School Plan

Print Version

ROOT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2014-2015

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

Grade Span: K-5 Title I: Not Applicable School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: We will work to improve in the area of Literacy

1. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 96 students were tested and 92% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 90 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and practical passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. In 2014, 73 students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content passage (multiple choice) and practical passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.

2. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 74 students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 90 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: literary and practical passage (multiple choice) and practical passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2014, 96 students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: literary and practical passage (multiple choice) and literary passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.
3. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 84 students were tested and 92% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 81 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and practical passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. In 2014, 78 students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and literary and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains.
4. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 18 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, there were fewer than 10 students tested. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, there were 13 students tested and 69% were proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: literary and practical passage (multiple choice) and literary passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested.
5. English Language Learners (LEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 2013, and 2014 fewer than 10 students were tested. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 2013, 2014 fewer than 10 students were tested. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 2013, and 2014 fewer than 10 students were tested.
6. FRLP: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 23 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 24 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 16 students were tested and 94% were proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, 21 students were tested and 95% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: all three parts (multiple choice) and literary passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 17 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested.
7. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 72 students were tested and 88% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 63 students were tested and 95% were proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that

the lowest identified areas are: content passage (multiple choice) and practical passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 81 students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 78 students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: literary and practical passage (multiple choice) and literary passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2014, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 70 students were tested and 95% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 73 students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and literary and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content and style domains. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: practical passage (multiple choice) and content passages (open-response). The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: content domains. African Americans: In 2011, 2012, and 2013 fewer than "10" students were tested in Grades 3, 4 and 5.

Hispanics, Native American and Asian/Pacific Islander: In 2011, 2012, and 2012 fewer than "10" students were tested in Grades 3, 4, and 5.

8. Attendance Rate:
In 2012, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2013, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2014, the attendance rate was 96%.

9. ITBS 2012
Grade K-:
Combined Population: 86 Students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supporting Data:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ITBS 2013
Grade K-:
Combined Population: 86 Students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ITBS 2014

Grade 1:
Combined Population: 84% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2:
Combined 84% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3:
Combined Population: 77% in Reading scored above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 73 students were tested and 61% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

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

Grade 4:
Combined Population: 82 Students were tested and 73% in reading scored above the 50th percentile.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10.

11.

12. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Root Elementary conducted a three year data trend analysis of literacy achievement using the results from formative assessments, local common assessments, ACTAAP, and ITBS. Results for both the All Student population and the Targeted Achievement Gap Group were examined, along with NCLB subpopulations, to identify specific areas of weakness in learning strands. Our data analysis identified the following focus areas for improvement: reading comprehension; reading and interpreting a variety of text including practical, informational and technical texts; writing with understanding of purpose, speaker, audience, and form; and writing conventions with attention given to sentence structure, type and length, and rules of capitalization and punctuation. We examined our instructional strategies, classroom structure/grouping, and classroom walkthrough data and are modifying our curriculum, instruction, common assessments, and professional development practices to better meet the needs of all of our students. In addition, literacy teachers meet monthly with an instructional facilitator to review and discuss data and instructional practices that will improve student achievement. We will use available funds to implement appropriate interventions and programs that will best address the needs of our students.

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

Benchmark: During the 2014-2015 school year, Root Elementary will meet or exceed the Annual Measurable Outcomes (AMO) for Performance (2014 AMO 96.37% for All Students and 87.5% for Targeted Achievement Gap Group) and for Growth for both All Students population and Targeted Achievement Gap Group. Root Elementary School will also meet or exceed the AMO's for all NCLB subpopulations. For the 2013-2014 school year, Root Elementary school met the AMO's for Performance, but did not meet growth for the All Students population. The Targeted Achievement Gap Group met the AMO for performance but did not meet the AMO for growth.

