

## School Plan

PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL  
401 PARKERS CHAPEL RD, EL DORADO, AR 71730

### Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2013-2014

Our mission at Parkers Chapel Elementary is to offer the opportunity for all students to be proficient or advanced by nurturing, challenging, and guiding them toward their maximum academic, physical, social and emotional potential in a caring, safe environment.

Grade Span: K-6

Title I: Title I Targeted Assistance

School Improvement: MS

---

#### Table of Contents

**Priority 1: LITERACY**

**Goal:** To Improve Literacy Scores in Multiple Choice Content and Multiple Choice Practical Passages. To Improve Open Response Practical Passages. To Improve Writing Scores in Content and Style. To Improve Multiple Choice Writing Skill Responses.

**Priority 2: MATH**

**Goal:** To Improve Math Scores in the Areas of Multiple Choice Measurement, Open Response Geometry, and Open Response Data Analysis and Probability.

**Priority 3: WELLNESS**

**Goal:** To Improve the Health and Physical Well Being of Students.

**Priority 4: ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

**Goal:** Students Identified as English Language Learners will receive support to ensure they become successful learners in the classroom, and score proficient on the augmented benchmark exams and ELDA assessments.

**Priority 5: SCIENCE**

**Goal:** To Increase 5th Grade Science Scores in the Areas of Physical Science Multiple Choice and Earth Science Multiple Choice. To Increase Life Science Open Responses.

---

Priority 1: To improve literacy scores on the Arkansas Benchmark Tests and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

1. The attendance rate for Parkers Chapel Elementary for 2009-2010 was 95.1%, for
2. 2010-2011 was 95.4, and for 2011-12 was 96.60%.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
8. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL
9. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
15. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
16.                   40 Students: 75% of Combined Students
17.                   3 Students: 67% of African American Students

Supporting  
Data:

18. . Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
19. 37 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students
20. 9 Students: 78% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
21. . Students: N/A% of LEP Students
22. 3 Students: 67.0% of Students with Disabilities
23. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Open
24. Response Literary passage and open response content passage.
25. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Open response
26. Content passage and Multiple Choice content passage.
27. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:
28. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Open response content
29. passage and Open Response Literary Passage.
30. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:  
Open
31. Response literary Passage and multiple choice content passage.
32. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:
- 33.
34. 2011 3rd Literacy -# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring
35. Proficient/Advanced:
36. 51 tested and 92% of Combined Students
37. 5 tested and 80% of African American Students
38. 0 tested and n/a%Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
- 39.
40. 45 tested and 94% of Caucasian Students
41. 15 tested and 80% of Economically Disadvantaged Students

- 42.
43. 0 tested and N/A% of LEP Students
44. 6 tested and 84% of Students with Disabilities
45. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Multiple
46. Choice: Content and Practical Passages; Open Response: Practical Passages;
47. Writing: Content & Style
- 48.
49. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Multiple Choice:
50. Content Passages; Open Response: Literary Passages; Writing: Style
- 51.
52. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:
53. N/A - no students tested.
54. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Multiple Choice: Content
55. & Practical Passages; Open Response: Practical Passages; Writing: Content &
56. Style
57. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
58. Multiple Choice: Practical Passages; Open Response: Literary Passages; Writing:
59. Content & Style
60. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A
- 61.
62. 2012 3rd Literacy -# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring
63. Proficient/Advanced:
64. 42 tested and (40/42) 95% of Combined Students
- 65.
66. 2 tested and (2/2) 100% of African American Students

- 67.
68. 0 tested and n/a % of Hispanic Students
- 69.
70. 40 tested and (38/40) 95% of Caucasian Students
- 71.
72. 17 tested and (16/17) 98% of Economically Disadvantaged Students
- 73.
74. 0 tested and N/A% of LEP Students
75. 5 tested and (3/5) 60% of Students with Disabilities
- 76.
77. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Multiple
78. Choice: Practical Passages (237/336 points - 71%); Open Response: Practical
79. Passages (168/336 points - 50%); Writing: Content & Style (251/336 points in
80. both areas - 75%)
- 81.
- 82.
83. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Multiple Choice:
84. Practical Passages (12/16 points - 75%); Open Response: Content and Practical
85. Passages (11/16 points in both areas - 69%); Writing: Sentence Formation (11/16
86. points - 69%)
- 87.
88. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:
89. N/A - no students tested.
- 90.
91. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Multiple Choice:
92. Practical Passages (225/320 points - 70%); Open Response: Practical Passages
93. (157/320 points - 49%); Writing: Content & Style (238/320 points in both areas
94. - 74%)

- 95.
96. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
97. Multiple Choice: Practical Passages (6/8); Open Response: Literary & Content
98. Passages (4/8); Writing: Content & Style (5.9/8).
- 99.
100. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were:  
Multiple
101. Choice: Content & Practical Passages (4/8); Open Response: Content Passages
102. (2/8); Writing: Content & Style (4.5 / 8).
- 103.
- 104.
105. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A - no students
106. tested
- 107.
- 108.
109. Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Report Information for
- 110.
111. Parkers Chapel Elementary 4th Grade Literacy
- 112.
- 113.
- 114.
- 115.
- 116.
117. 2010-# of students tested & percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 118.
119. 55 Students: 72.7% of Combined Students
120. 3 Students: 33.3% of African American Students
121. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
122. 52 Students: 75.0% of Caucasian Students

123. 16 Students: 68.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
124. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
125. 8 Students: 37.5% of Students with Disabilities
126. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Open
127. response literary and open response content passage.
128. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Open Response
129. Content passage and Open response literary passage.
130. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
N/A
- 131.
132. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Open Response literary
133. passage and open response content passage.
134. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:  
open
135. response content passage and multiple choice content passage.
136. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A
- 137.
- 138.
- 139.
140. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 141.
142. 41 tested and 95% of Combined Students
143. 3 tested and 100% of African American Students
144. 1 tested and 100% of Hispanic Students
145. 37 tested and 95% of Caucasian Students
146. 20 tested and 95% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
147. 1 tested and 100% of LEP Students

148. 3 tested and 33% of Students with Disabilities
149. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Multiple
150. Choice: Practical Passages; Open Response: Content Passages; Writing: Content &  
151. Style.
152. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Multiple Choice:
153. Content and Practical Passages; Open Response: Content and Practical Passages;  
154. Writing: Content, Style, and Usage.
155. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
Multiple Choice:
156. Practical Passages; Open Response: Content & Practical Passages; Writing:  
157. Sentence Formation and Mechanics.
158. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice:
159. Practical Passages; Open Response: Content Passages; Writing: Content & Style  
160.
161. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
162. Multiple Choice: Practical Passages; Open Response: Content & Practical  
163. Passages; Writing: Mechanics, Content & Style.
164. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
Multiple Choice:
165. Practical Passages, Open Response: Content & Practical Passages; Writing:  
166. Sentence Formation & Mechanics.  
167.  
168.
- 169.
170. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
171.
172. 52 tested and (48/52) 92% of Combined Students

173.  
174. 5 tested and (4/5) 80% of African American Students
175.  
176. 0 tested and n/a % of Hispanic Students
177. 45 tested and (43/45) 96% of Caucasian Students
178. 2 tested and (1/2) 50% of Students - 2 or More Races
179.  
180. 18 tested and (16/18) 89% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
181.  
182. 0 tested and n/a % of LEP Students
183. 7 tested and (5/7) 71% of Students with Disabilities
184.  
185. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Multiple  
186. Choice: Practical Passages (5/8); Open Response: Practical Passages (3/8);  
187. Writing: Content & Style (both 5.6/8).
188.  
189. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Multiple Choice:  
190. Content & Practical Passages (55% - 22/40 points); Open Response: Practical  
191. Passages (33% - 13/40 points); Writing: Content & Style (64% - 25.5 / 40  
192. points in both areas).
193.  
194. The lowest identified areas for 2 or more races were:  
Multiple Choice:  
195. Literary Passages (63% - 10/16 points); Open Response: Practical Passages (19%  
196. - 3/16 points); Writing: Content & Style 63% - 10/16 points).
197.  
198. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
n/a - none were  
199. tested



- 200.
- 201. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice:  
202. Practical Passages (68% - 245/360 points); Open Response: Practical Passages  
203. (33% - 118/360 points) ; Writing: Content & Style (74% - 268 / 360 points).
- 204.
- 205.
- 206. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:  
  
207. Multiple Choice: Practical Passages (5/8); Open Response: Content & Practical  
208. Passages ( 2/8 ); Writing: Mechanics, Content & Style (5.6 / 8 in both areas).
- 209.
- 210.
- 211. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were:  
  
212. Multiple Choice: Practical Passages (5/8); Open Response: Content & Practical  
213. Passages ( 2/8 ); Writing: Mechanics, Content & Style (5.6 / 8 in both areas).
- 214.
- 215.
- 216. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a (no students tested  
217. in this area)
- 218.
- 219.
- 220.
- 221.
- 222. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL
- 223. Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam
- 224.
- 225.
- 226.
- 227. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 228.

- 229. 46 Students: 78.2% of Combined Students
- 230. 2 Students: 50.0% of African American Students
- 231. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
- 232. 44 Students: 79.5% of Caucasian Students
- 233. 9 Students: 77.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
- 234. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
- 235. 1 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities
- 236. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Content
- 237. passage open response and Literary passage open response
- 238. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Open response
- 239. content passage and multiple choice literary passage
- 240. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
N/A
- 241.
- 242. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Practical passage open
- 243. response and literary passage open response
- 244. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
- 245. Content passage open response and practical passage open response
- 246. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A
- 247.

2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring  
Proficient/Advanced:

50 tested and 80% of Combined Students

5 tested and 80% of African American Students

0 tested and N/A% of Hispanic Students

44 tested and 80% of Caucasian Students

19 tested and 69% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

0 tested and N/A% of LEP Students

7 tested and 29% of Students with Disabilities

The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:

Multiple

Choice: Content Passages; Open Response: Literal Passages; Writing: Content & Style.

The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:

Multiple Choice:

Content Passages; Open Response: Literal Passages; Writing: Sentence Formation.

The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:

N/A

The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:

Multiple Choice:

Content Passages; Open Response: Literal Passages; Writing: Content & Style.

The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:

Multiple Choice: Content Passages; Open Response: Literal Passages; Writing: Content & Style.

The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:

N/A .

2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

39 tested and 97% of Combined Students

5 tested and 100% of African American Students

1 tested and 100% of Hispanic Students

33 tested and 97% of Caucasian Students

16 tested and 100% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

1 tested and 100% of LEP Students

2 tested and 50% of Students with Disabilities

The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:

Multiple

Choice: Content Passages (243 / 312 points - 78%); Open Response: Literary Passages (195/312 points - 63%); Writing: Content (260/312 points - 83%) and Style (261 / 312 points - 84%).

The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:

Multiple Choice:

Practical Passages (23/40 points - 58%); Open Response: Content Passages (27/40 points - 68%); Writing: Content & Style (33/40 points in both areas - 83%)

The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:

Multiple Choice:

Content Passages (6/8 points - 75%); Open Response: Practical Passages (2/8 points -25%); Writing: Content & Style (7.5 / 8 points in both areas - 94%)

The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:

Multiple Choice:

Content Passages (210/264 points - 80%); Open Response: Literary Passages (162/264 points - 61%); Writing: Content (219.5 / 264 points - 83%) & Style

(220.5/ 264 points - 84%).

The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:

Multiple Choice: Content and Practical Passages (6/8); Open Response: Literary and Content Passages (5/8); Writing: Content & Style (6.7 /8 in both areas).

The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:

Multiple Choice:

Content Passages (6/8 points - 75%); Open Response: Practical Passages (2/8 points -25%); Writing: Content & Style (7.5 / 8 points in both areas - 94%)

248.

249. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL

250. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam

251.

252.

253.

254.

255. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

256.           52 Students: 63.4% of Combined Students

257.           5 Students: 60.0% of African American Students

258.           1 Students:     0% of Hispanic Students

259.           46 Students: 65.2% of Caucasian Students

260. 13 Students: 53.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
261. . Students: N/A% of LEP Students
262. 3 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities
263. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Literary
264. passage open response and practical passage open response
- 265.
266. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Literary
267. passage Open response and Content passage open response
- 268.
269. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
Literary passage open
270. response and practical passage open response
- 271.
272. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Literary Passage Open
273. response and practical passage open response
- 274.
275. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
276. Literary Passage Open response and Practical passage open response
- 277.
278. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:
279. N/A
- 280.
- 281.
282. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 283.
284. 61 tested and 74%of Combined Students
285. 6 tested and 50% of African American Students
286. 1 tested and 100% of Hispanic Students

287. 54 tested and 75% of Caucasian Students
288. 17 tested and 65% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
289. 0 tested and N/A% of LEP Students
290. 6 tested and 33% of Students with Disabilities
291. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Multiple
292. Choice: Literary Passages; Open Response: Content Passages; Writing: Content &
293. Style.
- 294.
295. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Multiple Choice:
296. Literary Passages; Open Response: Content Passages; Writing: Content & Style.
- 297.
- 298.
299. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
Multiple Choice:
300. Content and Practical Passages; Open Response: Literary and Content Passages;
301. Writing: Content & Style.
- 302.
303. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice:
304. Literary Passages; Open Response: Content Passages; Writing: Content & Style
- 305.
- 306.
307. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
308. Multiple Choice: Literary Passages; Open Response: Content Passages; Writing:
309. Content & Style
310. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A

311.  
312.  
313. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
314.
315. 49 tested and (36/49) 73% of Combined Students
316.  
317. 5 tested and (2/5) 40% of African American Students
318.  
319. 0 tested and n/a % of Hispanic Students
320. 43 tested and (33/43) 77% of Caucasian Students
321.  
322. 20 tested and (14/20) 70% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
323.  
324. 0 tested and N/A% of LEP Students
325. 6 tested and (2/6) 33% of Students with Disabilities
326.  
327. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Multiple  
328. Choice: Literary Passages (256/392 points - 65%); Open Response: Practical  
329. Passages (143 / 392 points); Writing: Content (303/392 points - 77%) and Style  
330. (301.5 / 392 points - 77%).
331.  
332. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Multiple Choice:  
333. Literary Passages (20 / 40 points - 50%) ; Open Response: Practical Passages  
334. (12/40 points - 30%); Writing: Content (28/40 points - 70%), Style (28/40  
335. points - 70%), and Sentence Formation (29/40 points - 73%).
336.  
337. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
N/A - no students were



338. tested in this area.

339.

340. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:

Multiple Choice:

341. Literary Passages (236/352 points - 67%); Open Response: Practical Passages

342. (131 / 352 points - 37%); Writing: Content (275 /352 points - 78%) & Style

343. (273.5 / 352 points - 78%)

344.

345. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:

346. Multiple Choice: Literary and Practical Passages (5/8 - 63%); Open Response:

347. Practical Passages (4/8 - 50%); Writing: Content & Style (6.1 / 8 - 76%)

348.

349.

350. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:

N/A - no students

351. were tested in this area.

352.

353.

354. In 2010, 47% of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the SAT

355. 10 - Kindergarten;

356. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Vocabulary

357.

358.

359.

360. In 2011, # of Kindergarten students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %

361. scoring above 50th percentile:

362.

363. Combined Population: 49 students: 98% scored above the 50th percentile reading;

364.

365.

366. African Americans: 4 students: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in

367. reading;

368.  
369. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
370.

371.  
372. Caucasion Students: 43 students: 97.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
373. reading;

374.  
375. Economically Disadvantaged: 23 students: 95.7% scored above the 50th percentile  
376. in reading;

377.  
378. LEP: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

379.  
380. The lowest identified area for all populations was: Vocabulary

381.  
382. In 2012, Kindergarten students in Arkansas did not take the Iowa Tests of Basic  
383. Skills Test.

384.  
385.  
386. In 2010, 77% of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the Iowa  
387. Test of Basic Skills in First Grade;  
388. The lowest identified area for the combined population was: Comprehension  
389.  
390. In 2011, # of First Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
391. scoring above 50th percentile were:

392.  
393. Combined Population: 46 students: 73.9% scored above the 50th percentile  
394. reading;

395.  
396. African Americans: 4 students: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in  
397. reading;

398.

399. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
400.

401.

402. Caucasian Students: 40 students: 72.5% scored above the 50th percentile in  
403. reading;

404.

405. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 47.1% scored above the 50th percentile  
406. in reading;

407.

408. LEP: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

409.

410. Students with Disabilities: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile  
411. in reading;

412.

413. The lowest identified area for all populations was: Vocabulary

414.

415. The African American population also showed a weakness in language.

416.

417. The Hispanic population also showed a weakness in reading.

418.

419.

420.

421. In 2012, # of students in First Grade taking the ITBS and scoring above the 50%  
422. were:

423.

424. Combined Population: 47 students: 68% scored above the 50th percentile reading;  
425.

426.

427. African Americans: 3 students: 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
428. reading;

429.  
430. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
431.

432.  
433. Multi-Ethnic Students: 2 students: 50% scored above the 50th percentile in  
434. reading;

435.  
436. Caucasian Students: 41 students: 70.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
437. reading;

438.  
439. Economically Disadvantaged: 21 students: 61.9% scored above the 50th percentile  
440. in reading;

441.  
442. LEP: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

443.  
444. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 40% scored above the 50th percentile in  
445. reading.

446.  
447. The lowest identified area for all populations in First Grade was: Vocabulary  
448.

449.  
450. LEP students showed the greatest weakness in Vocabulary (1/1 - 100% below 50th  
451. percentile).

452.  
453. Economically Disadvantaged students showed the greatest weakness in Vocabulary  
454. (9/21 - 43% below 50th percentile).

455.  
456. Caucasian students showed the greatest weakness in the area of Vocabulary  
457. (14/41 - 34% below 50th percentile).

458.  
459. Students with Disabilities showed the greatest weakness in the area of  
460. Vocabulary (3/5 - 60% below the 50th percentile).

461.  
462.  
463.  
464. In 2010, 44% of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the SAT  
465. 10 in Second Grade;  
466. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Listening  
467. In 2011, # of Second Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
468. scoring above 50th percentile:

469. Combined Population: 47 students: 80.9% scored above the 50th percentile in  
470. reading;

471. African Americans: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
472.

473. Hispanic Students: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in  
474. reading;

475. Caucasian Students: 46 students: 82.6% scored above the 50th percentile in  
476. reading;

477. Economically Disadvantaged: 16 students: 81.3% scored above the 50th percentile  
478. in reading;

479. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

480. Students with Disabilities: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile  
481. in reading;

482. The lowest identified area for all populations was: Vocabulary

483. In 2012, # of students in Second Grade taking the ITBS and scoring above the  
484. 50% were:

485.  
486. Combined Population: 45 students: 77.8% scored above the 50th percentile

487. reading;

488.

489. African Americans: 4 students: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in

490. reading;

491.

492. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

493.

494.

495. Multi-Ethnic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in

496. reading;

497.

498. Caucasian Students: 39 students: 76.9% scored above the 50th percentile in

499. reading;

500.

501. Economically Disadvantaged: 19 students: 57.9% scored above the 50th percentile

502. in reading;

503.

504. LEP: 0 student: n/a scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

505.

506. Students with Disabilities: 3 students: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in

507. reading.

508.

509. The lowest identified area for all populations in Second Grade was: Vocabulary

510.

511.

512. LEP students showed the greatest weakness in N/A - no students tested in this

513. area.

514.

515. Economically Disadvantaged students showed the greatest weakness in Vocabulary

516. (9/19 - 47% below 50th percentile).

517.  
518. Caucasian students showed the greatest weakness in the area of Vocabulary.

519.  
520.  
521. Students with Disabilities showed the greatest weakness in the area of  
522. Vocabulary.

523.  
524.  
525. In 2010, 65 % of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the SAT  
526. 10 - Third;  
527. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Word Analysis  
528.

529.  
530. In 2011, # of Third Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
531. scoring above 50th percentile:

532. Combined Population: 51 students: 64.7% scored above the 50th percentile  
533. reading;

534. African Americans: 5 students: 40% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
535.

536. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
537.

538. Caucasian Students: 45 students: 51.1% scored above the 50th percentile in  
539. reading;

540. Economically Disadvantaged: 15 students: 40% scored above the 50th percentile  
541. in reading;

542. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

543. Students with Disabilities: 6 students: 16.7% scored above the 50th percentile  
544. in reading;

545. The lowest identified area for all populations was: Reading Comprehension.

546.

547.

548. In 2012, # of students in Third Grade taking the ITBS and the Natl. Percentile

549. Rank of Mean Standard Scores:

550.

551. Combined Population: 42 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 55 in

552. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 71 in Language;

553.

554. African Americans: 2 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 60 in reading

555. and a Natl. Percentile Score of 54 in Language.

556.

557. Hispanic Students: 0 students: n/a - no students tested in the areas of reading

558. or language;

559.

560. Multi-Ethnic Students: 0 students: n/a - no students tested in the areas of

561. reading or language;

562.

563. Caucasion Students: 40 students : with a Natl. Percentile Score of 55 in

564. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 71 in Language.

565.

566. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 53 in

567. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 61 in Language;

568.

569. LEP: 0 student: n/a no students tested in the areas of reading or language;

570.

571.

572. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 25 in

573. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 52 in Language.

574.



575.  
576.  
577. In 2010, 77 % of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the SAT  
578. 10 - Fourth;  
579. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Spelling  
580. In 2011, # of Fourth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
581. scoring above 50th percentile:  
  
582. Combined Population: 41 students: 65.9% scored above the 50th percentile  
583. reading;  
  
584. African Americans: 3 students: 33% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
585.  
  
586. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
587.  
  
588. Caucasian Students: 37 students: 70.3% scored above the 50th percentile in  
589. reading;  
  
590. Economically Disadvantaged: 20 students: 50% scored above the 50th percentile  
591. in reading;  
  
592. LEP: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
  
593. Students with Disabilities: 3 students: 33% scored above the 50th percentile in  
594. reading;  
  
595. The lowest identified area for all populations was: Reading Comprehension.  
  
596.  
597.  
598. In 2012, # of students in Fourth Grade taking the ITBS and the Natl. Percentile  
599. Rank of Mean Standard Scores:  
  
600.  
601. Combined Population: 52 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 59 in  
602. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 74 in Language;  
  
603.

604. African Americans: 5 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 38 in reading  
605. and a Natl. Percentile Score of 72 in Language.

606.

607. Hispanic Students: 0 students: n/a - no students tested in the areas of reading  
608. or language;

609.

610. Multi-Ethnic Students: 2 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 43 in  
611. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 57 in Language;

612.

613. Caucasion Students: 45 students : with a Natl. Percentile Score of 61 in  
614. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 75 in Language.

615.

616. Economically Disadvantaged: 18 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 50 in  
617. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 65 in Language;

618.

619. LEP: 0 student: n/a no students tested in the areas of reading or language;  
620.

621.

622. Students with Disabilities: 7 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 39 in  
623. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 54 in Language.

624.

625.

626.

627. In 2010, 75 % of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the SAT  
628. 10 - Fifth;

629. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Spelling

630.

631. In 2011, # of Fifth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
632. scoring above 50th percentile:

633. Combined Population: 50 students: 52% scored above the 50th percentile reading;  
634.

635. African Americans: 5 students: 20% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
636.

637. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
638.

639. Caucasion Students: 44 students: 54.5% scored above the 50th percentile in  
640. reading;

641. Economically Disadvantaged: 21 students: 38.1% scored above the 50th percentile  
642. in reading;

643. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

644. Students with Disabilities: 7 students: 14.3% scored above the 50th percentile  
645. in reading;

646. The lowest identified area for all populations was: Reading Comprehension.

647.

648.

649. In 2012, # of students in Fifth Grade taking the ITBS and the Natl. Percentile

650. Rank of Mean Standard Scores:

651.

652. Combined Population: 39 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 63 in

653. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 70 in Language;

654.

655. African Americans: 5 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 30 in reading

656. and a Natl. Percentile Score of 41 in Language.

657.

658. Hispanic Students: 1 student: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 48 in reading

659. and a Natl. Percentile Score of 56 in Language;

660.

661. Multi-Ethnic Students: 0 students: n/a - no students tested in the areas of

662. reading or language;

663.  
664. Caucasian Students: 33 students : with a Natl. Percentile Score of 68 in  
665. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 73 in Language.

666.  
667. Economically Disadvantaged: 16 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 55 in  
668. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 63 in Language;

669.  
670. LEP: 0 student: 1 student: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 48 in reading and  
671. a Natl. Percentile Score of 56 in Language;

672.  
673. Students with Disabilities: 2 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 63 in  
674. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 55 in Language.

675.  
676.  
677.  
678.  
679. In 2010, 61 % of combined students scored above the 50th percentile on the SAT  
680. 10 - Sixth;  
681. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Reading  
682. Comprehension.

683.  
684. In 2011, # of Sixth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
685. scoring above 50th percentile:

686. Combined Population: 61 students: 50.8% scored above the 50th percentile  
687. reading;

688. African Americans: 6 students: 16.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
689. reading;

690. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;  
691.

692. Caucasian Students: 54 students: 53.7% scored above the 50th percentile in

693. reading;

694. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 41.2% scored above the 50th percentile

695. in reading;

696. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in reading;

697. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 20% scored above the 50th percentile in

698. reading;

699. The lowest identified area for all populations, other than the Hispanic

700. population, was: Vocabulary

701. The Hispanic population's greatest weakness was language.

702.

