

# School Plan

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

## Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2012-2013

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 Literary Passages, and Open Response Literary, Content, and Practical Passages. To improve writing scores in Content and Style.

#### Priority 2: MATH

**Goal:** To improve math scores in the areas of Multiple Choice Number Sense, Properties, and Operations and Open Response Measurement.

#### Priority 3: Wellness

**Goal:** To improve the health and physical well being of students.

---

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 2010-2011 was 95.4, and for 2011-12 was 96.60%.
	2.
	3.
	4.
	5.
	6.
	7.
	8. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PARKERS CHAPEL ELEM. SCHOOL
	9. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam
Supporting Data:	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
	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. Caucasian 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. \_\_/\_\_ - \_\_% below 50th percentile).

520.  
521. Students with Disabilities showed the greatest  
weakness in the area of  
522. Vocabulary (\_\_\_/\_\_\_ - \_\_\_%) below the 50th percentile).

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. Caucasian 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. Caucasian 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. Caucasian 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 students were proficient or advanced in 2011.
- 765.
766. The 2012 AMO for Hispanic students is 100%.
767. The 2013 AMO for Hispanic students is 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 Caucasian students is 91.66.  
781. The 2017 AMO for Caucasian students is 92.86.  
782.  
783. The total number of Economically Disadvantaged students attempting 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 To improve literacy scores in Multiple Choice Content and Literary Passages, and Open Response Literary, Content, and Practical Passages. To improve writing scores in Content and Style.

Benchmark 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 were 197. The percentage of students proficient or advanced in 2011 was 85.28.

Benchmark 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. The target achievement TAG group was 79.12% and will gain 1.90% by 2013. The African American group was 78.43% and will gain 1.96% by 2013. The Hispanic group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013. The Caucasian group was 86.90% and will gain 1.19% by 2013. The Economically Disadvantaged group was 84.24% and will gain 1.44% by 2013. The English Language Learner group was 100% and will gain 0% by 2013. The Students with disabilities group was 50.34% and will gain 4.52% by 2013. 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. The target achievement TAG group was 73.81% and will gain 2.38% by 2013. The African American group was 77.08% and will gain 2.09% by 2013. The Hispanic group was 54.17% and will gain 4.16% by 2013. The Caucasian group was 79.79% and will gain 1.84% by 2013. The Economically Disadvantaged group was 77.08% and will gain 2.09% by 2013. The English Language Learner group was 8.33% and will gain 8.34% by 2013. The students with disabilities group was 43.59% and will gain 5.13% by 2013.

Intervention: To 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 to guide instruction. PCES has shown growth in reading comprehension scores and writing scores.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation</p> <p>Action Type: Special Education</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<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 inservice on effective literacy practices. Teachers will increase their knowledge of research based balanced 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</p>	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Other \$4100.00</p> <p>Objects:</p> <p>PD (State-223) - Purchased Services: \$7049.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$11149</p>

<p>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.  Action Type:  Alignment  Action Type:  Collaboration  Action Type:  Professional Development  Action Type: Special Education  Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>				
<p>Strategies: "Daily Warm-ups" and "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. Title IIA Class Size Reduction Funds will be used to reduce student/teacher ratio to 1:15 in the reading area by providing a reading teacher, Hannah Cheshier, at .35 FTE at the second grade.  Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012  End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title II-A  - Employee Salaries: \$12566.00  Title II-A  - Employee Benefits: \$3380.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$15946</p>
<p>Strategies: * All students, including special education students, will use computers and software in each</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012  End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• School Library</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>



classroom and in the computer lab to extend instruction. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	
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. Two instructional assistants, Janis Moss (.50 FTE) and Becky Gross (.50 FTE) will provide small group instruction to students identified in grades K-6 as having the greatest need for assistance. Action Type: Title I Target Assistance	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Employee \$18233.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$7422.00 Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$25655
Evaluation: Annual SRA DI Placement Tests will be conducted to evaluate student progress in the DI reading program. This reading instruction program is aligned to the Arkansas Curriculum Frameworks and to the Common Core Curriculum. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
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	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2848.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$5740.00 NSLA (State-281) - \$22500.00