Intervention: Standards-based Writing: ELLA, Effective Literacy, and Step Up to Writing				
Scientific Based Research: Mann, D., et. al, A Research Study, West Virginia Story: Achievement Gains from a Statewide Comprehensive Instructional Technology Program, 1999. Cooper, H., & Hedges, L. v. (1994) The handbook of research synthesis, New York: Russell Sage Foundation				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Summative evaluations include developing student AIP's or IRI's for any student scoring below proficient on state mandated criterion referenced exams. Other students exhibiting at-risk performance will also have an AIP or an IRI developed by parents and teachers. Action Type: AIP/IRI	Crissa Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Implement research-based writing strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of all students, including but not limited to the step-up-to-writing program. This program will require professional development across grade levels to ensure implementation with fidelity. Action Type: Equity	Cheri Murphy	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Formative performance assessments and writing prompts with rubrics enable all students to assess and revise their own work and demonstrate proficiency in writing and responding in writing to literary, practical and content passages. Action Type: Equity	Ali Mangrum	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Provide access to a rich collection of diverse writing and reading resources through the school library. Action Type: Equity	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Provide opportunities for independent and group library/research/real world application projects using various media resources and utilizing technology which supports and are/is integrated	Melinda Jorn	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

with classroom instruction and demonstrate an ability to communicate content knowledge through writing skills, as well as reading comprehension skills. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity				
Use technology to access reference information, collect research data, and publish student work. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shannon Nickell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Participate in ongoing professional development in literacy skills, including training in programs such as: Effective Literacy, Step Up to Writing, DibelsNEXT and Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Ali Mangrum	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated writing strategies for all students - particularly those with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve writing skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Cheri Murphy	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through ACTAAP and the writing continuum in K-1 and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the 5 students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

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

Incorporate writing skills and strategies from the Common Core Standards into the curriculum of all content areas and implement vertically aligned Fayetteville's curriculum K-5. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Integrate writing instruction into all content areas with the help of technology. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Deanna Martin	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
A formative evaluation will require all students to write to demonstrate their learning in all content areas, using the Arkansas Writing Rubric for scoring, and emphasizing content in non-language arts curriculum. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Melinda Jorn	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
A summative evaluation for each student includes 4 quarterly writing assessments. Action Type: Collaboration	Shannon Nickell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through examination of lesson plans, math open ended response items on unit tests, science and social studies open ended writing prompts, and learning notebooks used in all subject areas and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Reading Fluency and Comprehension Strategies				
Scientific Based Research: Scott Foresman, Soar to Success; Center for Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First: The Research Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read, 1999.				
Actions	Person	Timeline	Resources	Source of

	Responsible			Funds
Map reading instruction and collaborate to evaluate alignment with district curriculum and Arkansas Content Frameworks. Set training as needed for staff using this formative evaluation. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Mallory Alderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Implement research-based reading strategies according to the district curriculum and input the identified needs of students using the dashboard. Action Type: Equity	Sarah Sullivan	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Identify areas of weakness and gaps in the aligned reading curriculum by analyzing formative assessments, such as NWEA MAPs, and summative evaluations of literacy scores on the CRT and NRT scores. Action Type: Alignment	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through performance assessments (i.e. NWEA MAPs)and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding to literature and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Participate in grade-level learning teams, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instruction to assist students in achieving reading proficiency in all content areas. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Irene Adams	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated reading strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve reading skills. Closing the Achievement Gap (Literacy): Regular	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

biannual meetings of our (Literacy) ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building capacity within our school. Each meeting agenda will include the following Core Principles: A. The selection, and continuous evaluation, of research-based, scientifically validated, Interventions designed to improve our ability to improve student performance on the Literacy portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along with a sign-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention and Action, is carefully monitored through the collection of Formative and Summative Data so that those strategies that prove ineffective can be revised or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each spring and fall in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education				
Use a variety of media to motivate students to read. Integrate technology, software, and visits to the school media center to give students access to varied selections of materials. Use flexible scheduling to allow children multiple weekly visits to the library and for library skills instruction. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Adriane Hapgood	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Communicate literacy and content area expectations and student progress to parents through classroom curriculum nights, assignment sheets, graded work with accompanying rubric, parent-teacher conferences, report cards, newsletters, Web access to the curriculum, classroom websites. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Deanna Martin	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Designated certified and classified personnel will be trained annually at both in district and out of district sites with the intended outcome of gaining differentiated and intervention strategies. Trainings will include literacy lab, ELLA, effective literacy, and response to intervention (RTI). Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas (ELLA), Effective Literacy				
Scientific Based Research: Adams, M., Beginning to Read; Clay, M., Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T., Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions in Reading and Writing, 1994. Cunningham, P. and Allington, R., Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write; Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S., Guided Readers and Writers for Grades 3-6, 1999.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Implement balanced-literacy skills and strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of students. Action Type: Equity	Irene Adams	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Performance Assessments	ACTION BUDGET: $