703. In 2012, # of students in Sixth Grade taking the ITBS and the Natl. Percentile

704. Rank of Mean Standard Scores:

705.

706. Combined Population: 49 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 50 in

707. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 64 in Language;

708.

709. African Americans: 5 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 29 in reading

710. and a Natl. Percentile Score of 32 in Language.

711.

712. Hispanic Students: 0 students : n/a - no students tested in the areas of

713. reading and language;

714.

715. Multi-Ethnic Students: 1 student: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 85 in

716. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 98 in Language;

717.

718. Caucasian Students: 43 students : with a Natl. Percentile Score of 52 in

719. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 66 in Language.

720.

721. Economically Disadvantaged: 20 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 45 in  
722. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 60 in Language;

723.

724. LEP: 0 student: n/a - no students tested in the areas of reading and language;  
725.

726.

727. Students with Disabilities: 6 students: with a Natl. Percentile Score of 36 in  
728. reading and a Natl. Percentile Score of 32 in Language.

729.

730.

731. The 3rd through 6th Benchmark three-year trend analysis shows weaknesses in  
732. Reading Comprehension, Open Response Content passage, and Multiple Choice  
733. Content Passage.

734.

735. The 2012 AMO for all students is 86.51.  
736. The 2013 AMO for all students is 87.73.  
737. The 2014 AMO for all students is 88.96.  
738. The 2015 AMO for all students is 90.19.  
739. The 2016 AMO for all students is 91.41.  
740. The 2017 AMO for all students is 92.64.

741.

742. The number of students in the TARGETED ACHIEVEMENT GAP GROUP was 79. The  
743. percent proficient in literacy in 2011 was 77.22.

744.

745. The 2012 AMO for the targeted achievement gap group is 79.12.  
746. The 2013 AMO for the targeted achievement gap group is 81.02.  
747. The 2014 AMO for the targeted achievement gap group is 82.92.  
748. The 2015 AMO for the targeted achievement gap group is 84.81.  
749. The 2016 AMO for the targeted achievement gap group is 86.71.  
750. The 2017 AMO for the targeted achievement gap group is 88.61.

751.

752. The total number of African American students attempting the literacy test in  
753. 2011 was 17. The percentage of African American students scoring proficient or  
754. advanced in year 2011 was 76.47.

755.

756. The 2012 AMO for African Americans is 78.43.  
757. The 2013 AMO for African Americans is 80.39.

758. The 2014 AMO for African Americans is 82.35.  
759. The 2015 AMO for African Americans is 84.31.  
760. The 2016 AMO for African Americans is 86.27.  
761. The 2017 AMO for African Americans is 88.24.  
762.  
763. The total number of Hispanic students attempting the literacy test in 2011 was  
764. 3. 100% of those studens were proficient or advanced in 2011.  
765.  
766. The 2012 AMO for Hispanic students is 100%.  
767. The 2013 AMO for Hispanic students ins 100%.  
768. The 2014 AMO for Hispanic students is 100%.  
769. The 2015 AMO for Hispanic students is 100%.  
770. The 2016 AMO for Hispanic students is 100%.  
771. The 2017 AMO for Hispanic students is 100%.  
772.  
773. The total number of Caucasian students attempting the 2011 literacy test was  
774. 175. 85.71% of those students were proficient or advanced in 2011.  
775.  
776. The 2012 AMO for Caucasian students is 86.90.  
777. The 2013 AMO for Caucasian students is 88.09.  
778. The 2014 AMO for Caucasian students is 89.28.  
779. The 2015 AMO for Caucasian students is 90.47.  
780. The 2016 AMO for Cuacasian students is 91.66.  
781. The 2017 AMO for Caucasian students is 92.86.  
782.  
783. The total number of Economically Disadvantaged students attmpting the literacy  
784. test in 2011 was 64. The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students  
785. scoring proficient or advanced in 2011 was 82.81.  
786.  
787. The 2012 AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is 84.24.  
788. The 2013 AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is 85.68.  
789. The 2014 AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is 87.11.  
790. The 2015 AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is 88.54.  
791. The 2016 AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is 89.97.  
792. the 2017 AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is 91.41.  
793.  
794. The total number of English Language Learners attempting the 2011 literacy test  
795. was 1. 100% of the ELL students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy  
796. test in 2011.  
797.

798. The 2012 AMO for ELL is 100%.
799. The 2013 AMO for ELL is 100%.
800. The 2014 AMO for ELL is 100%.
801. The 2015 AMO for ELL is 100%.
802. The 2016 AMO for ELL is 100%.
803. The 2017 AMO for ELL is 100%.
- 804.
805. The total number of Students with Disabilities attempting the literacy test in
806. 2011 was 24. The percentage of those students scoring proficient or advanced
807. on the 2011 test was 45.83.
- 808.
809. The 2012 AMO for Students with Disabilities is 50.34.
810. The 2013 AMO for Students with Disabilities is 54.86.
811. The 2014 AMO for Students with Disabilities is 59.37.
812. The 2015 AMO for Students with Disabilities is 63.89.
813. The 2016 AMO for Students with Disabilities is 68.40.
814. The 2017 AMO for Students with Disabilities is 72.92.
- 815.
- 816.
817. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Combined and all sub-populations are making AYP.
- 818.
819. According to the AMO Report, Parkers Chapel Elementary is an Achieving School
820. in Literacy.
- 821.

Goal	<p>To Improve Literacy Scores in Multiple Choice Content and Multiple Choice Practical Passages. To Improve Open Response Practical Passages. To Improve Writing Scores in Content and Style. To Improve Multiple Choice Writing Skill Responses.</p> <p>At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 85.3% of the Combined Population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-2012 school year 88.3% of the Combined Population will be proficient. This benchmark was met. 90% were proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2012 - 13 school year, 92% of the Combined Population will be proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 76.5% of the African American Population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 79.2% of the African American Population will be proficient. This benchmark was met. 80% were proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 82% of the African American Population will be proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 85.7% of the Caucasian Population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 88.7% of the Caucasian Population will be proficient. We met this benchmark. 91% of the Caucasian Population were proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 93% of the Caucasian Population will be proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 82.8% of the Economically Disadvantaged Population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 85.7% of the Economically Disadvantaged Population will be proficient. We met this benchmark with 88% proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 90% of the Economically Disadvantaged Population will be proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2010-11 school year 45.8% of the Students with Disabilities were proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 47.4% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient. We met this benchmark with 53.5%. At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 54.86% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient or advanced. A growth of 4.52% will be achieved. According to the 2012 ESEA AMO printout, the total number of students attempting the literacy test in the year 2011 was 197. The percentage of students proficient or advanced in 2011 was 85.28. According to the 2013 ESEA AMO printout, the total number of students attempting the literacy test in the year 2012 was 186. The percentage of students proficient or advanced in 2012 was 85.48.</p> <p>AMO Literacy Performance Statements: At the end of the 2011-2012 school year the Literacy performance AMO showed: all students 86.51% and an improvement of 1.22% will be achieved by 2013. This benchmark was not met. The three year average of 487/567 or 85.89% of all students scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14, according to the AMO, 88.96% of all students will be proficient or advanced. This will be a gain of 3.07%. The target achievement TAG group was 79.12% and will gain 1.90% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. The three year average of 191/252 or 75.79% of the TAG group scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 82.92% of the TAG group will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 7.13%. The African American group was 78.43% and will gain 1.96% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 11/19 or 57.89% of the African American population scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 82.35% of the African American population will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 24.46%. The Hispanic group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 2/3 or 66.67% of the Hispanic group scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-13 year, according to the AMO, 100% of the Hispanic population will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 33.33%. The Caucasian group was 86.90% and will gain 1.19% by 2013. This benchmark was met. 143/161 or 88.82% of the Caucasian group was proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 89.28% of the Caucasian population will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 0.46%. The Economically Disadvantaged group was 84.24% and will gain 1.44% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 58/74 or 78.38% of the Economically Disadvantaged group was proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 87.11% of the Economically Disadvantaged group will be proficient or advanced. This is an increase of 8.73%. The English Language Learner group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013. This benchmark was met. 1/1 or 100% of the English Language Learner group was proficient or advanced. At the end of 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 100% of the ELL students will continue to be proficient or advanced. This will require there is no decline in performance. The Students with Disabilities group was 50.34% and will gain 4.52% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 8/24 or 33.33% of Student with Disabilities scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 59.37% of the Students with Disabilities group will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 26.04%. AMO Literacy Growth Statements: At the end of the 2011-2012 school year the Literacy Growth AMO showed: all students 79.34% and an improvement of 1.88% will be achieved by 2013. This growth was not met. The three year average of 309/400 or 77.25% showed growth. At the end of 2013-14 year, according to the AMO growth, 83.10% of all students will show growth. This is an increase of 5.85%. The target achievement TAG group was 73.81% and will gain 2.38% by 2013. The projected benchmark of 76.19% of the TAG group showing growth was not achieved. Using the three year average, 117/168 or 69.64% of the TAG group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 78.57% of the TAG group will show growth. This will be an increase of 8.93%. The African American group was 77.08% and will gain 2.09% by 2013. This growth was not met. 5/14 or 35.71% of the African American subgroup showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 81.25% of the African American group will show growth. This will be an increase of 45.54%. The Hispanic group was 54.17% and will gain 4.16% by 2013. This growth benchmark was met. 1/1 or 100% of the Hispanic subgroup showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 62.5% of the Hispanic subgroup will show growth. This would be a decrease in growth. The Caucasian group was 79.79% and will gain 1.84% by 2013. This growth benchmark was not met. 84/112 or 75% of the Caucasian group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 83.46% of the Caucasian subgroup will show growth. This is an increase of 8.46%. The Economically Disadvantaged group was 77.08% and will gain 2.09% by 2013. The benchmark growth was not met. 27/47 or 57.45% of the Economically Disadvantaged group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 81.25% of the Economically Disadvantaged group will show growth. This is an increase of 23.8%. The English Language Learner group was 8.33% and will gain 8.34% by 2013. This growth benchmark was met. 1/1 or 100% of the English Language Learner group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 25% of the ELL group will show growth. This would be a decrease in growth. The Students with Disabilities group was 43.59% and will gain 5.13% by 2013. This benchmark growth was met. 7/14 or 50% of the Students with Disabilities group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 53.85% of the Students with Disabilities group will show growth. This is an increase of 3.85%.</p>
Benchmark	<p>The attendance rate for 2011-2012 was 96.6% The attendance rate for 2012-2013 was 97.23%.</p>
Benchmark	