<p>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. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education</p>				<p>281) - Employee Salaries:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$31088</p>
<p>Strategy: Teachers will create performance based writing assignments by implementing the "4 Square" method, "Traits of Writing" method, and "ELF" method. These assignments will be administered to students. They will be aligned to the Common Core and Arkansas Frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: Teachers and / or Counselor will conduct a parent meeting informing parents about Benchmark Exams and IOWA testing. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Counselor / Teachers</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: Accelerated Reader is implemented at all grade levels for all students, including special education</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>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 9weeks; 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, 10 pts. 2nd 9 weeks, 12 pts. 3rd 9 weeks, and 15 pts. 4th 9 weeks; 4th grade = 15 pts. 1st nine weeks, 25 pts. 2nd nine weeks, 15 pts. 3rd 9 weeks, and 20 pts. for 4th 9weeks; 5th grade = 20 pts. for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd nine weeks, and 25 pts. the 4th nine weeks; 6th grade = 25 pts. the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd nine weeks, and 30 pts. the 4th 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</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>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, and will be posted on the school building entrance / exit doors. Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>Training: Teachers, including special education teachers, media specialists, and any instructional assistants will be trained in the use and evaluation of the Accelerated Reader program and attend other professional development required by the district. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• School Library</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<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</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

shown an increase in teaching that involves higher order questioning techniques and thinking skills. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Strategy: Reading instruction will be adjusted using the "replacement model" according to students' (including special education students) evaluation data determined by SRA / DI Placement Test, workbooks, and individual writing at the Kindergarten-4th grade level. Juanice Owers is hired at .50 FTE to provide reading instruction to Title I identified students. Cindy Murray is hired at .29 FTE to provide reading instruction to Title I identified students. Materials and supplies will be purchased for Title I student use. Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$9554.00 Title I - Employee Salaries: \$33030.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$8158.44 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$50742.44
No students that reside in our school district attend private schools. Action Type: Title I Target Assistance	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
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	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

IRI. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				\$134580.44

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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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 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	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: All teachers, including special education teachers, will use pacing guides to document when benchmarks are being taught. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: Teachers, including special education teachers, will be trained in the implementation of integrating arts (art, music, movement, drama) into the curriculum, based on the A+ method. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

	Responsible			
Strategy: *Parents will be notified at the annual report to public of Parkers Chapel Elementary School's Adequate Yearly Progress Status and AMOs. Action Type: AIP/IRI	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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 will conduct the workshop. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Target Assistance	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training *Teachers will attend Benchmark and Common Core meetings provided by the Arkansas State Department of Education. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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. Grades 1 - 6 will use small group remediation and 1:1 instruction and Grades 3-6 will use the "Buckle Down" program to assist with remediation. Action Type: AIP/IRI	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Develop Academic Improvement	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$



<p>Plans for all students scoring below basic and basic on the 2012 Arkansas Benchmark Exam and/or the IOWA Test. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>		<p>End: 06/30/2013</p>		<p>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 and 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 during Summer remediation, during RTI classroom time, or afterschool interventions sessions . *Purchase instructional materials and supplies to provide remediation.\$ Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>June Wells, Director of School Improvement</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Evaluation * The DIBELS test will be given at appropriate times to students in grades K, 1, &amp; 2 that have an improvement plan. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Juanice Owers, Literacy Chairperson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <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</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

determine if interventions are working and adjust remediation as needed. \$ Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Target Assistance				
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Parent Involvement

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

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
*Parents will be given an opportunity to have the results of his or her child's Benchmark and IOWA tests interpreted for them in group settings and/or individual meetings with the school counselor or his or her teacher. *Parkers Chapel Elementary shall have a minimum of two parent-teacher conferences per school year. 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. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	John Gross, Supt.	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central Office</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
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	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>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. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<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 &amp; updated parental involvement policy and the student/parent compact. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>		<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *The school board will designate a parent facilitator (one certified staff member) to serve as a parent facilitator. This person will organize meaningful</p>	<p>John Gross</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Office</li> </ul>	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>				
<p>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.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>John Gross, Supt.</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Office</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Jewel Kelley</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Library</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>*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.</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement				
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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		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". 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 compact will be kept on file in a designated parent involvement folder in the parent coordinator's office. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *The process for solving parental concerns is outlined in the student handbook.	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	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 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.	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement				
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. (Remind101.com) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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. ( <a href="http://pc-elementary.blogspot.com">http://pc-elementary.blogspot.com</a> ) 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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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
- Supporting Data:

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.
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 Choice: Geometry & Measurement; Open Response: Geometry.
35. Choice: Geometry & Measurement; Open Response: Geometry.
36. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Measurement & Geometry.
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; Open Response: Geometry & Data Analysis and Probability.
41. Open Response: Geometry & Data Analysis and Probability.
- 42.
43. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Geometry.
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 Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Measurement.
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 Choice: Measurement (5/7 avg) 71%; Open Response:
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. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 236.
237. 39 Students: (38/39) % of Combined Students
- 238.
239. 5 Students: 80% of African American Students
240. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students
241. 44 Students: 94% of Caucasian Students
242. 19 Students: 79% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
243. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
244. 7 Students: 71% of Students with Disabilities
245. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple
246. Choice: Algebra; Open Response: Geometry.
247. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:
248. Algebra; Open Response: Measurement & Geometry.
249. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: n/a.
- 250.
251. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were: Multiple Choice: Algebra;
252. Open Response: Geometry.
253. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple
254. Choice: Data Analysis & Probability; Open Response: Geometry and
255. Measurement.
256. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: n/a
257. The lowest identified areas for Students with

Disabilities were: Multiple  
258. Choice: Data Analysis and Probability; Open Response:  
Measurement and Geometry.  
259.  
260.  
261. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students  
Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
262.  
263. 50 Students: 92% of Combined Students  
264. 5 Students: 80% of African American  
Students  
265. 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students  
266. 44 Students: 94% of Caucasian Students  
267. 19 Students: 79% of Econ. Disadvantaged  
Students  
268. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
269. 7 Students: 71% of Students with  
Disabilities  
270. The lowest identified areas for the combined  
population were: Multiple  
271. Choice: Algebra; Open Response: Geometry.  
272. The lowest identified areas for African Americans  
were: Multiple Choice:  
273. Algebra; Open Response: Measurement & Geometry.  
274. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
n/a.  
275.  
276. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice: Algebra;  
277. Open Response: Geometry.  
278. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged  
students were: Multiple  
279. Choice: Data Analysis & Probability; Open Response:  
Geometry and  
280. Measurement.  
281. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
n/a  
282. The lowest identified areas for Students with  
Disabilities were: Multiple  
283. Choice: Data Analysis and Probability; Open Response:  
Measurement and Geometry.



284.

285.

286. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students  
Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

287.

288. 39 Students: (38/39) 97% of Combined  
Students

289.

290. 5 Students: (4/5)80% of African American  
Students

291.

292. 1 Students: (1/1) 100% of Hispanic  
Students

293.

294. 33 Students: (33/33) 100% of Caucasian  
Students

295.

296. 16 Students: (15/16) 94% of Econ.  
Disadvantaged Students

297.

298. 1 Students: (1/1) 100% of LEP Students

299.

300. 2 Students: (2/2) 100% of Students with  
Disabilities

301.

302. The lowest identified areas for the combined  
population were: Multiple

303. Choice: Numbers and Operations (260/351 points) 74%  
and Data Analysis and

304. Probability (198/273 points) 73%; Open Response:  
Geometry (139/312 points) 45%.

305.

306.

307. The lowest identified areas for African Americans  
were: Multiple Choice:

308. Measurement (16/35 points) 46%; Open Response:  
Geometry (12/40 points) 30%.

309.

310.

311. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
Multiple Choice: Data

312. Analysis and Probability (5/7 points) 71%; Open  
Response: Geometry (4/8 points)

313. 50%.

314.

315. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice: Data

316. Analysis and Probability (172/231 points) 74%; Open  
Response: Geometry (123/264

317. points) 47%.

318.

319. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged  
students were: Multiple

320. Choice: Numbers and Operations (6/9 avg.) 67%; Open  
Response: Geometry (3/8

321. avg.) 38%.

322.

323. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
Multiple Choice: Data

324. Analysis and Probability (5/7) 71%; Open Response:  
Geometry (4/8) 50%

325.

326. The lowest identified areas for Students with  
Disabilities were: Multiple

327. Choice: Data Analysis and Probability (4/7 avg) 57%;  
Open Response: Geometry

328. (4/8 avg) 50%.

329.

330.

331.

332.

333.

334.

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

336. Benchmark-6th Grade Mathematics Exam

337. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring  
Proficient/Advanced:

338. 52 Students: 88.4% of Combined Students

339. 5 Students: 60.0% of African American  
Students

340. 1 Students:100.0% of Hispanic Students

341. 46 Students: 91.3% of Caucasian Students

342. 13 Students: 76.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged  
Students

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

344. 3 Students: 33.3% of Students with

Disabilities

345. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were:  
Algebra
346. Open Response and Geometry Open response
347. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were:  
Algebra Open
348. Response and Geometry Open response
349. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were:  
N/A
- 350.
351. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were:  
Algebra Open Response
352. and Geometry Open response
- 353.
354. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were:
355. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
N/A
- 356.
357. 2011-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
- 358.
359. 61 Students: 92% of Combined Students
360. 6 Students: 84% of African American Students
361. 1 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students
362. 54 Students: 93% of Caucasian Students
363. 17 Students: 76% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
364. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students
365. 6 Students: 50% of Students with Disabilities
366. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple
367. Choice: Measurement; Open Response: Numbers & Operations.
368. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:
369. Measurement; Open Response: Measurement.
370. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were:  
Multiple Choice: Numbers &
371. Operations; Open Response: Algebra.

372. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice:

373. Measurement; Open Response: Numbers & Operations.

374. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple

375. Choice: Measurement and Geometry; Open Response: Numbers & Operations.

376. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
n/a

377. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple

378. Choice: Geometry & Measurement; Open Response: Numbers & Operations, Geometry,

379. and Measurement.

380.

381. 2012-# of Students Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:

382.

383. 49 Students: (41/49) 84% of Combined Students

384.

385. 5 Students: (3/5) 60% of African American Students

386.

387. 0 Students: N/A % of Hispanic Students

388. 1 Student: (1/1) 100% of Students with 2 or More Races

389.

390. 43 Students: (37/43) 86% of Caucasian Students

391.

392. 20 Students: (14/20) 70% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students

393.

394. 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students

395. 6 Students: (4/6) 67% of Students with Disabilities

396.

397. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple

398. Choice: Algebra (299/441 points) 68% and Measurement (236/343 points) 69%; Open

399. Response: Measurement (189/392 points) 48%.

400.

401. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Multiple Choice:

402. Algebra (22/45 points) 49%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (8/40 points)

403. 20%.

404.

405. The lowest identified areas for Hispanics were: N/A  
- no students were tested

406. in this area.

407.

408. The lowest identified areas for Students with Two or More Races were:

409. Multiple Choice: \_\_\_\_\_; Open Response: \_\_\_\_\_.

410.

411.

412. The lowest identified areas for Caucasians were:  
Multiple Choice: Algebra

413. (277/387 points ) 72%, Geometry (249/344 points) 72%, and Measurement (215/301

414. points) 71%; Open Response: Measurement (179/344 points) 52%.

415.

416. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple

417. Choice: Algebra (5/9 avg) 56% and Measurement (4/7 avg) 57%; Open Response:

418. Measurement (3/8 avg) 38%.

419.

420. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were:  
n/a

421.

422. The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Multiple

423. Choice: Numbers and Operations (4/9 avg) 44%, Algebra (4/9 avg) 44%, and

424. Measurement (3/7 avg) 43%; Open Response: Numbers and Operations (3/8 avg) 38%,

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

426.

427.

428.

429.

430. SAT 10

431. Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring

At/Above 50th Percentile:

432.	COMBINED POPULATION	Grade: K		
433.	Year	2008	2009	2010
434.	Number Tested			
435.		N/A	54	60
436.				
437.	% At/Above 50th NPR In:			
438.	Math Problem Solving			
439.		N/A	59.3%	30.0%

440.

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

442. scoring above 50th percentile:

443. Combined Population: 49 students: 85.7% scored above the 50th percentile in

444. math;

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

446.

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

448.

449. Caucasian Students: 43 students: 86% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

450.

451. Economically Disadvantaged: 23 students: 82.6% scored above the 50th percentile

452. in math;

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

454.

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

456.

457.

458.

459. SAT 10

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

461.	COMBINED POPULATION	Grade:1		
462.	Year	2008	2009	2010
463.	number Tested	44	55	52
464.	% At/Above 50th NPR In:			
465.				
466.	Math Problem Solving			
467.		86.4%	70.9%	59.6%

468.  
469. In 2011, # of First Grade students taking the Iowa  
Tests of Basic Skills and %  
470. scoring above 50th percentile:  
  
471. Combined Population: 46 students: 76.1% scored above  
the 50th percentile in  
472. math;  
  
473. African Americans: 4 students: 75% scored above the  
50th percentile in math;  
474.  
  
475. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the  
50th percentile in math;  
476.  
  