			• Teachers • Teaching Aids	
Instruct students in their zone of proximal development utilizing formative evaluation tools including Developmental Spelling Analysis (DSA), DibelsNEXT, and Phoenetic Connections. Action Type: Equity	Mallory Alderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Central Office • Computers • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through summative evaluations such as performance assessments, ITBS standardized tests, observation surveys, and developmental reading assessments are used to evaluate student progress in literacy learning skills and formative assessments such as progress monitoring in DIBELS and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sarah Sullivan	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Participate in grade-level learning teams to share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students in achieving literacy learning skills and proficiency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to support balanced literacy strategies, and implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve literacy learning skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Use the district selection policy to purchase guided reading books, and other materials, to support	Holly Smith	Start: 07/01/2014	• Central Office • District Staff	ACTION

literacy skills and strategies. Action Type: Alignment		End: 06/30/2015	• Teachers • Teaching Aids	BUDGET: $
Use the district selection policy to purchase well-reviewed trade books, and other materials, for the library to support literacy skills and strategies. Action Type: Alignment	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Central Office • Computers • District Staff • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Use technology such as cloud-computing (websites, google docs, blogs), MS Office, etc. to support literacy skills and strategies, and to publish student work. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Marjo Burk	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Central Office • Computers • District Staff • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Kindergarten students, who score delayed in both written and oral communication on the Qualls Early Learning Inventory (QELI), and first and second grade students, who score "below basic" in reading on the SAT 10, will be considered to have a substantial reading deficiency. These children will be provided intensive reading instruction utilizing Phonetic Connection, a scientifically-based word study program. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) will be administered to all K-5 students and those who are shown to have a substantial reading deficiency will be progressed monitored. The DIBELS will be used as: A) The evaluation instrument to determine which areas of reading the child is deficient, B) The progress-monitoring instrument to document progress toward grade level proficiency, and C) The assessment instrument used for discontinuing services. Intensive reading interventions will be comprehensive in nature and will be targeted to remediate the area of deficiency. For those affected students, school personnel will develop an Intensive Reading Improvement Plan (IRI) that will describe our intervention program. Intervention will be provided in the form of additional teacher instruction time. These intervention strategies and methods will continue until each student has reached grade level proficiency in all essential areas of reading. Student achievement in each of the essential elements shall be monitored bi-weekly until proficiency occurs. Students who are not meeting current expectations shall be provided additional interventions. Each parent or guardian will be notified in writing when their child has been identified with a substantial reading deficiency. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Instruct students in their zone of proximal development through formative evaluations of guided reading groups. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Deanna Martin	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Performance Assessments • Title Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to support comprehensive literacy strategies and	Adriane Hapgood	Start: 07/01/2014	• Administrative	ACTION

implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve literacy skills Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity		End: 06/30/2015	Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Library Media Program				
Scientific Based Research: Clyde, L. A. (ed.). Sustaining the Vision: A Collection of Articles and Papers on Research in School Librarianship; McQuillan, J. and Au, J., The Effect of Print Access on Reading Frequency; Lance, K., The Impact of School Library Media Centers on Academic Achievement, 1981.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teach the ethical use of information to all students through technology instruction and library media skills. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Sarah Sullivan	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Develop lessons that integrate classroom learning with information so that students can access, evaluate and use information in any subject area. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mallory Alderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with special and classroom teachers to develop lessons that integrate classroom instructional units with research-based information literacy strategies according to the district curriculum and the identified needs of students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Melinda Jorn	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with teachers to analyze summative assessments of student performance on the Benchmark Exam and ITBS in terms of information skills performance. Action Type: Collaboration	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with teachers to use performance assessments and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding to practical, content, and literary passages. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation	Shannon Nickell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Formative evaluations include: conferring with grade level teachers to share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and alignment of instructional objectives to assist all students in achieving informational literacy proficiency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Ali Mangrum	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated reading strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve information literacy skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Delia Gorder	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