Intervention: Implement a Comprehensive Balanced Literacy Model				
Scientific Based Research: 1. Teaching Children to Read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. (NICHD)(2000). Report of the National Reading Panel. 2. Reading First, Federal Initiative authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. 3. McTighe, J. & Wiggins, G., Understanding by Design, ASCD, Alexandria, VA, p8-18.(1998) 4. Fletcher, Ralph, and Portalupi, JoAnn. Craft Lessons: Teaching Writing K-8. 1998. 5. Butler, A., & Turbill, J. (1984). Towards a Reading-Writing Classroom.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Evaluation: *Teachers will analyze Benchmark Data &amp; IOWA Data to determine areas of weaknesses and strengths and will use this analysis to guide their instruction. PCES has shown a growth in literacy scores for Caucasian students and English language learners and met the growth for Hispanic students, English language learners, and students with disabilities.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Training: *Using Title I Professional Development Funding and State Professional Development Money, teachers will receive professional development by attending in-service on effective literacy practices. Teachers and Administrators will attend workshops to learn to integrate technology into the literacy lessons (TICAL Conference). Teachers will increase their knowledge of research based literacy activities at the kindergarten, first, second, and third grade levels. Those teachers attending the previously mentioned training will share the strategies learned with the other classroom teachers, including special education teachers. Regular Classroom Teachers and Special Education Teachers working with students in 3rd-8th grade will attend Literacy Lab Training or will continue using strategies learned in previous trainings, and will implement those strategies (Reader's and Writer's workshop) in 3rd-8th grade language and reading classes.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Other Objects: \$3555.51 PD (State-223) - \$6919.00 Purchased Services:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$10474.51</p>
<p>Strategies: "Daily Reading Warm-ups" and the "Daily Language Review" supplemental materials will be used with all students, including special education students, each day in grades 1-6 to increase reading comprehension and literacy skills in reading and to increase grammar and writing skills in language arts.</p> <p>Action Type: Special Education</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategies: * All students, including special education students, will use computers and software in each classroom and in the computer lab to extend instruction. Teachers will integrate the use of iPads and apps to reinforce skills. Links to free reading &amp; language arts websites will be added to the elementary webpage for parents and student to use for practice at home. Teachers will list apps on their school webpages that have proven to extend and reinforce learning in their classrooms.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● School Library</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Evaluation: Teachers will use data from on-going DI Reading rate and accuracy tests as well as pacing guides at each grade level to determine appropriate placement and remediation needs.</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Evaluation: Annual SRA DI Placement Tests will be conducted to evaluate overall student progress in the DI reading program. Student progress will be documented weekly through the program's rate and accuracy checks and comprehension handouts. This reading instruction program is aligned to the Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: The Literacy Committee, including special education teachers, met and adopted the Harcourt Language Series (K-5), Holt Language Series (6-12), Handwriting Without Tears (K-4), and SRA Direct Instruction for Reading. These series are being used as resources to teach to the Arkansas Frameworks and Common Core Standards. The content in these textbook series have been aligned to the Arkansas Frameworks and Common Core Standards. A director of school improvement, June Wells, is hired at .25 FTE to oversee total instruction. The Director of School Improvement will oversee the Middle School Initiative that began in the 2011-12 School Year.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: Teachers will be trained to use different writing methods and then will use their training to create performance based writing assignments. Teachers will implement writing methods such as the "4 Square" method, "Traits of Writing" method, "ELLA" &amp; "ELF" methods throughout the year. Writing styles and methods will be modeled and then assignments will be administered to students. They will be aligned to the Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: Teachers and / or Counselor will conduct a parent meeting in the fall to inform parents about Benchmark Exams and IOWA testing results and how to interpret their child's scores. Expectations for the upcoming year's test will also be discussed.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education</p>	Counselor / Teachers	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	
<p>Strategy: Accelerated Reader is implemented at all grade levels for all students, including special education students, to encourage reading. The minimum required points for each grade for each 9 weeks are as follows: K = 1pt for 3rd and 4th 9 weeks; 1st = 2 pts. for 1st 9 weeks, 2.5 pts. for 2nd 9 weeks, 3pts. for 3rd 9 weeks, 4pts. for 4th 9 weeks; 2nd grade = 5 pts. 1st 9 weeks, 6 pts. 2nd 9 weeks, 7 pts. 3rd 9 weeks, and 8 pts. 4th 9 weeks; 3rd grade = 8 pts. 1st 9 weeks, 8 pts. 2nd 9 weeks, 8 pts. 3rd 9 weeks, and 10 pts. 4th 9 weeks; 4th grade = 10 pts. 1st nine weeks, 10 pts. 2nd nine weeks, 12 pts. 3rd 9 weeks, and 12 pts. for 4th 9 weeks; 5th grade Lit Lab groups = 20 pts. for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd nine weeks, and 25 pts. the 4th nine weeks; 5th grade DI groups: 10 points each nine weeks; 6th grade Lit Lab = 25 pts. the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd nine weeks, and 30 pts. the 4th nine weeks; 6th grade DI = 12 AR points each nine weeks. AR Guidelines to be followed: 1) AR tests may only be taken between the hours of 7:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. 2) No AR test may be administered by a grandparent, parent, or any other family member. 3) Kindergarten students may have their AR books and tests read to them. All kindergarten test results will be cleared before students move on to first grade. First through fourth grade students may not have their books or tests read to them, with the exception of 504 and resource students. All students may have individual words told to them in the book and on a test. 4) Students may use books to refer to during AR testing of non-fiction and informational books for a limited amount of time to be determined by the teacher (to increase scanning for information in text skills). 5) Times for AR Testing will be posted in hallways, published on the school blog or school website, and they will be posted on the school building entrance and exit doors. Parent Literacy Nights will be implemented to increase knowledge and understanding of the AR program. An AR "Read-a-Thon" for K-6 students will take place in the spring to encourage students to read more. At least one novel study will be completed in each 5th and 6th grade reading class per nine week grading period.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● School Library</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Training: Teachers, including special education teachers, media specialists, and any instructional assistants will be trained in the use of and evaluation tools available through the "Accelerated Reader" program and attend all other professional development required by the district.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● School Library</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Evaluation of the balanced literacy program will continue to include Reading Renaissance "STAR" assessments, teacher observations, and "Classroom Walk-Throughs". "Classroom Walk-Throughs" have shown an increase in teaching that involves higher order questioning techniques and thinking skills as well as time on task.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Strategy: Reading instruction will be adjusted using the "replacement model" according to students' (including special education students) evaluation data determined by the SRA / DI Placement Test, workbooks, and individual writing samples at the Kindergarten-5th grade level. Dana Rumph is hired at 1.00 FTE \$47,726. salary and \$13,808. fringe benefits to provide reading instruction to Title I identified students. Paraprofessionals - (Janis Moss.20 FTE Title I \$3519. salary and \$1456. benefits)is also hired to provide 1:1 and small group reading instruction and interventions. Materials and supplies will be purchased for Title I student use.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> <li>● Title Teachers</li> </ul>	Title I - Employee Salaries: \$51244.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$15045.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$66289
<p>No students that reside in our school district attend private schools.</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● None</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Strategy: Response to Intervention (RTI) will be implemented for 30 minutes for a minimum of 3 days per week for students that indicate a need based on any of the following: Direct Instruction Testing, Classroom Based Assessments, AIP, or IRI.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$76763.51
Intervention: Curriculum Alignment (Implement curriculum alignment in all areas of Literacy with Common Core Standards)				
Scientific Based Research: 1)Jacobs, Heidi Hayes. (1997) Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment K-12. ASCD				

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Professional Development: *Training - All literacy teachers, including special education teachers, will attend professional development to align the language arts curriculum to the common core standards and to released Benchmark items. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluation - Proficiency in curriculum alignment will be monitored by: * Annual reviews of lesson plans, curriculum maps, and pacing guides to ensure all Common Core Standards are being taught * Reviewing Benchmark test data and ITBS test data to determine areas of the curriculum that need to be strengthened * Teacher evaluations and classroom walk-throughs Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Professional Development: Teachers will meet to determine textbook adoptions each year. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: art and music classes are taught 40 minutes each week at each grade level. The instruction is aligned to the Arkansas Art, Music, Language Arts Frameworks and Common Core Standards. Action Type: Alignment	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: All teachers, including special education teachers, will use pacing guides, curriculum maps, and / or lesson plans to document when benchmarks are being taught. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: Teachers, including special education teachers, will document the integration of arts (art, music, movement, drama) into their curriculum. *based on the "A+" method training administration and select mid-level teachers have received and shared with remaining faculty members. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement Academic Improvement Plans

Scientific Based Research: Wolf, P., ASCD, Brain Matters: Translating Research into Classroom Practice, (2001).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Strategy: *Parents will be notified at the annual report to public (Sept. 17, 2013, 6:00 p.m.) of Parkers Chapel Elementary School's Adequate Yearly Progress Status and AMOS. Action Type: AIP/IRI	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will attend content specific professional development to prepare to use the released benchmark items for remediation in the AIP. The principal and / or director of school improvement will conduct the workshop(s). Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Target Assistance	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training *Teachers will attend Benchmark, Common Core, and Alternative Portfolio Assessment meetings / workshops provided by the Arkansas State Department of Education. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Target Assistance	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Evaluation: *Teacher designed tests will be given to students with AIP's to determine when a student is proficient. *Proficiency status is earned by the student when the student achieves the percent correct that correlates to the percent correct a student has to achieve at that grade level in that given subject area. Grades 1 - 6 will use small group remediation and 1:1 instruction; students in Grades 3-6 will also incorporate the "Buckle Down" program to assist with remediation.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI</p>	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *Develop Academic Improvement Plans for all students scoring below basic and basic on the Spring 2013 Arkansas Benchmark Exam and/or Spring 2013 IOWA (ITBS) Test.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p> <p>Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Implementation - All literacy teachers, including special education teachers, will: * Develop Academic Improvement Plans for all students scoring below basic and basic on the Benchmark and Iowa Test of Basic Skills, as well as Classroom Based Assessments * Teachers will conduct parent conferences with parents and students needing an AIP / IRI * Remediation will be provided to students with an AIP in any or all of the following ways: during summer remediation, RTI classroom time, computer lab assignments, or after-school intervention sessions . *Purchase instructional materials and supplies to provide remediation.\$</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p> <p>Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Evaluation * The DIBELS test will be administered at appropriate times to students in grades K,1,&amp; 2 that have an improvement plan.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI</p> <p>Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Dana Rumph, Literacy Chairperson	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Evaluation - All teachers, special education teachers, and principal will compare previous Benchmark, IOWA test scores, Dibels, and / or classroom based assessments for students with AIP's with current and ongoing test data to determine if interventions are working and adjust remediation as needed. \$</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation</p> <p>Action Type: Special Education</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$0</b>

Intervention: Parental Involvement

Scientific Based Research: 1. Canter,L. (1991). Parents On Your Side.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>*Parents will be given an opportunity to have the results of his or her child's Benchmark and IOWA test results interpreted for them at the fall Parent / Teacher Conference. A meeting with the counselor for additional explanation will also be available. *Parkers Chapel Elementary shall have a minimum of two parent-teacher conferences per school year (Fall - Sept. 17, 2013 and Spring - Feb. 6, 2014). These will be included on the school calendar. *Parents will have access to student grades through the use of "Edline" and more information will be available to parents on the school websites.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration</p> <p>Action Type: Equity</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Michael White, Superintendent	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Central Office</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Training: Parkers Chapel Elementary School provides instruction to parents on how to incorporate developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment and provides assistance to parents in understanding content and how to monitor a child's progress, standards, and academic assessments. The school provides materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve academic achievement; educates teachers, principals, and other staff in the importance of effective communication, value, and utility of contributions of parents; coordinates and integrates parent involvement programs and activities; ensures that information related to school and parent programs is sent to parents to the extent practical in a language parents can understand; and provides other reasonable support for parent involvement activities as parents may request. *Administrators will attend three hours of professional development on parental involvement and teachers will attend two hours of professional development on parental involvement. An emphasis will be placed on Charlotte Danielson's TESS model for effective parent communication.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Evaluation: *An alumni advisory committee will meet to make recommendations to promote more parental involvement and to assist in evaluating the parental plan. *A parental involvement committee has reviewed, revised & updated parental involvement policy and the student/parent compact. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014			ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *The school board will designate a parent facilitator (one certified staff member) to serve as a parent facilitator. This person will organize meaningful training for staff and parents and undertake efforts to ensure that parent participation is recognized as an asset to the school. The district will pay the parent facilitator a stipend for assuming duties as required by law. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Michael White, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Central Office		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Informational packets concerning Act 603 of 2003 and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Act 307 of 2007) will be distributed to all parents of children of the appropriate age and grade. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *A notice in the newspaper will be published at the end of the school year honoring parents that have attended all parent-teacher conferences scheduled by the school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	John Gross, Supt.	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Central Office		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *The library will provide parenting books, magazines, and other materials regarding responsible parenting. Parents will be allowed to check out these materials. A list of the available materials will be sent to each home. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Jewel Kelley	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● School Library		ACTION BUDGET: \$
*Parkers Chapel Elementary will schedule regular "Parent Involvement Meeting" evenings where parents are given a report on the state of the school and are allowed to meet with teachers to discuss student progress and discover ways to reinforce skills taught at school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *An area shall be designated as the parent center. *A survey will be conducted in August and a list of volunteers compiled to form a Volunteer Resource Book, listing the interests and availability of volunteers for school staff members' use, including the parent survey. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014			ACTION BUDGET: \$
*A parent, teacher, principal, student compact will be signed. This compact will be distributed to parents before the school year begins, during "Open House" or registration. Teachers will explain to the parents the school's commitment to each child's education and stress our dedication to fostering parental involvement. Parents will be asked to discuss the compact with their child, sign and return the compact to the school. This signed compact will be kept on file in a designated parent involvement folder in the parent coordinator's office. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff ● Teachers		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *The process for solving parental concerns is outlined in the student handbook.	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *All students and parents will be personally invited to attend an "Open House" (grades K-4) or "Registration Day" (grades 5 & 6) by their child's teacher. This event will allow teachers an opportunity to provide information and share expectations for the upcoming year. "Open House" & "Registration Day" will be held prior to the school year's first day. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff ● Teachers		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *The Elementary School (principals and teachers) will use a texting and email messaging system to notify parents of upcoming events in order to increase parental involvement. (www.remind101.com) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Computers ● District Staff ● Teachers		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *The elementary principal will create a school blog and post information frequently in order to notify parents of upcoming events. School information (from the principal and teachers) will be posted and student pictures will be uploaded for special recognition. Parent involvement in activities will be increased due to notifications on blog. (http://pc-elementary.blogspot.com) Evaluation: *The elementary blog will have a counter gadget added that will provide data / feedback of times the blog has been visited daily, weekly, etc. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Computers ● District Staff ● Teachers		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:					\$0

Priority 2: To improve math scores on the Arkansas Benchmark Tests and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL
2. Benchmark-3rd Grade Mathematics Exam
- 3.
4. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
5. 38 Students: 92.1% of Combined Students
6. 2 Students:100.0% of African American Students
7. . Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
8. 36 Students: 91.6% of Caucasian Students
9. 9 Students: 88.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
10. . Students: N/A% of LEP Students
11. 6 Students:100.0% of Students with Disabilities
12. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Geometry
13. Open Response and Measurement Open response
14. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Geometry Open
15. Response and Measurement Open response
- 16.
17. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:
18. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Geometry Open Response
19. and Measurement Open response
- 20.
21. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
22. Geometry Open Response and Measurement Open Response
23. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:
- 24.