477. Caucasian Students: 40 students: 75% scored above the  
50th percentile in math;  
478.  
  
479. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 82.4% scored  
above the 50th percentile  
480. in math;  
  
481. LEP: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile  
in math;  
  
482. Students with Disabilities: 0 students: n/a% scored  
above the 50th percentile  
483. in math.  
  
484.  
485. In 2012, # of First Grade students taking the Iowa  
Tests of Basic Skills and %  
486. scoring above 50th percentile:  
  
487. Combined Population: 47 students: 70.3% scored above  
the 50th percentile in  
488. math;  
  
489. African Americans: 3 students: 100% scored above the  
50th percentile in math;  
490.  
  
491. Hispanic Students: 1 student: 0% scored above the  
50th percentile in math;  
  
492.  
493. MultiEthnic Students: 2 students: 50% scored above  
the 50th percentile in math;  
494.  
  
495. Caucasian Students: 41 students: 70.7% scored above  
the 50th percentile in

496. math;

497. Economically Disadvantaged: 21 students: 61.9% scored above the 50th percentile

498. in math;

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

500. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile

501. in math.

502.

503.

504.

505.

506.

507. SAT 10

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

509.

510. COMBINED POPULATION	Grade:2		
511. Year	2008	2009	2010
512. number Tested	52	45	55
513. % At/Above 50th NPR In:			
514.			
515. Math Problem Solving			
516.	67.3%	82.2%	69.1%
517.			
518.			

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

520. scoring above 50th percentile:

521. Combined Population: 47 students: 68.1% scored above the 50th percentile in

522. math;

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

524.

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

526.

527. Caucasian Students: 46 students: 69.6% scored above the 50th percentile in

528. math;

529. Economically Disadvantaged: 16 students: 68.8% 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: 0 students: n/a% scored  
above the 50th percentile

533. in math.

534.

535.

536. In 2012, # of Second Grade students taking the Iowa  
Tests of Basic Skills and %

537. scoring above 50th percentile:

538. Combined Population: 45 students: 73.3% scored above  
the 50th percentile in

539. math;

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

541.

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

543.

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

545.

546. Caucasian Students: 39 students: 71.8% scored above  
the 50th percentile in

547. math;

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

549. in math;

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

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

552. in math.

553.

554.

555.

556.

557. SAT 10

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

559.

560. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:3

561. Year 2008 2009  
2010

562. Number Tested 57 52  
49

563. % At/Above 50th NPR In:

564. Reading Comprehension 54.4% 38.5%  
65.3%

565. Math Problem Solving 71.9% 69.2%  
85.7%

566.

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

568. scoring above 50th percentile:

569. Combined Population: 51 students: 64.7% scored above  
the 50th percentile in

570. math;

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

572.

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

574.

575. Caucasian Students: 45 students: 66.7% scored above  
the 50th percentile in

576. math;

577. Economically Disadvantaged: 15 students: 53.3% scored  
above the 50th percentile

578. in math;

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

580. Students with Disabilities: 6 students: 50% scored  
above the 50th percentile in

581. math.

582.

583. In 2012, # of Third Grade students taking the Iowa  
Tests of Basic Skills and %

584. scoring above 50th percentile:

585. Combined Population: 42 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above  
the 50th percentile in

586. math;

587. African Americans: 2 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the

50th percentile in math;  
588.

589. Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a% scored above the  
50th percentile in math;  
590.

591. MultiEthnic Students: 0 students; n/a% scored above  
the 50th percentile in  
592. math;

593. Caucasian Students: 40 students: \_\_\_\_% scored above  
the 50th percentile in  
594. math;

595. Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: \_\_\_\_%  
scored above the 50th  
596. percentile in math;

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

598. Students with Disabilities: 5 students: \_\_\_\_% scored  
above the 50th percentile  
599. in math.

600.

601.

602.

603.

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

605.

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

607.

608. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:4

609. Year: 2008 2009 2010

610. Number Tested: 40 60 52

611. % At/Above 50th NPR In:

612. Math Problem Solving :

613. 85.0% 91.7% 80.8%

614.

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

616. scoring above 50th percentile:

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

618. math;

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

620.

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

622.

623. Caucasian Students: 37 students: 78.4% scored above the 50th percentile in

624. math;

625. Economically Disadvantaged: 20 students: 70% scored above the 50th percentile

626. in math;

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

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

629. math.

630.

631. In 2012, # of Fourth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %

632. scoring above 50th percentile:

633. Combined Population: 43 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

634. math;

635. African Americans: 3 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

636.

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

638.

639. MultiEthnic Students: 1 student: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

640. math;

641. Caucasian Students: 39 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

642. math;

643. Economically Disadvantaged: 18 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th

644. percentile in math;

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

646. Students with Disabilities: 7 students: \_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile  
647. in math.

648.

649.

650.

651.

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

653.

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

655.

656. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:5

657. Year

658. 2008 2009 2010 <

659. Number Tested

660. 58 42 59 <

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

662. Math Problem Solving

663. 87.9% 88.1% 91.5%

664.

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

666. scoring above 50th percentile:

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

668.

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

670.

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

672.

673. Caucasian Students: 44 students: 65.9% scored above the 50th percentile in

674. math;

675. Economically Disadvantaged: 21 students: 57.1% scored above the 50th percentile

676. in math;

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

678. Students with Disabilities: 7 students: 28.6% scored above the 50th percentile  
679. in math.

680.

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

682. scoring above 50th percentile:

683. Combined Population: 39 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

684. math;

685. African Americans: 5 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

686. math;

687. Hispanic Students: 1 student : \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

688. math;

689. MultiEthnic Students: 0 students: n/a scored above the 50th percentile in math;

690.

691. Caucasian Students: 33 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in

692. math;

693. Economically Disadvantaged: 16 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th

694. percentile in math;

695. LEP: 1 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th percentile in math;

696. Students with Disabilities: 2 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above the 50th

697. percentile in math.

698.

699.

700.

701.

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

703.

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

705.

706. COMBINED POPULATION Grade:6

707. Year

	2008	2009	2010
708.			
709.	Number Tested		
710.	48	59	44
711.	% At/Above 50th NPR In: <		
712.	Math Problem Solving		
713.	87.5%	84.7%	84.1%
714.	In 2011, # of Sixth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %		
715.	scoring above 50th percentile:		
716.	Combined Population: 61 students: 72.1% scored above the 50th percentile in		
717.	math;		
718.	African Americans: 6 students: 33% scored above the 50th percentile in math;		
719.			
720.	Hispanic Students: 1 student: 100% scored above the 50th percentile in math;		
721.			
722.	Caucasian Students: 54 students: 75.9% scored above the 50th percentile in		
723.	math;		
724.	Economically Disadvantaged: 17 students: 52.9% scored above the 50th percentile		
725.	in math;		
726.	LEP: 0 students: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;		
727.	Students with Disabilities: 5 students: 20% scored above the 50th percentile in		
728.	math.		
729.			
730.	In 2012, # of Sixth Grade students taking the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and %		
731.	scoring above 50th percentile:		
732.	Combined Population: 49 students: _____% scored above the 50th percentile in		
733.	math;		
734.	African Americans: 5 students: _____% scored above the 50th percentile in math;		
735.			
736.	Hispanic Students: 0 student: n/a% scored above the 50th percentile in math;		
737.			

738. MultiEthnic Students: 1 student: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above  
the 50th percentile in  
739. math;

740. Caucasian Students: 43 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored above  
the 50th percentile in  
741. math;

742. Economically Disadvantaged: 20 students: \_\_\_\_\_%  
scored above the 50th  
743. percentile in math;

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

745. Students with Disabilities: 6 students: \_\_\_\_\_% scored  
above the 50th percentile  
746. in math.

747.  
748.

749. The attendance rate for Parkers Chapel Elementary for  
2009-2010 was 95.1%, for  
750. 2010-2011 was 95.4, and for 2011-12 was 96.60%.

751.  
752.

753. The 2011 3rd through 6th Benchmark three-year trend  
analysis shows weaknesses  
754. in Geometry and Measurement open response, and  
measurement and data analysis  
755. multiply choice.

756. The 2012 3rd through 6th Benchmark analysis shows the  
greatest weakness in the  
757. area of Measurement Multiple Choice with an average  
score of 71.5% The  
758. greatest weaknesses in open response items are  
equally in the areas of Numbers  
759. and Operations, Geometry, and Measurement, all with  
an average score of 4.8 / 8  
760. points.

761.

762. The 2012 AMO for all students is 93.95  
763. The 2013 AMO for all students is 94.50  
764. The 2014 AMO for all students is 95.05  
765. The 2015 AMO for all students is 95.60  
766. The 2016 AMO for all students is 96.15  
767. The 2017 AMO for all students is 96.70  
768.

769. The number of students in the TARGETED ACHIEVEMENT  
GAP GROUP was 197. The  
770. percent proficient in literacy in 2011 was 93.40.  
771.  
772.

