targeted Achievement Gap Group must be proficient or advanced in Math.

Intervention: To improve measurement multiple choice and geometry open response through proven research-based instructional strategies.

Scientific Based Research: Kim Bailey and Chris Jakicic, "Common Formative Assessment: A Toolkit for Professional Learning Communities at Work," Solution Tree Press, Bloomington, IN, USA, 2012.
Battista, M. T. (2012). Cognition-based assessment & teaching of place value, building on students' reasoning. Heinemann.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All teachers, including special education teachers, staff, and parents, have reviewed, researched, and decided to implement the following instructional strategies and resources: *Classroom teachers and Learning Specialists modeling successful research-based instructional strategies in the classroom with an emphasis in measurement and open response *Explorations in Nonfiction Writing *Kagan Cooperative Learning *Developing Number Concepts *Do the Math *Reflex Math *Number Talks *CGI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Kim Fugitt, 1st Grade Amanda Fisher, 3rd Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All teachers, including special education teachers, will be trained in the following mathematics strategies and programs at local, state, and national conferences and workshops with an emphasis in: *Explorations in Nonfiction Writing *Kagan Cooperative Learning *Developing Number Concepts *Do the Math	Anita Hall, 2nd Grade Jodi White, 4th Grade	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>*Reflex Math *Number Talks *CGI</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>Parents will be given information on how to become more involved in their child's learning through: *Classroom Newsletters *School newsletter informing parents of school status *Parent surveys *Websites, including the District site, School site, Common Core Expectations, and PARCC</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Carol Johnson, Kindergarten Leslie Smith, 5th Grade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be measured by: *Formative Assessments (K-5) *PLCs (K-5) *District-adopted interim assessments (1-5) *Classroom Walkthroughs *RTI Roundtable *Norm-referenced tests This is the first year for this intervention. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Andrea Willis, ESL Katy Turbeville, Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>

• Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Amanda Fisher	3rd Grade	Needs Improvement Chair
Classroom Teacher	Anita Hall	2nd Grade	Needs Improvement
Classroom Teacher	Belinda Moore	3rd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Carol Johnson	Kindergarten	Needs Improvement
Classroom Teacher	Celest Pritchett	1st Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Chelsea Mansfield	Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Courtney Worthen	4th Grade	Steering
Classroom Teacher	Debbie Huddleston	Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Deborah Coles	2nd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Elizabeth Hoofman	1st Grade	Literacy Chair
Classroom Teacher	Holly Aldridge	5th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Janet Patton	Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jessica Catlett	3rd Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jodi White	4th Grade	Needs Improvement
Classroom Teacher	Kathy Crossett	2nd grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Kim Fugitt	1st Grade	Needs Improvement
Classroom Teacher	Kim Weaver	2nd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Kim Whittaker	1st Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Lee Ann McDaniel	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Leigh Hooton	4th Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Leslie Smith	5th Grade	Needs Improvement
Classroom Teacher	Lisa Childers	5th Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Meryl Vaughn	3rd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Teri Henningsen	4th Grade	Math Chair

Classroom Teacher	Tracey Wilson	5th Grade	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Alvie Bearden	Food Service	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Andrea Willis	ESL Instructor	Needs Improvement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Becky Williams	O/T	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Bobbie Morehart	Physical Education	Wellness Chair
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Daphne Crider	Speech Pathologist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Debbie Goble	Math Specialist	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Delynne West	Music Specialist	Steering
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Diana Lewis	Art Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Holly Majors	Media Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Hope Boone	Cafeteria Manager	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jamie Glover	Paraprofessional	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jeff Coppock	Physical Therapist	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jessica Young	Paraprofessional	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Karen Pounders	Food Service	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Katy Turbeville	Special Education	Needs Improvement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Keisha Mosley	Special Education	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kristin Reynolds	Special Education	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Lori Yarberry	Paraprofessional	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mapra Gentry	Paraprofessional	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Melanie Martin	Occupational Therapist	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Paula Schaeffer	Literacy Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Polly Yant	Secretary	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Rachel Cobb	Nurse	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sandy Pennington	Secretary	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Stephanie Culbreath	Paraprofessional	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Stephanie Wineland	Special Ed Paraprofessional	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Tara Efird	Counselor	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Tara Efird	Counselor	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Theresa Deen	Food Service	Wellness
Parent	Erin Wilson	Parent	Literacy
Parent	Mike Funk	Parent	Wellness
Parent	Sandy Orender	Parent	Math
Principal	Deborah Tazelaar	Asst. Principal	Steering
Principal	Russ Sherrill	Principal	Steering
Principal	Russ Sherrill	Principal	Federal Programs