Supporting  
Data:

25. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
26.
27. 51 Students: 94% of Combined Students
28. 5 Students: 80% of African American Students
29. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
30. 45 Students: 96% of Caucasian Students
31. 15 Students: 87% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
32. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
33. 6 Students: 67% of Students with Disabilities
34. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple  
35. Choice: Geometry & Measurement; Open Response: Geometry.
36. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
37. Measurement; Open Response: Measurement & Geometry.
38. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: n/a.
- 39.
40. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Geometry;  
41. Open Response: Geometry & Data Analysis and Probability.
- 42.
43. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
44. Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Geometry.
45. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a
46. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
47. Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Measurement.
- 48.
49. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

- 50.
51. 42 Students: (40/42) 95% of Combined Students
- 52.
53. 2 Students: (2/2) 100% of African American Students
- 54.
55. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
56. 40 Students: (38/40) 95% of Caucasian Students
- 57.
58. 5 Students: (3/5) 60% of Students with Disabilities
- 59.
60. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple  
61. Choice: Measurement (5/7 avg) 71%; Open Response: Data Analysis and Probability  
62. (3/8 avg) 38%.
- 63.
64. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
65. Algebra (4/9 avg) 44%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (0/8 avg) 0% and  
66. Data Analysis and Probability (2/8 avg) 25%.
- 67.
68. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: n/a.
- 69.
70. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Measurement  
71. (201/280 points) 72%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (106/320 points)  
72. 33% and Data Analysis and Probability (112/320 points) 35%.
- 73.
74. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
75. Choice: Algebra (6/9 avg) 67%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (1/8 avg)  
76. 13% and Data Analysis and Probability (1/8 avg) 13%.
- 77.
- 78.



79. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a
- 80.
81. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple
82. Choice: Measurement( 3/7 avg) 43%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (1/8
83. avg) 13% and Data Analysis and Probability (0/8 avg) 0%.
- 84.
- 85.
- 86.
- 87.
- 88.
- 89.
90. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL
91. Benchmark-4th Grade Mathematics Exam
- 92.
- 93.
94. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
95. 55 Students: 83.6% of Combined Students
96. 3 Students: 66.6% of African American Students
97. . Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
98. 52 Students: 84.6% of Caucasian Students
99. 16 Students: 81.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
100. . Students: N/A% of LEP Students
101. 8 Students: 75.0% of Students with Disabilities
102. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Data
103. Analysis and Probability Open Response and Measurement Open response
104. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Data Analysis

105. and Probability Open Response and Measurement Open response
106. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
N/A
- 107.
108. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Data Analysis and
109. Probability Open Response and Measurement Open response
110. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:  
Data
111. Analysis and Probability Open Response and Measurement Open response
112. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:
- 113.
114. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 115.
116. 41 Students: 95% of Combined Students
117. 3 Students: 66% of African American Students
118. 1 Student: 100% of Hispanic Students
119. 37 Students: 97% of Caucasian Students
120. 20 Students: 90% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
121. 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students
122. 3 Students: 66% of Students with Disabilities
123. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple
124. Choice: Algebra & Geometry; Open Response: Numbers and Operations.
125. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:
126. Algebra, Geometry, & Measurement; Open Response: Measurement & Geometry.
- 127.
128. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: Multiple Choice: Data
129. Analysis & Probability; Open Response: Numbers and Operations.

- 130.
131. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Geometry;  
132. Open Response: Numbers and Operations.
133. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
134. Choice: Algebra, Data Analysis & Probability; Open Response: Numbers &  
135. Operations.
136. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: Multiple Choice: Data  
137. Analysis and Probability; Open Response: Numbers and Operations.
138. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
139. Choice: Numbers and Operations; Open Response: Numbers & Operations, Algebra,  
140. and Geometry.
- 141.
142. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
143.
144. 52 Students: (46/52)88% of Combined Students
- 145.
146. 5 Students: (3/5) 60% of African American Students
- 147.
148. 0 Student: N/A% of Hispanic Students
149. 45 Students: (41/45) 91% of Caucasian Students
150. 2 Students: (2/2) 100% of Two or More Races Students
- 151.
152. 18 Students: (16/18) 89% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
- 153.
154. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
155. 7 Students: (3/7) 43% of Students with Disabilities
- 156.

157. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple  
158. Choice: Measurement (247/364 points) 68%; Open Response: Measurement (211/416  
159. points)51%

160.

161. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
162. Algebra (24/54 points) 53% and Measurement (19/35 points) 54%; Open Response:  
163. Geometry (12/40 points) 30%.

164.

165. The lowest identified areas for Students with 2 or More Races were: Multiple  
166. Choice: Geometry (12/16 points) 75%; Open Response: Geometry (6/16 points) 38%.  
167.

168.

169. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Measurement  
170. (217/315 points) 69%; Open Response: Measurement (184/360 points) 51%.

171.

172. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
173. Choice: Measurement (4/7 avg) 57% ; Open Response: Measurement (3/8 avg)  
174. 38%.

175.

176. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A - no students tested  
177. in this area.

178.

179. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
180. Choice: Algebra (4/9 avg) 44%; Open Response: Measurement (2/8 avg) 25% and  
181. Data Analysis and Probability (2/8 avg) 25%.

182.

183.

184.

185. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL

186. Benchmark-5th Grade Mathematics Exam

187.

188.  
189.  
190. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
  
191.           46 Students: 93.4% of Combined Students  
  
192.           2 Students:100.0% of African American Students  
  
193.           . Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students  
  
194.           44 Students: 93.1% of Caucasian Students  
  
195.           9 Students:100.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
  
196.           . Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
  
197.           1 Students:     0% of Students with Disabilities  
  
198. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
    Data  
199. Analysis and Probability Open Response and Geometry Open response  
200. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
    Data Analysis and  
201. Probability Open Response and Geometry Open Response  
202. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
  
203. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
    Data Analysis and  
204. Probability Open Response and Geometry Open response  
205.  
206. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:  
    Data  
207. Analysis and Probability Open Response and Geometry Open response  
208. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
    N/A  
209.  
210. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
211.  
  
212.           50 Students: 92% of Combined Students

213. 5 Students: 80% of African American Students
214. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
215. 44 Students: 94% of Caucasian Students
216. 19 Students: 79% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
217. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
218. 7 Students: 71% of Students with Disabilities
219. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple  
220. Choice: Algebra; Open Response: Geometry.
221. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
222. Algebra; Open Response: Measurement & Geometry.
223. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: n/a.
- 224.
225. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Algebra;  
226. Open Response: Geometry.
227. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
228. Choice: Data Analysis & Probability; Open Response: Geometry and  
229. Measurement.
230. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a
231. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
232. Choice: Data Analysis and Probability; Open Response: Measurement and Geometry.  
233.
- 234.
- 235.
- 236.
237. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
238.

239. 39 Students: (38/39) 97% of Combined Students

240.  
241. 5 Students: (4/5)80% of African American Students

242.  
243. 1 Students: (1/1) 100% of Hispanic Students

244.  
245. 33 Students: (33/33) 100% of Caucasian Students

246.  
247. 16 Students: (15/16) 94% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

248.  
249. 1 Students: (1/1) 100% of LEP Students

250.  
251. 2 Students: (2/2) 100% of Students with Disabilities

252.  
253. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple  
254. Choice: Numbers and Operations (260/351 points) 74% and Data Analysis and  
255. Probability (198/273 points) 73%; Open Response: Geometry (139/312 points) 45%.  
256.

257.  
258. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
259. Measurement (16/35 points) 46%; Open Response: Geometry (12/40 points) 30%.

260.  
261.  
262. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: Multiple Choice: Data  
263. Analyiss and Probability (5/7 points) 71%; Open Response: Geometry (4/8 points)  
264. 50%.

265.  
266. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Data  
267. Analysis and Probability (172/231 points) 74%; Open Response: Geometry (123/264

268. points) 47%.

269.

270. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
271. Choice: Numbers and Operations (6/9 avg.) 67%; Open Response: Geometry (3/8  
272. avg.) 38%.

273.

274. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: Multiple Choice: Data  
275. Analysis and Probability (5/7) 71%; Open Response: Geometry (4/8) 50%

276.

277. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
278. Choice: Data Analysis and Probability (4/7 avg) 57%; Open Response: Geometry  
279. (4/8 avg) 50%.

280.

281.

282.

283.

284.

285.

286. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL

287. Benchmark-6th Grade Mathematics Exam

288. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

289. 52 Students: 88.4% of Combined Students

290. 5 Students: 60.0% of African American Students

291. 1 Students:100.0% of Hispanic Students

292. 46 Students: 91.3% of Caucasian Students

293. 13 Students: 76.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

294. . Students: N/A% of LEP Students



295. 3 Students: 33.3% of Students with Disabilities
296. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Algebra
297. Open Response and Geometry Open response
298. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Algebra Open
299. Response and Geometry Open response
300. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
N/A
- 301.
302. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Algebra Open Response
303. and Geometry Open response
- 304.
305. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
306. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A
- 307.
308. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 309.
310. 61 Students: 92% of Combined Students
311. 6 Students: 84% of African American Students
312. 1 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students
313. 54 Students: 93% of Caucasian Students
314. 17 Students: 76% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
315. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
316. 6 Students: 50% of Students with Disabilities
317. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple
318. Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Numbers & Operations.

319. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
320. Measurement; Open Response: Measurement.
321. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: Multiple Choice: Numbers &  
322. Operations; Open Response: Algebra.
323. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice:  
324. Measurement; Open Response: Numbers & Operations.
325. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
326. Choice: Measurement and Geometry; Open Response: Numbers & Operations.
327. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a
328. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
329. Choice: Geometry & Measurement; Open Response: Numbers & Operations, Geometry,  
330. and Measurement.
- 331.
332. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
333.
334.           49 Students: (41/49) 84% of Combined Students
- 335.
336.           5 Students: (3/5) 60% of African American Students
- 337.
338.           0 Students: N/A % of Hispanic Students
339.           1 Student: (1/1) 100% of Students with 2 or More Races
- 340.
341.           43 Students: (37/43) 86% of Caucasian Students
- 342.
343.           20 Students: (14/20) 70% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
- 344.
345.           0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students

346. 6 Students: (4/6) 67% of Students with Disabilities
- 347.
348. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple  
349. Choice: Algebra (299/441 points) 68% and Measurement (236/343 points) 69%; Open  
350. Response: Measurement (189/392 points) 48%.
- 351.
352. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:  
353. Algebra (22/45 points) 49%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (8/40 points)  
354. 20%.
- 355.
356. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: N/A - no students were tested  
357. in this area.
- 358.
359. The lowest identified areas for Students with Two or More Races were:  
360. Multiple Choice: (6/7 - 86%) Measurement; Open Response: (4/8 - 50%) Geometry.  
361.
- 362.
- 363.
364. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Algebra  
365. (277/387 points ) 72%, Geometry (249/344 points) 72%, and Measurement (215/301  
366. points) 71%; Open Response: Measurement (179/344 points) 52%.
- 367.
368. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple  
369. Choice: Algebra (5/9 avg) 56% and Measurement (4/7 avg) 57%; Open Response:  
370. Measurement (3/8 avg) 38%.
- 371.
372. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a
- 373.
374. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple  
375. Choice: Numbers and Operations (4/9 avg) 44%, Algebra (4/9 avg) 44%, and  
376. Measurement (3/7 avg) 43%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (3/8 avg) 38%,

377. Measurement (3/8 avg) 38%, and Data Analysis and Probability (3/8 avg) 38%.  
378.

379.

380.

381.

382. SAT 10

383. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

384. COMBINED POPULATION	Grade:K		
385. Year	2008	2009	2010
386. Number Tested			
387.	N/A	54	60

388.

389. % At/Above 50th NPR In:

390. Math Problem Solving

391.	N/A	59.3%	30.0%
------	-----	-------	-------

392.

393. In 2011, # of Kindergarten students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
394. scoring above 50th percentile:

395. Combined Population: 49 students: 85.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
396. math;

397. African Americans: 4 students: 75% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
398.

399. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
400.

401. Caucasion Students: 43 students: 86% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
402.

403. Economically Disadvantaged: 23 students: 82.6% scored above the 50th percentile  
404. in math;

405. LEP: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

406.

407. In 2012 - Kindergarten students did not take the Iowa Test Of Basic Skills.

408.

409.

410.