773. The total number of African American students



attempting the math test in 2011  
 774. was 17. The percentage of African American students scoring proficient or  
 775. advanced in year 2011 was 76.47.  
 776.  
 777. The total number of Hispanic students attempting the math test in 2011 was 3.  
 778. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient or advanced in the year  
 779. 2011 was 100.  
 780.  
 781. The total number of Caucasian students attempting the 2011 math test was 175.  
 782. 94.86% of those students were proficient or advanced in 2011.  
 783.  
 784.  
 785. The total number of Economically Disadvantaged students attempting the math  
 786. test in 2011 was 64. The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students  
 787. scoring proficient or advanced in 2011 was 82.81.  
 788.  
 789.  
 790. The total number of English Language Learners attempting the 2011 math test was  
 791. 1. 100% of the ELL students scored proficient or advanced on the math test in  
 792. 2011.  
 793.  
 794. The total number of Students with Disabilities attempting the math test in 2011  
 795. was 24. The percentage of those students scoring proficient or advanced on the  
 796. 2011 math test was 70.83.  
 797.  
 798.  
 799.  
 800. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Combined and all sub-populations are making AYP.  
 801.  
 802. Parkers Chapel Elementary is a Needs Improvement School in the area of Math.  
 803.  
 804.

Goal To improve math scores in the areas of Multiple Choice Number Sense, Properties, and Operations and Open Response Measurement.

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%. 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% 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%. 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%. 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%. 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%. 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%. 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%. According to the 2012 ESEA AMO printout, the total number of students attempting the math test in the year 2011 were 197. The percentage of students proficient or advanced in 2011 was 93.40%.

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 teachers, including special education teachers, will place math framework numbers / Common Core State Standards being taught in lesson plans.* All teachers, including special education teachers, will use pacing guides to document when benchmarks are being taught. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: * All teachers, including special education teachers, will meet each 9 weeks across grade levels to determine which	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$

Common Core State Standards have been taught, how they are being taught, and which standards still need to be taught. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education				
Evaluation: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will analyze Benchmark Data & IOWA data to determine areas of weaknesses and strengths. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Rachel Hardy, Math Chairperson	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will attend professional development to align the math curriculum to the Common Core State Standards and to the released benchmark items, which will be provided by the principal. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	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
Training: *All teachers, including special education teachers will conduct an annual review of lesson plans.	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>curriculum maps, and pacing guides to ensure all Common Core State Standards and frameworks 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 plan, reviewed 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;  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Special Education  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>Strategies: All teachers, including special education teachers, are using the Harcourt Series as a resource to teach the Arkansas Frameworks and the Common Core State Standards. The content in these textbook series have been aligned to the Arkansas Frameworks. A director of school improvement, June Wells, is hired at .25 FTE to oversee total instruction.  Action Type: Equity  Action Type: Special Education  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal &amp; June Wells, Director of School Improvement</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012  End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>NSLA (State-281) - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$2585.00  NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$5739.00  NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$22500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$30824</p>
<p>Evaluation: *All teachers, including special education teachers, will review Benchmark test data and IOWA test data to determine areas of the</p>	<p>Carrie Burson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012  End: 06/30/2013</p>		<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

curriculum that need to be strengthened as well as compare test results of individual students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education				
Training: *Train teachers in the use of software and hardware to research, keep up with data, and to teach (HIVE). Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Teachers will use "Arithmetic Developed Daily" in all classrooms and will focus on the "problem of the day".	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: *Teachers will attend Common Core State Standards training and other meetings provided by the Arkansas State Department of Education. Action Type: Professional Development	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		PD (State-223) - Purchased Services: \$7049.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$7049
Strategy: *Use released items from the Benchmark Exam as an alternative assessment and compare results to evaluate strengths and weaknesses. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$37873

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 concerning	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End:	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Parkers Chapel Elementary School's Adequate Yearly Progress Status. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement		06/30/2013		
Strategy: *Develop Academic Improvement Plans for all students scoring below basic and basic on the 2012 Arkansas Benchmark Exam and/or the IOWA Test. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Technology Inclusion	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Training: *Teachers will attend the Common Core State Standards meetings and Benchmark / ACTAAP meetings provided by the Arkansas State Department of Education. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		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. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

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

Supporting Data: 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.
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
Training: *The American Lung Association will provide an asthma education in-service for all staff, teachers, and special education teachers. *Teachers will attend professional development in the area of physical education for a minimum of two hours. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *P.E. instruction will be scheduled for every student, under the supervision of a highly qualified elementary physical education teacher, for a minimum of 150 minutes per week with a maximum student to adult ratio of 30:1.	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>*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>Evaluation: *Assess annually, using the School Health Index for Physical Activity, Healthy Eating and a Tobacco-Free Lifestyle using Modules 1,2,3,4, &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 - 98%          Module 2: Health Education - 98%          Module 3: Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - 99%          Module 4: Nutrition Services - 99%          Module 5: School Health Services - 98%          Module 6: School Counseling , Psychological, and Social Services - 100%          Module 7: Health Promotion for Staff - 81%          Module 8: Family and Community Involvement - 78%          Action Type: Program Evaluation          Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Dianna Adams</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012          End: 06/30/2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Strategy: *Develop a School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory</p>	<p>Dianna Adams</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2012          End:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>