Provide all students the opportunity for a variety of reading experiences like library instructional units, story times, shared reading experiences, reading motivation programs, reading contests, and sustained silent reading. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Irene Adams	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Use the district selection policy to purchase and maintain audio visual equipment that supports reading instruction. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Diane Carpenter	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • School Library	ACTION BUDGET: $
Maintain open times in the library schedule so to provide opportunities for independent and group library research projects that are integrated with classroom instruction and that result in student work that shows skill and knowledge in reading comprehension, written expression, content knowledge, and information literacy. Action Type: Equity	Lindsay Dees	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library	ACTION BUDGET: $
Participate in ongoing professional development in information skills and library services. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library	ACTION BUDGET: $
Provide professional development and assistance to teachers in information access and use. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Cheri Murphy	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • School Library	ACTION BUDGET: $
Communicate information literacy expectations to parents through special programs, newsletters, and Web access to the curriculum. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Community Leaders • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through the integration of library skills taught collaboratively with classroom teachers and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who	Anne Garrett	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Professional Development				
Scientific Based Research: National Staff Development Council, Standards for Staff Development; NSDC, Learning Teams; Nave, B., National School Reform Faculty Program Evaluation, 1990.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheri Murphy	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Develop faculty-wide consensus on areas of focus for building-level professional development. Summative evaluations will necessarily include the designing of professional devleopment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Maintain a professional development committee that offers broad representation of teachers throughout the school. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Adriane Hapgood	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Use student Academic Improvement Plans, and identified special needs of students, to assess professional development needs of certified and classified staff. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity	Ali Mangrum	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education				
Support the formation and ongoing work of Learning Teams as they collaborate share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist students in achieving reading proficiency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sarah Sullivan	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Coordinate building-level professional development with the district professional development steering committee (PDSC), and collaborate to build connections among schools. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development	Deanna Martin	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Use community resources and outside consultants to provide additional expertise in meeting the professional development needs of certified staff. Training will take place throughout the school year at Root Elementary. The grade levels involved are K-5. The approximate number of teachers will be 40 with 2 administrators attending as well. All grade levels will engage in peer observation and training with the literacy coach, within-school, and within-district. School teams will attend trainings to refine and enhance the positive behavior support plan which supports academic instruction and other trainings as necessary. All teachers and administrators will participate in additional training focused on closing the achievement gap. Specific training will be conducted on utilizing technology to both support and enhance the curriculum. This technology focus centers on the improvement of instructional methods and applications to allow for the demonstration of higher order thinking/performance tasks. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mallory Alderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Public Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
All teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the school and district professional development plan. Teachers will use an instrument developed by the district professional development committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the professional development plan, the course offerings and the effectiveness of the knowledge gained. Annually, upon review of the test data, the professional development committee, working under the guidelines of the district professional development plan, will develop a professional development plan for the school and individual teachers based on information obtained through data analysis. All new teachers and teachers in need of assistance will be assigned a mentor to assist them in reaching their professional development goals and needs. All teachers will have the opportunity to have input on the district and building level professional development plan. The district will provide all teachers and administrators will no less than 60 hours of professional development including 6 hours of technology and 2 hours of parental involvement development (3 hours of Parental Involvement for Administrators) and for those who teach Arkansas History, 2 hours of	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

training in that subject. Teachers will have the opportunity to evaluate the benefit of the professional development activities and provide formative feedback on needed changes. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Teachers may have the opportunity to develop knowledge on literacy and math initiatives through the use of outside consultants/conferences, pending annual funding. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Comprehensive System of Professional Development for Special Education Needs				
Scientific Based Research: Caldwell, S. Staff Development: A Handbook of Effective Practices, National Staff Development Council, 1989.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Assess professional development needs in the targeted areas of pre-referral interventions, positive behavioral supports, integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms (general curriculum content, modifications, differentiated instruction, multiple intelligences, and co-teaching), conflict resolution and negotiation skills, assistive technology, and learning disabilities. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Cindy Ratcliff	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: AIP/IRI	Cindy Ratcliff	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education				
Use professional development needs assessment information and special education targeted areas to plan, design, and implement building-level professional development activities. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Cindy Ratcliff	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Use varied instructional methodologies, techniques, and resources in the classroom to address the needs of all students, including those with disabilities. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Formative evaluations include the delivery of instruction to meet the special learning needs of students with disabilities based on weekly special education staffing meetings. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Central Office • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Evaluate the implementation of the professional development plan by assessing its involvement of teachers and its focus on teacher and student needs and outcomes. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Deanna Martin	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Summative evaluations include the designing of annual professional development for all faculty. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Cindy Ratcliff	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: School Wide Positive Behavior Support Plan				
Scientific Based Research: Irvin, L.K., Horner, R.H., Ingram, K., Todd, A.W., Sugai, G., Sampson, N., & Boland, J. (2006). Using office discipline referral data for decision-making about student behavior in elementary and middle schools: An empirical investigation of validity. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8(1), 10-23.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Develop and implement universal School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) expectations, protocols, and interventions. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants	ACTION BUDGET: $

Action Type: Professional Development			• Teachers	
Provide professional development in the SWPBS Model. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Irene Adams	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all stakeholders to evaluate, support and provide interventions for social competency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Develop ongoing instruction for program expectations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ali Mangrum	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth.	Nicky Anderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Priority 2: We will work to improve mathematics.

1. Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 96 students were tested and 93% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and data analysis (open-response). Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 90 students were tested and 91% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response). In 2014, 73 students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: geometry and measurement (multiple choice) and geometry and measurement (open-response).

2. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 74 students were tested and 98% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and data analysis (open-response). Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 90 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: geometry (multiple choice) and data analysis and probability (open-response). In 2014, 96 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and measurement (open-response).
3. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 84 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and data analysis (open-response). Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2013, 81 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and probability (multiple choice) and number and operations and algebra (open-response). In 2014, 81 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and measurement (multiple choice) geoemetry and measurement, data analysis and algebra (open-response).
4. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, 18 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, 13 students were tested and 46% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and measurement, geometry, and data analysis (open-response). Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested.
5. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested. Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested. Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested.

Supporting Data:

6. FRLP: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, 24 students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 16 students were tested and 88% scored proficent or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response). Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2014, 21 students were tested and 77% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and geometry (open-response). Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2013, 17 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, fewer than 10 students were tested.
7. Caucasian: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 72 students were tested and 93% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 63 students were tested and 97% were proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: measurement (multiple choice) and measurement (open-response). Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 81 students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 78 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: geometry (multiple choice) and data analysis and probability (open-response). Grade 5 Benchmark Exam:In 2012, 11 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2013, 70 students

were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. In 2014, 73 students were tested and 95& scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: data analysis and measurement (multiple choice) geoemetry and measurement, data analysis and algebra (open-response). African Americans: In 2012, 2013, and 2014 fewer than "10" students were tested in Grades 3, 4 and 5.

8. Attendance Rate: In 2012, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2013, the attendance rate was 96%. In 2014, the attendance rate was 96%.
9. ITBS Grade 1 ITBS: Combined Population: 96% scored above the 50th percentile. Grade 2-ITBS Combined Population: 71% scored above the 50th percentile. Grade 3-ITBS 2014: Combined Population: 96% scored above the 50th percentile. Grade 4-ITBS Combined Population: 96% in reading scored above the 50th percentile. Grade 5 ITBS Combined Population: 96% scored above the 50th percentile.
10. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Root Elementary conducted a three year data trend analysis of mathematical achievement using the results from formative assessments, local common assessments, ACTAAP, and ITBS. Results for both the All Student population and the Targeted Achievement Gap Group were examined, along with NCLB subpopulations, to identify specific areas of weakness in learning strands. Our data analysis identified the following focus areas for improvement: make sense of problems and persevere in solving them, reason abstractly and quantitatively, construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others, model with mathematics, use appropriate tools strategically, attend to precision, look for and make use of structure, look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning. We examined our instructional strategies, classroom structure/grouping, and classroom walkthrough data and are modifying our curriculum, instruction, common assessments, and professional development practices to better meet the needs of all of our students. In addition, math teachers meet monthly with an instructional facilitator to review and discuss data and instructional practices that will improve student achievement. We will use available funds to implement appropriate interventions and programs that will best address the needs of our students.

Goal: All students will improve in mathematic skills and respond to constructed response questions with additional attention to 'data analysis and probability' and 'measurement' mathematic strands. 100% of All Students population and the Targeted Achievement Gap Group will meet or exceed their AMO growth target.

Benchmark: During the 2014-2015 school year, Root Elementary will meet or exceed the Annual Measurable Outcomes (AMO) for Performance (2014 AMO 92.74% for All Students and 75% for Targeted Achievement Gap Group) and Growth for All Students and Targeted Achievement Gap Group. Root Elementary School will aslo meet or exceed the AMO's for all NCLB subpopulations. For the 2013-2014 school year, Root Elementary school met the AMO's for Performance for the All Students population, but they did not meet the AMO for growth. The Targeted Achievement Gap Group did not meet the AMO for performance or growth.