411. SAT 10

412. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

413. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:1

414.	Year	2008	2009	2010
------	------	------	------	------

415.	number Tested	44	55	52
------	---------------	----	----	----

416. % At/Above 50th NPR In:

417.

418. Math Problem Solving

419.		86.4%	70.9%	59.6%
------	--	-------	-------	-------

420.

421. In 2011, # of First Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %

422. scoring above 50th percentile:

423. Combined Population: 46 students: 76.1% scored above the 50th percentile in

424. math;

425. African Americans: 4 students: 75% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

426.

427. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

428.

429. Caucasion Students: 40 students: 75% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

430.

431. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 82.4% scored above the 50th percentile

432. in math;

433. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

434. Students with Disabilities: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile

435. in math.

436.

437. In 2012, # of First Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
438. scoring above 50th percentile:

439. Combined Population: 47 students: 70.3% scored above the 50th percentile in  
440. math;

441. African Americans: 3 students: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
442.

443. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

444.

445. MultiEthnic Students: 2 students: 50% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
446.

447. Caucasion Students: 41 students: 70.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
448. math;

449. Economically Disadvantaged: 21 students: 61.9% scored above the 50th percentile  
450. in math;

451. LEP: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

452. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile  
453. in math.

454.

455.

456.

457.

458.

459. SAT 10

460. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

461.

COMBINED POPULATION		Grade:2		
Year	2008	2009	2010	

464. nuumber Tested	52	45	55	
---------------------	----	----	----	--

465. % At/Above 50th NPR In:				
------------------------------	--	--	--	--

466.

467. Math Problem Solving

468.                   67.3%           82.2%           69.1%

469.

470.

471. In 2011, # of Second Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
472. scoring above 50th percentile:

473. Combined Population: 47 students: 68.1% scored above the 50th percentile in  
474. math;

475. African Americans: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

476.

477. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
478.

479. Caucasion Students: 46 students: 69.6% scored above the 50th percentile in  
480. math;

481. Economically Disadvantaged: 16 students: 68.8% scored above the 50th percentile  
482. in math;

483. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

484. Students with Disabilities: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile  
485. in math.

486.

487.

488. In 2012, # of Second Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
489. scoring above 50th percentile:

490. Combined Population: 45 students: 73.3% scored above the 50th percentile in  
491. math;

492. African Americans: 4 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
493.

494. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

495.

496. MultiEthnic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

497.

498. Caucasion Students: 39 students: 71.8% scored above the 50th percentile in

499. math;

500. Economically Disadvantaged: 19 students: 63.1% scored above the 50th percentile

501. in math;

502. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

503. Students with Disabilities: 3 students: 33.3% scored above the 50th percentile

504. in math.

505.

506.

507.

508.

509. SAT 10

510. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

511.

512. COMBINED POPULATION                      Grade:3

513.        Year	2008	2009	2010
------------------	------	------	------

514.        Number Tested	57	52	49
---------------------------	----	----	----

515.        % At/Above 50th NPR In:

516. Reading Comprehension	54.4%	38.5%	65.3%
----------------------------	-------	-------	-------

517. Math Problem Solving	71.9%	69.2%	85.7%
---------------------------	-------	-------	-------

518.

519. In 2011, # of Third Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %

520. scoring above 50th percentile:



521. Combined Population: 51 students: 64.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
522. math;

523. African Americans: 5 students: 40% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
524.

525. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
526.

527. Caucasion Students: 45 students: 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile in  
528. math;

529. Economically Disadvantaged: 15 students: 53.3% scored above the 50th percentile  
530. in math;

531. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

532. Students with Disabilities: 6 students: 50% scored above the 50th percentile in  
533. math.

534.

535. In 2012, # of Third Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and  
536. National Percentile Rank of Mean Standard Score:

537. Combined Population: 42 students: 74 NPR in math;

538. African Americans: 2 students: 68 NPR in math;

539. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a NPR in math  
540.

541. MultiEthnic Students: 0 students; n/a NPR in math;

542.

543. Caucasion Students: 40 students: 75 NPR in math;

544.

545. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 71 NPR in math;

546.

547. LEP: 0 student: n/a NPR in math;

548.

549. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 22 NPR in math.

550.

551.

552.

553.

554. SAT10 NORM REFERENCED TEST -- Report Completed: Aug 23, 2010

555.

556. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

557.

558. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:4

559. Year: 2008 2009 2010

560. Number Tested: 40 60 52

561. % At/Above 50th NPR In:

562. Math Problem Solving :

563. 85.0% 91.7% 80.8%

564.

565. In 2011, # of Fourth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %

566. scoring above 50th percentile:

567. Combined Population: 41 students: 75.6% scored above the 50th percentile in

568. math;

569. African Americans: 3 students: 33% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

570.

571. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

572.

573. Caucasion Students: 37 students: 78.4% scored above the 50th percentile in

574. math;

575. Economically Disadvantaged: 20 students: 70% scored above the 50th percentile  
576. in math;

577. LEP: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

578. Students with Disabilities: 3 students: 33% scored above the 50th percentile in  
579. math.

580.

581. In 2012, # of Fourth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and  
582. National Percentile Rank of Mean Standard Score:

583.

584. Combined Population: 52 students: 65 NPR in math;

585.

586. African Americans: 5 students: 41 NPR in math;

587.

588. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a NPR in math;

589.

590. MultiEthnic Students: 2 students: 74 NPR in math;

591.

592. Caucasion Students: 45 students: 67 NPR in math;

593.

594. Economically Disadvantaged: 18 students: 50 NPR in math;

595.

596. LEP: 0 student: n/a NPR in math;

597.

598. Students with Disabilities: 7 students: 29 NPR in math.

599.

600.

601.

602.  
603. SAT10 NORM REFERENCED TEST -- Report Completed: Aug 23, 2010

604.  
605. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

606.

607. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:5

608.	Year			
609.		2008	2009	2010 <
610.	Number Tested			
611.		58	42	59 <
612.	% At/Above 50th NPR In: <			
613.	Math Problem Solving			
614.		87.9%	88.1%	91.5%

615.

616. In 2011, # of Fifth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
617. scoring above 50th percentile:

618. Combined Population: 50 students: 60% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
619.

620. African Americans: 5 students: 0% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
621.

622. Hispanic Students: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
623.

624. Caucasion Students: 44 students: 65.9% scored above the 50th percentile in  
625. math;

626. Economically Disadvantaged: 21 students: 57.1% scored above the 50th percentile  
627. in math;

628. LEP: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

629. Students with Disabilities: 7 students: 28.6% scored above the 50th percentile

630. in math.

631.

632. In 2012, # of Fifth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and

633. National Percentile Rank of Mean Standard Score:

634.

635. Combined Population: 39 students: 70 NPR in math;

636.

637. African Americans: 5 students: 41 NPR in math;

638.

639. Hispanic Students: 1 student : 69 NPR in math;

640.

641. MultiEthnic Students: 0 students: n/a NPR in math;

642.

643. Caucasion Students: 33 students: 74 NPR in math;

644.

645. Economically Disadvantaged: 16 students: 55 NPR in math;

646.

647. LEP: 1 student: 69 NPR in math;

648.

649. Students with Disabilities: 2 students: 76 NPR in math.

650.

651.

652.

653.

654. SAT10 NORM REFERENCED TEST -- Report Completed: Aug 23, 2010

655.

656. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile:

657.

658. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:6

659. Year

660. 2008 2009 2010

661. Number Tested

662. 48 59 44

663. % At/Above 50th NPR In: <

664. Math Problem Solving

665. 87.5% 84.7% 84.1%

666. In 2011, # of Sixth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %  
667. scoring above 50th percentile:

668. Combined Population: 61 students: 72.1% scored above the 50th percentile in  
669. math;

670. African Americans: 6 students: 33% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
671.

672. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;  
673.

674. Caucasion Students: 54 students: 75.9% scored above the 50th percentile in  
675. math;

676. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 52.9% scored above the 50th percentile  
677. in math;

678. LEP: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

679. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 20% scored above the 50th percentile in  
680. math.

681.

682. In 2012, # of Sixth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and

683. National Percentile Rank of Mean Standard Score:

684.  
685. Combined Population: 49 students: 60 NPR in math;

686.  
687. African Americans: 5 students: 24 NPR in math;

688.  
689. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a NPR in math;

690.  
691. MultiEthnic Students: 1 student: 90 NPR in math;

692.  
693. Caucasion Students: 43 students: 64 NPR in math;

694.  
695. Economically Disadvantaged: 20 students: 49 NPR in math;

696.  
697. LEP: 0 students: n/a NPR in math;

698.  
699. Students with Disabilities: 6 students: 34 NPR in math.

700.  
701.  
702. The attendance rate for Parkers Chapel Elementary for 2009-2010 was 95.1%, for  
703. 2010-2011 was 95.4, and for 2011-12 was 96.60%.

704.  
705.  
706. The 2011 3rd through 6th Benchmark three-year trend analysis shows weaknesses  
707. in Geometry and Measurement open response, and measurement and data analysis  
708. multiply choice.  
709. The 2012 3rd through 6th Benchmark analysis shows the greatest weakness in the  
710. area of Measurement Multiple Choice with an average score of 71.5% The  
711. greatest weaknesses in open response items are equally in the areas of Numbers  
712. and Operations, Geometry, and Measurement, all with an average score of 4.8 / 8  
713. points.

714.

715. The 2012 AMO for all students is 93.95  
716. The 2013 AMO for all students is 94.50  
717. The 2014 AMO for all students is 95.05  
718. The 2015 AMO for all students is 95.60  
719. The 2016 AMO for all students is 96.15  
720. The 2017 AMO for all students is 96.70  
721.  
722. The number of students in the TARGETED ACHIEVEMENT GAP GROUP was 197. The  
723. percent proficient in literacy in 2011 was 93.40.  
724.  
725.  
726. The total number of African American students attempting the math test in 2011  
727. was 17. The percentage of African American students scoring proficient or  
728. advanced in year 2011 was 76.47.  
729.  
730. The total number of HIspanic students attempting the math test in 2011 was 3.  
731. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient or advanced in the year  
732. 2011 was 100.  
733.  
734. The total number of Caucasian students attempting the 2011 math test was 175.  
735. 94.86% of those students were proficient or advanced in 2011.  
736.  
737.  
738. The total number of Economically Disadvantaged students attmepting the math  
739. test in 2011 was 64. The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students  
740. scoring proficient or advanced in 2011 was 82.81.  
741.  
742.  
743. The total number of English Language Learners attempting the 2011 math test was  
744. 1. 100% of the ELL students scored proficient or advanced on the math test in  
745. 2011.  
746.  
747. The total number of Students with Disabilities attempting the math test in 2011  
748. was 24. The percentage of those students scoring proficient or advanced on the  
749. 2011 math test was 70.83.  
750.  
751.  
752.  
753. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Combined and all sub-populations are making AYP.  
754.



755. 2012-2013:

756. Parkers Chapel Elementary is a Needs Improvement School in the area of Math.

757.

758.

Goal To Improve Math Scores in the Areas of Multiple Choice Measurement, Open Response Geometry, and Open Response Data Analysis and Probability.

Benchmark

• Benchmark 1: At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 93.4% of the Combined Population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-2012 school year 96.7% of the Combined Population will be proficient. This benchmark was not met. 91% of students in 3rd - 6th grade were proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012 - 13 school year, 94.5% of the Combined Population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of .55%. This benchmark was not met. 88.17% of students in 3rd – 6th grade were proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 90% of students in 3rd – 6th grade will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.83%. • At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 76.5% of the African American population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 79.2% of the African American population will be proficient. This benchmark was not met. 71% of the students were proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 80.39% of the African American population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.96%. This benchmark was not met. 68.42% of the African American population was proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 69.92% of the African American population, in grades 3-6, will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.5%. • At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 100% of the Hispanic Population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 100% of the Hispanic population will remain proficient. This benchmark was met. 100% were proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 100% of the Hispanic population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 0%. This benchmark was not met. 66.67% of the Hispanic population was proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 68.17% of the Hispanic population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.5%. • At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 94.86% of the Caucasian population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 95.29% of the Caucasian population will be proficient. We did not meet this benchmark. 93% of the Caucasian population was proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 95.72% of the Caucasian Population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 0.43%. This benchmark was not met. 90.68% of the Caucasian population was proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 92.18% of the Caucasian population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.5%. At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 82.81% of the Economically Disadvantaged population was proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 85.7% of the Economically Disadvantaged population will be proficient. We met this benchmark with 86% proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 85.68% of the Economically Disadvantaged population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.44%. We did not meet this benchmark. 79.73% of Economically Disadvantaged population scored proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 81.23% of the Economically Disadvantaged population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 1.55%. • At the end of the 2010-11 School Year 100% of the English Language Learners were proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 100% of the English Language Learners will be proficient. We met this benchmark with 100% proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 100% of the English Language Learners population will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 0%. We met this benchmark. 100% of the ELL population scored proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 100% of the English Language Learner population will continue to be proficient or advanced, maintaining current achievement and showing no regression. • At the end of the 2010-11 school year 70.83 % of the Students with Disabilities were proficient. By the end of the 2011-12 school year 73.3 % of Students with Disabilities will be proficient. We did not meet this benchmark. We had 60% proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2012-13 school year, 75.69% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient or advanced, showing a growth of 2.43%. We did not meet this benchmark. 50% of Students with Disabilities scored proficient or advanced. • At the end of the 2013-14 school year, 51.5% of Students with Disabilities, an increase of 1.5%, will be proficient or advanced. • According to the 2012 ESEA AMO printout, the total number of students attempting the math test in the year 2011 was 197. • According to the 2013 ESEA AMO printout, the total number of students attempting the math test in the 2012-13 school year was 191. 192 were expected to take the test. 99.48% of students participated in the math portion of the 12-13 Benchmark Exam. • The percentage of students proficient or advanced in 2011 was 93.40%. The percentage of students proficient or advanced in 2012 was 88.17%.