Committee. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness		06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	
*Encourage participation in extracurricular activities (soccer, dance, etc.) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Diana Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
*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	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
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	Carrie Burson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Hand out surveys on Parent/Grandparent's Day. *Surveys and a suggestion box will be available in the cafeteria at all times. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Dianna Adams, School Nurse & Mona Williams, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: *Provide opportunities for students to be involved in grade-appropriate nutritional activities in the cafeteria Action Type: Wellness	Dianna Adams	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Strategy: An opportunity for CPR certification will be provided as part of the professional	Diana Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

development for all teachers, including special education teachers. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness				
Strategy: Students will be assigned to health and counseling groups in the 5th and 6th grades. Teachers will meet twice a week with small groups to work with students on making healthy lifestyle choices and encourage social well being. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Wellness	June Wells, Director of School Improvement	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
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: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<hr/> 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 - 33.3% First Grade - n/a Second Grade - 30% Third Grade - n/a Fourth Grade - 38.5% Fifth Grade - n/a Sixth Grade - 30.4% The BMI rate for females that were overweight or obese in the elementary school were: Kindergarten - 30.8% First Grade - n/a Second Grade - 47.8% Third Grade - n/a Fourth Grade - 20% Fifth Grade - n/a Sixth Grade -	Dianna Adams, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

34.8%				
Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				\$0

• Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Ashley Mullen	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Brenda Blaylock	1st Grade Reading / Spelling Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Cindy Murray	K-8 Art Teacher	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Dana Rumph	3rd Grade Reading / Spelling Teacher	Literacy, Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Dawn Robinette	Kindergarten Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Donna Pridgen	Special Education Teacher	Literacy / Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Hannah Cheshier	2nd Grade Reading / Social Studies Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Hillary Frisby	2nd Grade Math / Spelling Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Janet White	1st Grade Math / Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jeane Owens	6th Grade Math & Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jennilee Brasher	1st Grade Language / Science Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Kathy McAdams	5th Grade Math & Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Laura Laymon	5th & 6th Grade Reading Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lori Henricks	3rd Grade Language / Science Teacher	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Lucretia Hargett	Kindergarten Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Melissa Slaughter	2nd Grade Language / Science Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Monica Smith	3rd Grade Math / Social Studies Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Patricia Murray	5th / 6th Grade Language Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Rachel Hardy	4th Grade Math / Social Studies Teacher	Math / Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Renee Collier	4th / 5th Grade Science Teacher	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Tiffany Graven	5th -8th Grade Special Education Teacher	Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Vicki Pepper	4th Grade Reading / Language Teacher	Literacy, Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Yolanda Gafford	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Benita Jones	District Bookkeeper	Federal Programs
District-Level Professional	Corrie Bechtelheimer	Speech Therapist	Literacy, Federal Programs
District-Level Professional	John Gross	Superintendent	Federal Programs, Literacy
District-Level Professional	Juanice Owers	Reading Replacement Teacher	Literacy Chairperson

District-Level Professional	Mark Looney	6th Grade Science Teacher	Math
District-Level Professional	Sherrie Sweeney	Administrative Assistant	Federal Programs
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Becky Gross	Instructional Assistant	Parental Involvement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Cheryl Shoup	Computer Lab Instructor	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, Federal Programs
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kathleen Nixon	Secretary	Math & Handbook
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mona Williams, Chairperson	Counselor	Parent Involvement Coordinator/Health & Nutrition Committee & Handbook
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Susan Barnes	Physical Education Teacher	Health & Nutrition & Handbook Committee
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Teressa Jackson	Director Cafeteria	Health & Nutrition
Parent	Amanda Shoup	Parent	Math
Parent	Amanda Waggoner	Parent	Literacy
Parent	Christy Caldwell	Parent	Literacy
Parent	Fran Brotherton	Parent	Parental Involvement
Parent	Rhonda Lewis	Parent	Federal Programs/ Literacy
Parent	Tara Morgan	Parent	Math/Federal Programs
Principal	Carrie Burson	Elementary Principal	Literacy

---