Intervention: Computation and Procedural Fluency				
Scientific Based Research: Standards in Classroom Practice - USDE, McRel, OERI 2201, 2001.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Integrate supplemental computational strategies and materials into the daily math program. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Elizabeth Williams	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will	Shania Mosely	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Designated certified personnel will be trained annually at both in district and out of district sites with the intended outcome of gaining differiented and intervention strategies. Action Type: Professional Development	John Griesse	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Open-Response Problem Strategies				
Scientific Based Research: Smart Start; Smart Step; NCSI-performance assessments; Reeves, Doug. Making Standards Work, 1998				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Train certified staff on the use of formative and summative performance assessments, scoring guides (rubrics), and PARACC open-response scoring. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Jake Beers	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Review student performance on open-response problems as part of curriculum mapping and implementation of existing programs. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Maggie Kelley	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Evaluate teacher and student achievement gains in improving open-response performance, and determine effectiveness in reducing achievement gaps. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and	Shania Mosely	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Math Curriculum Mapping and Alignment				
Scientific Based Research: Heide Hayes Jacobs-"Mapping the Big Picture" NSCI, 1997.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Participate in weekly grade level meetings to compare current curriculum map to students' areas of strengths and weaknesses. Formative evaluations include adjusting pacing and changing focus as a result of this collaboration. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	John Griesse	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Do professional development, curriculum alignment, and test data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	John Griesse	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact	Shania Mosely	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Request professional development opportunities that address areas of concern determined in the curriculum mapping process. Action Type: Professional Development	John Griesse	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Collaborate with all certified and classified staff to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve mathematics skills. Closing the Achievement Gap (Math): Regular monthly grade level meetings will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building capacity within our school. Each meeting agenda will include the following Core Principles: A. The selection, and continuous evaluation, of research-based, scientifically validated, Interventions designed to improve our ability to improve student performance on the Math portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along with a sign-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention, and Action, is carefully monitored through the collection of Formative and Summative Data.so that those strategies, which prove ineffective, can be revised, or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each spring, and fall, in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning. Action Type: Collaboration	John Griesse	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: School Wide Positive Behavior Support Plan				
Scientific Based Research: Irvin, L.K., Horner, R.H., Ingram, K., Todd, A.W., Sugai, G., Sampson, N., & Boland, J. (2006). Using office discipline referral data for decision-making about student behavior in elementary and middle schools: An empirical investigation of validity. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8(1), 10-23.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Develop and implement universal School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) expectations, protocols, and interventions. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Brady Carman	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Provide professional development in the SWPBS Model. Action Type: Collaboration	Mindy Duell	Start: 07/01/2014 End:	• Administrative Staff • Outside	ACTION BUDGET: $

Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development		06/30/2015	Consultants • Teachers	
Collaborate with all stakeholders to evaluate, support and provide interventions for social competency. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Maggie Kelley	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Develop ongoing instruction for program expectations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Elizabeth Williams	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Nicky Anderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

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

1. 2010-2011: Combined population: 245 students were assessed and 54.2% were considered overweight or obese. K: 34 males were assessed and 32.4% were considered overweight or obese. 46 females were assessed and 21.7% were considered overweight or obese. Grade 2: 45 males were assessed and 24.4% were considered overweight or obese. 43 females were assessed and 18.6% were considered overweight or obese. Grade 4: 39 males were assessed and 38.5% were considered overweight or obese. 38 females were assessed and 28.9% were considered overweight or obese.
2. 2011-2012: Combined population: 235 students were assessed and 55.6% were considered overweight or obese. K: 42 males were assessed and 19% were considered overweight or

obese. 38 females were assessed and 31.6% were considered overweight or obese. Grade 2: 41 males were assessed and 24.4% were considered overweight or obese. 41 females were assessed and 31.7% were considered overweight or obese. Grade 4: 38 males were assessed and 23.7% were considered overweight or obese. 35 females were assessed and 37.1% were considered overweight or obese.