Benchmark

The attendance rate for 2011-2012 was 96.6%. The attendance rate for 2012-2013 was 97.23%. AMO Math Performance Statements: At the end of the 2011-2012 school year the Math Performance AMO showed: all students 93.95% and an improvement of 0.55% (94.50%) will be achieved by 2013. This benchmark was not met. The three year average of 511/567 or 90.12% of all students scored proficient or advanced. For the 2012-13 year only – 164/186 students scored proficient or advanced – or 88.17%. At the end of the 2013-14, according to the AMO, 95.05% of all students will be proficient or advanced. This will be a gain of 4.93% above the 3 year average. The target achievement TAG group was 84.91% and was to gain 1.37% (86.28%) by 2013. This benchmark was not met. The three year average of 202/252 or 80.16% of the TAG group scored proficient or advanced. For the 2012-2013 year only – 67/86 students scored proficient or advanced – 77.91%. This benchmark was not met. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 87.66% of the TAG group will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 7.50% for the three year average or 9.75% for the individual year increase. The African American group was 78.43% and will gain 1.96% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 13/19 or 68.42% of the African American population scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 82.35% of the African American population will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 13.93%. The Hispanic group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 2/3 or 66.67% of the Hispanic group scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 100% of the Hispanic population will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 33.33%. The Caucasian group's AMO for 2012 was 95.29% and was to gain 0.43% (95.72%) by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 146/161 students or 90.68% of the Caucasian group was proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 96.15% of the Caucasian population will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 5.47%. The Economically Disadvantaged group was 84.24% and will gain 1.44% by 2013. This benchmark was not met. 59/74 economically disadvantaged students or 79.73% of the Economically Disadvantaged group was proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 87.11% of the Economically Disadvantaged group will be proficient or advanced. This is an increase of 7.38%. The English Language Learner group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013. This benchmark was met. 1/1 or 100% of the English Language Learner group was proficient or advanced. At the end of 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 100% of the ELL students will continue to be proficient or advanced. This will require there is no decline in performance. The Students with Disabilities group AMO for 2012 was 73.26% and was to gain 2.43% by 2013 to reach 75.69%. This benchmark was not met. 12/24 students with disabilities or 50% of Students with Disabilities scored proficient or advanced. At the end of the 2013-14 year, according to the AMO, 78.12% of the Students with Disabilities group will be proficient or advanced. This will be an increase of 28.12%. AMO MATH Growth Statements: At the end of the 2011-2012 school year the MATH Growth AMO showed: all students 87.74% and an improvement of 1.11 will be achieved by 2013. The individual year's growth was not met for all students (103/128 students or 80.47%). However, the three year average of all students (337/400 or 84.25%) showed growth and met the benchmark according to the GROWTH PERFORMANCE - MATH printout. At the end of 2013-14 year, according to the AMO growth, 89.97% of all students will show growth. This will be an increase of 9.5% for the individual year's growth or 5.72% for the three year average. The target achievement TAG group was 78.72% and will gain 1.94% by 2013. The projected benchmark of 80.66% of the TAG group showing growth was not achieved. Using the three year average, 124/168 or 73.81% of the TAG group showed growth. For the individual year, 39/55 or 70.91% of the TAGG showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 82.59% of the TAG group will show growth. This will be an increase of 8.78% for the three year average or an increase of 11.68% for the individual year. The African American group was 77.08% and will gain 2.09% by 2013 to reach 79.17%. This growth was not met. 9/14 or 64.29% of the African American subgroup showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 81.25% of the African American group will show growth. This will be an increase of 16.96%. The Hispanic group was 100% proficient or advanced for the 2012 year. This level of achievement was to be maintained. This growth benchmark was met. 1/1 or 100% of the Hispanic subgroup maintained growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 100% of the Hispanic subgroup will maintain growth. There will be no increase or decrease. The Caucasian group was 88.45% for 2012 and was to gain 1.05% by 2013. This growth benchmark was not met. 92/112 or 82.14% of the Caucasian group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 90.55% of the Caucasian subgroup will show growth. This is an increase of 8.41%. The Economically Disadvantaged group was 80.91% and will gain 1.73% by 2013 to reach 82.64%. The benchmark growth was not met. 34/47 or 72.34% of the Economically Disadvantaged group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 84.38% of the Economically Disadvantaged group will show growth. This is an increase of 12.04%. The English Language Learner group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013, but maintain. This growth benchmark was met / maintained. 1/1 or 100% of the English Language Learner groups maintained. At the end of the 2013-14 year, there will be no ELL group growth. They will maintain 100%. The Students with Disabilities group was 57.7% and will gain 3.84% by 2013 to reach 61.54%. This benchmark growth was not met. 7/14 or 50% of the Students with Disabilities group showed growth. At the end of the 2013-14 year, 65.39% of the Students with Disabilities group will show growth. This is an increase of 15.39%.

Intervention: Curriculum Alignment				
Scientific Based Research: 1. Jacobs, Heidi Hayes. (1997). Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment K-12. ASCD				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Strategies: *All math teachers, including special education teachers, will place Math Common Core State Standard numbers in their lesson plans to document which skills have been or are being taught. * All teachers, including special education teachers, will use pacing guides / mapping documents to verify specifically when standards are being taught. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: * All math teachers, including special education teachers, will meet at the end of each 9 week grading period. This will be a vertical alignment and mapping meeting to determine which Common Core State Standards have been taught, how they are being taught, and which standards still need to be taught. Mapping documents will be updated during the meetings if needed. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluation: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will analyze Benchmark Data & IOWA (ITBS)data to determine areas of weaknesses and strengths. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Rachel Hardy, Math Chairperson	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will attend professional development to align the Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley / Pearson "enVisionMATH" common core math curriculum to the Common Core State Standards and to the released benchmark items, which will be provided by the principal. * current math adoption: Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley / Pearson "enVisionMATH" Common Core. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Administrative Staff ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$

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

Intervention: Implement Standards Based Mathematics Model

Scientific Based Research: 1. ED Thoughts: What We Know About Mathematics Teaching and Learning, P.44-45, McRel. Edited by John Sutton and Krueger, Aurora, CO.,(2002) 2. Van De Walle, John A. (2005). Elementary and Middle School Mathematics.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Training: *All math teachers, including special education teachers, will conduct an annual review of lesson plans, curriculum maps, and pacing guides to ensure all Common Core State Standards are being taught. *All teachers, including special education teachers will attend a minimum of 6 hours of technology training. *Each teacher has an individual professional development / growth plan, developed using Charlotte Danielson's TESS model which is reviewed at least annually, that complies with A.C.A. 6-17-704(c)(2)(A); 6-15-17-3(a); 6-17-703; 6-17-705;6-15-1004;</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal & June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategies: All teachers, including special education teachers, are using the Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley / Pearson "enVisionMath" Common Core series as a resource to teach the Common Core State Standards. The content in this textbook series has been aligned to the Arkansas Common Core State Standards.A Math Teacher at the 3rd grade will be hired to reduce class size at 1. FTE with NSLA Funds.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal & June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$42506.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$12677.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$55183</p>
<p>Evaluation: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will review Benchmark test data and IOWA (ITBS) test data to determine areas of the curriculum that need to be strengthened.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Training: *Teachers, including special education teachers, will receive training in the use of software and hardware to research, keep up with data, and to teach (HIVE).</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *Math teachers will use "Arithmetic Developed Daily" in all classrooms K-6 and will focus on the "problem of the day".</p>	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Training: *Teachers will attend Common Core State Standards training and other meetings provided by the Arkansas State Department of Education.</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development</p>	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		<hr/> <p>PD (State-223) - Purchased Services: \$6920.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$6920</p>
<p>Strategy: *Math teachers will use released items from the Benchmark Exam as an alternative assessment and compare results to evaluate strengths and weaknesses.</p>	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$62103

Intervention: Implement Academic Improvement Plans

Scientific Based Research: Wolf, P. ASCD, Brain Matters: Training Research into Classroom Practice, (2001).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
---------	--------------------	----------	-----------	-----------------

Strategies: *Parents will be notified at the Annual Report to the Public (Sept.17, 2013, 6:00 p.m.) concerning Parkers Chapel Elementary School's Adequate Yearly Progress Status and AMO. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Develop Academic Improvement Plans for all students scoring below basic and basic on the 2013 Arkansas Benchmark Exam and/or the IOWA (ITBS)Test. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Technology Inclusion	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: *Teachers will attend Common Core State Standards meetings, Benchmark / ACTAAP meetings, and PARCC assessment meetings provided by the Arkansas State Department of Education in order to be better informed about expectations and how to help students needing improvement. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluation: *Teacher designed tests will be given to students with AIP's to determine when a student is proficient. *Proficiency status is earned by the student when the student achieves the percent correct that correlates to the percent correct a student has to achieve at that grade level in that given subject area. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Conduct parent conferences with parents of students needing an Academic Improvement Plan and provide remediation to students with an AIP during non-required activity time. Provide additional guidance at .19 FTE for those students that need additional counseling at 5th and 6th grades. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$1128.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3903.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$15300.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$20331
Evaluation: All math teachers, as well as special education teachers, will compare current test results of individual students to last year's individual math results to determine personal gains and losses in order to assist with differentiated instructional plans and strengthen the current program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$20331

Priority 3: To improve the school district nutrition environment, promote student health, and reduce childhood obesity.

1. The "School Health Index" was given to a random sampling of students, parents and teachers at Parkers Chapel Elementary. Modules indicating the most needs are to be addressed. Those modules are: \*Module One: School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, \*Module Two: Health Education, \*Module Three: Physical education and Other Physical Activity Programs, \*Module Four: Nutrition Services, and Module Eight: Family and Community Involvement. 2009-2010 results: Module 1: 83% Module 2: 96% Module 3: 88% Module 4: 97% Module 8: 94%
2. 2004-2005 - 36.2% males were at risk of overweight or overweight. 37.1% females were at risk of overweight or overweight.
3. 2005-2006 - 33.6% males were at risk of overweight or overweight. 36.2% females were at risk of overweight or overweight.
4. 2006-2007 - 33.3% males were at risk of overweight or overweight. 27.8% females were at risk of overweight or overweight.
- Supporting Data: 5. 2007-2008 - 39.4% males were at risk of overweight. 26.6% females were at risk of overweight. 2008-2009 - 30.1% males were at risk of overweight and 24.2% of females were at risk of being overweight. 2009-2010: 29.6% of males were at risk of being overweight or obese and 29.5% of females were at risk of being overweight or obese.
6. 2006-2007 - 32% of students received free or reduced lunch; 2007-2008 31% were on free and reduced lunch. 2008-2009 - 32% of students were on free and reduced lunch. 2009-2010: 30% of students were on the free lunch program and 9% of students were on the reduced free lunch program: (total: 39%)

Goal To Improve the Health and Physical Well Being of Students.

Benchmark Parkers Chapel Elementary will continue to adhere to the "Arkansas Rules Governing Nutrition and Physical Activity Standards", as defined by the Arkansas State Department of Education, for all students.

Intervention: To Implement the Parkers Chapel Elementary School Health Improvement Plan				
Scientific Based Research: "Getting Smart from Working Out" , District Administration, January, 2008, Pg. 14: Leung, R., Davis-Brezette, J., Bower, G.G., Enzler, D., (2005) *Fitness Assessment of Physical Education and Exercise: Recreation and Dance Journal, 34(1):12-15				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

<p>Training: The school nurse will provide information from *The American Lung Association pertaining to asthma education to all staff, teachers, and special education teachers. *Teachers will attend professional development in the area of physical education / wellness / nutrition for a minimum of two hours. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *P.E. instruction will be scheduled for every student, K-6, under the supervision of a highly qualified elementary physical education teacher. Instruction will be for a minimum of 150 minutes per week with a maximum student to adult ratio of 30:1. (<a href="http://www.sos.arkansas.gov/rulesRegs/Arkansas%20Register/2005/sep_2005/005.01.05-009.pdf">http://www.sos.arkansas.gov/rulesRegs/Arkansas%20Register/2005/sep_2005/005.01.05-009.pdf</a>) *Health and Physical Education classes are aligned with the Arkansas Physical Education and Health Education Frameworks. *Educate families about the Family Center and its purpose through the school newsletter and school website. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Evaluation: *Assess annually, using the School Health Index for Physical Activity, Healthy Eating and a Tobacco-Free Lifestyle using Modules 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, &amp; 8, *Documentation professional development, and *Documentation of Local School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee Meetings. Module 1: School Health And Safety Policies and Environment - 89% Module 2: Health Education - 100% Module 3: Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - 98% Module 4: Nutrition Services - 100% Module 5: School Health Services - 96% Module 6: School Counseling , Psychological, and Social Services - 95% Module 7: Health Promotion for Staff - 89% Module 8: Family and Community Involvement - 83% Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Dianna Adams / School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *Continue to hold School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee meetings. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Dianna Adams / School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community Leaders</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>*Students will be encouraged to participate in extracurricular activities (soccer, dance, etc.) through classroom discussions and *Great Expectations recognition on closed circuit TV broadcasts. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Diana Adams, School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>*ALL of the Arkansas Nutrition Standards Regulations are adhered to at Parkers Chapel Elementary. *Students have access to drinking water, free of charge. Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *No food or beverages are used as rewards unless they meet the exceptions as defined by the Arkansas Nutrition Standards Regulations, (ex: Students whose IEP Plan indicates the use of a candy for behavior modification). Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *Hand out surveys on Parent/Grandparent's Days. *Surveys and a suggestion box will be available in the cafeteria and near the counselor's office at all times. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Dianna Adams, School Nurse &amp; Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *Provide opportunities for students to be involved in grade-appropriate nutritional activities in the cafeteria Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Dianna Adams / School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: An opportunity for CPR certification will be provided as part of the professional development for all teachers, including special education teachers. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Diana Adams, School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: Students will be assigned to counseling groups in Kindergarten - 4th grades. The counselor and school nurse will work together with students on making healthy lifestyle choices and encourage social well-being. This curriculum will be addressed in 5th and 6th grades by the science teacher and the school nurse. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>June Wells, Director of School Improvement</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Wellness			● Teachers	
Strategy: The District will work with the appropriate local government agencies and parents to provide an opportunity for all students to receive flu vaccinations. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Diana Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluation: BMI Screening will be done each year. The BMI rate for males that were overweight or obese in the elementary school were: Kindergarten - 17.5% (2013) 33.3% (2012) First Grade - n/a (2013) n/a (2012) Second Grade - 37% (2013) 30% (2012) Third Grade - n/a (2013) n/a (2012) Fourth Grade - 41.4% (2013) 38.5% (2012) Fifth Grade - n/a (2013) n/a (2012) Sixth Grade - n/a (2013) 30.4% (2012) The BMI rate for females that were overweight or obese in the elementary school were: Kindergarten - 57.1% (2013) 30.8% (2012) First Grade - n/a (2013) n/a (2012) Second Grade - 44.4% (2013) 47.8% (2012) Third Grade - n/a (2013) n/a (2013) Fourth Grade - n/a (2013) 20% (2012) Fifth Grade - n/a (2013) n/a (2012) Sixth Grade - 35.3 (2013) 34.8% (2012) Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Dianna Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: All elementary students will be provided with physical activity and physical education classes each week (documented on grade level schedules). All grades will have at least 60 minutes of physical education weekly and at least 90 minutes of physical activity per week. ( <a href="http://www.sos.arkansas.gov/rulesRegs/Arkansas%20Register/2005/sep_2005/005.01.05-009.pdf">http://www.sos.arkansas.gov/rulesRegs/Arkansas%20Register/2005/sep_2005/005.01.05-009.pdf</a> ) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Screenings for vision, hearing, scoliosis and BMI assessments will be given annually to students at various grade levels and will continue each year following the same grade level rotation. Action Type: Wellness	Dianna Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school nurse and the counseling department will work together to provide toiletry bags for students for personal hygiene. Action Type: Wellness	Dianna Adams, School Nurse / Mona Williams, School Counselor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff	ACTION BUDGET: \$
EVALUATION: The school Wellness Plan will be evaluated by using the Presidential Fitness Test. The 2013-14 fitness test results will be used as a baseline for future annual evaluations. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Laura Laymon, Elementary PE teacher	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students and parents will receive a copy of the Health and Nutrition Pamphlet from the State of Arkansas. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Dianna Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4:

- Two students are identified as English Language Learners. One scored above the 50% on the ITBS test and one scored Proficient on the Benchmark exam in the literacy, math and science areas at the fifth grade.

Supporting Data:

Goal Students identified as English Language Learners will receive support to ensure they become successful learners in the classroom, and score proficient on the augmented benchmark exams and ELDA assessments.

Benchmark ELL students will continue to pass the Benchmark exam with Proficient or Advanced scores and the pass the ELDA test.

Intervention: Provide teachers with appropriate training in appropriate instructional strategies that will help the student who struggles with the English language.				
Scientific Based Research: Heacox, Diane, Ed. D., "Differentiating Instruction in the Regular Classroom-How to Reach and Teach all Learners." Maria Paula, "When You Don't Speak Their Language: Guiding English Language Learners Through Conversations About Text", The REading TEacher, vol. 63, September 2009. Scientific Based Research: Managing ESL Programs in Rural and Small Urban Schools, Barney Berube, Teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) (2000). Education in the Post- Lakeview Era: What is Arkansas doing to close the achievement gap. Jay Barth, and Keith Nitta. Whatever It Takes, DuFour, Richard, National Education Service, 2004 Classroom Instruction that Works with English language Learners, Hill, Jane D. and Flynn, Kathleen, Association for Curriculum and Development, 2006 Detracking for Excellence and Equity, Burris, Carol and Garrity, Della, Association for Curriculum and Development, 2008				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
An ELL highly qualified teacher will work with ELL students to help them acquire the necessary skills to be proficient in the English language. Provide the ELL teacher with funds for materials and supplies to support the program. Program evaluation will be based on the number of students dismissed from the ELL program, proficient on augmented benchmark and/or ELDA assessments.	Tammy Burrow	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Teachers will be trained to provide strategies for working with students whose first language is not English. Action Type: Professional Development	Tammy Burrow	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Home Language Surveys will be given to all students upon enrollment in the district as well as all returning students during open house or registration. This will be used to identify prospective ELL students. A screening/placement test is then given to these students for language assessment. Students who have been identified as language learners will be served by ELL endorsed teachers to develop their language skills. This will be evaluated by the ELDA test at the end of the year. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Equity	June Wells / Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will align reading materials for ELL students with the language arts curriculum to identify the appropriate, differentiated instructional strategies that are appropriate for English Language Learners. This will be determined in various ways, such as: Instructional Facilitators, through PLC's, Leadership Teams, and / or district staff development; as well as using data collected from ELL Coordinator and formative/summative assessments (Teacher made assessments, ACTAAP, STAR/Renaissance, and/or ELDA). Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
EVALUATION: 2012-13 ELDA and Benchmark/EOC testing will provide data to determine the direction of the ELL program for 2013-14 school year. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

- Priority 5: To Increase 5th Grade Science Scores in the Area of Physical Science Multiple Choice and Earth Science Multiple Choice. To Increase Life Science Open Responses.
1. 2012-13 Benchmark Data: Nature of Science: 4/5 multiple choice and 6/8 open response: The state average was 4/5 multiple choice and 3/8 open response.
  2. 2012-13 Benchmark Data: Life Science: 8/11 multiple choice and 7/16 open response: The state average was 6/11 multiple choice and 6/16 open response.
- Supporting Data:
3. 2012-13 Benchmark Data: Physical Science: 8/12 multiple choice and 4/8 open response: The state average was 7/12 multiple choice and 3/8 open response.
  4. 2012-13 Benchmark Data: Earth and Space Science: 8/12 multiple choice and 5/8 open response: The state average was 7/12 multiple choice and 4/8 open response.

Goal To Increase 5th Grade Science Scores in the Areas of Physical Science Multiple Choice and Earth Science Multiple Choice. To Increase Life Science Open Responses.

Benchmark Physical Science Multiple Choice and Earth Science Multiple Choice answers will increase to 9/12 correct; Life Science Open Response answers will increase to 9/16 correct.

Intervention: Science labs / hands on activities will be used weekly (20% of instructional time) to reinforce material and enhance comprehension.				
Scientific Based Research: American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). 1993. Benchmarks for science literacy. New York: Macmillan. Cervetti, G. N., P. D. Pearson, M. A. Bravo, J. Barber. 2005. Reading and writing in the service of inquiry-based science. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Romance, N. R., and M. R. Vitale. 2001. Implementing an in-depth expanded science model in elementary schools: Multiyear findings, research issues, and policy implications. International Journal of Science Education 23: 373-404.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will document 20% of instructional time in lesson plans for hands on activities and science labs. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Alignment	June Wells, Director of School Improvement / Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Professional Development: Teachers will participate in professional development opportunities provided by the state, coop, and local district to enhance their curriculum and their approach to the identified weaker areas on the science benchmark exam. Math/science teachers will attend STEM training. Action Type: Professional Development	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Science Teachers will meet with language arts and math teachers in order to determine how they can assist with the common core implementation through science integration. A 5th grade science teacher, Clancie Laymon will be hired with Title IIA funds at .21 FTE and NSLA funds at .17 FTE to reduce class size at the fifth grade level. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$11855.00 Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$2844.20 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$2668.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$9598.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$26965.2

Total Budget:

\$26965.2

• Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Business Representative	Sarah Ochs	Speech Therapist	Literacy, Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Ashley Mullen	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Cindy Murray	K-8 Art Teacher	Parental Involvement / Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Clancy Laymon	5th Grade Science Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Dawn Robinette	2nd Grade Math & Spelling Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Donna Pridgen	Special Education Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Hannah Cheshier	1st Grade Science, Social Studies, & Spelling Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Hillary Frisby	3rd Grade Science & Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Janet White	1st Grade Math Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jeane Owens	6th Grade Math & Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jennilee Brasher	1st Grade Language Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jessie Kelley	Elementary Music Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Kathy McAdams	5th Grade Math & Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Katie Owens	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy / Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Laura Laymon	6th Grade Reading & Elementary PE Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lori Henricks	4th Grade Reading & Language Teacher	Literacy / Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Lucretia Hargett	1st Grade Reading Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Mark Looney	6th Grade Science Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Melissa Slaughter	2nd Grade Language & Science Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Monica Smith	3rd Grade Math & Spelling Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Patricia Murray	5th & 6th Grade Language Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Rachel Hardy	4th Grade Math & Spelling Teacher	Math / Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Rachel Smith	3rd Grade Reading & Language	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Renee' Bearden	4th Grade Science & Social Studies	Parental Involvement / Health & Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Rita Roe	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Tiffany Graven	5th -8th Grade Special Education Teacher	Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Whitney Gee	2nd Grade Reading & Social Studies Teacher	Literacy / Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Yolanda Gafford	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Community Representative	Juanice Owers	Community Representative	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Benita Jones	District Bookkeeper	Federal Programs
District-Level Professional	Dana Rumph	Reading Replacement Teacher	Literacy Chairperson
District-Level Professional	Michael White	Superintendent	Federal Programs / Math
District-Level Professional	Sherrie Sweeney	Administrative Assistant	Federal Programs
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Becky Gross	Instructional Assistant	Federal Programs / Parental Involvement / Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Cheryl Shoup	Instructional Assistant & Computer Lab	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Dianna Adams	Nurse	School Health & Nutrition
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Janis Moss	Instructional Assistant	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jewel Kelley	Librarian, Media Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Karon Ordoyne	Instructional Assistant	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mona Williams, Chairperson	Counselor	Parent Involvement Coordinator / Health & Nutrition Committee / Handbook
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Susan Barnes	Secretary	Parental Involvement / Handbook
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Teressa Jackson	Director Cafeteria	Health & Nutrition
Parent	Amanda Shoup	Parent	Math
Parent	Amanda Waggoner	Parent	Literacy, Federal Programs
Parent	Amy Boothe	Parent	Federal Programs / Parent Involvement
Parent	Angie Joiner	Parent	Math
Parent	Christy Caldwell	Parent	Literacy
Parent	Gina Watkins	Parent	Literacy / Parental Involvement
Parent	Kammie Brvant	Parent	Federal Programs / Parental Involvement
Parent	Karen Pridgen	Parent	Health & Nutrition / Handbook Committee
Parent	Tara Morgan	South Central Coop Preschool Teacher	Math / Federal Programs / Parental Involvement
Principal	Carrie Burson	Elementary Principal	Literacy