Supporting Data:

3. 2012-2013: Combined population: 228 students were assessed and 45.7% were considered overweight or obese. K: 40 males were assessed and 25% were considered overweight or obese. 41 females were assessed and 19.5% were considered overweight or obese. Grade 2: 33 males were assessed and 33.3% were considered overweight or obese. 35 females were assessed and NA% were considered overweight or obese. Grade 4: 40 males were assessed and 30% were considered overweight or obese. 39 females were assessed and 20.5% were considered overweight or obese.
4. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: At Root Elementary, we analyzed 2012 BMI data and health index surveys from families, students, faculty and staff. We examined the results from both the combined population for grades K, 2 and 4 (BMI data) and male/female subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. We examined our routines, customs, and norms in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Wellness Priority: Module 7 (Health Promotion for staff) and Module 8 (Family and Community Involvement). We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. The attendance rate for 2011-2012 school year was 96.02%.

Goal: Provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark: To decrease the number of students at risk of overweight and students overweight by 1/2% annually.

Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of physical activity for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: George, MA.,and Sellers, W. (Eds). (1993) The Michigan model for comprehensive school health education. Central Michigan Univeristy.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Within a 5 day rotation cycle our students are participate in 2 60 minute Physical Education classes. Our teachers also will provide two 15 minutes of physical activity per day. Action Type: Wellness	Bright East	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Students BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk of overweight or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Bo Mabry	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Implement and encourage participation in physical education program taught by a highly qualified teacher that supports phsyical activity. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Ashley Parrette	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Promote reduction of time children spend engaged in sedentary activities such as watching television and playing video games by sending home informational packages that include tips for parents/caregivers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Ashley Parette	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Encourage participation in family oriented, community-based physical activity program.	Bo Mabry	Start: 07/01/2014	• Administrative	

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness		End: 06/30/2015	Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through a student and parent survey and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Tony Bishop	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of sound nutritional practices for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: George, MA.,and Sellers, W. (Eds). (1993) The Michigan model for comprehensive school health education. Central Michigan Univeristy.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Implement Kids for Health, Farm to School, offering nutritional choices to students daily on the lunch line, and overall emphasis on good nutrition to parents and students. Action Type: Wellness	Cathy VonHatten	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Student BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk of overweight or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Jeanne King	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through a student and parent survey and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions	Tony Bishop	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: A percentage gain was made across all populations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				$0

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

Supporting Data:

1. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Root Elementary conducted a three year data trend analysis of literacy and mathematical achievement using the results from both ACTAAP and ITBS. Results for both this particular Targeted Achievement Gap Group were examined to identify specific areas of weakness in learning strands. Our data analysis identified the following focus areas for improvement: In math, make sense of problems and persevere in solving them, reason abstractly and quantitatively, construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others, model with mathematics, use appropriate tools strategically, attend to precision, look for and make use of structure, look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning. In literacy, reading comprehension; reading and interpreting a variety of text including practical, informational and technical texts; writing with understanding of purpose, speaker, audience, and form; and writing conventions with attention given to sentence structure, type and length, and rules of capitalization and punctuation. We examined our instructional strategies, classroom structure/grouping, and classroom walkthrough data and are modifying our curriculum, instruction, common assessments, and professional development practices to better meet the needs of all of our students. In addition, math teachers and literacy teachers meet weekly with an instructional facilitator to review and discuss data and instructional practices that will improve student achievement. We will use available funds to implement appropriate interventions and programs that will best address the needs of our students. Our 2011-2012 attendance rate is 96.02%

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

Benchmark: MATH: During the 2014-2015 school year, Root Elementary will meet or exceed the Annual Measurable Outcomes (AMO) for Performance (2014 AMO 05.14% for All Students and 87.5% for Targeted Achievement Gap Group) and Growth for All Students and Targeted Achievement Gap Group. Root Elementary School will aslo meet or exceed the AMO's for all NCLB subpopulations. For the 2013-2014 school year, Root Elementary school met the AMO's for Performance for the All Students population, but they did not meet the AMO for growth. The Targeted Achievement Gap Group did not meet the AMO for performance or growth. LITERACY: During the 2013-2014 school year, Root Elementary will meet or exceed the Annual Measurable Outcomes (AMO) for Performance (2014 AMO 94.51% for All Students and 84.75% for Targeted Achievement Gap Group) and for Growth for both All Students population and Targeted Achievement Gap Group. Root Elementary School will also meet or exceed the AMO's for all NCLB subpopulations. For the 2012-2013 school year, Root Elementary school met the AMO's for Performance, but not Growth for the All Students population. The Targeted Achievement Gap Group did not meet the AMO for performance but did meet the AMO for growth.

Intervention: We will employ Highly Qualified Instructors.				
Scientific Based Research:				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
We will employ a highly qualified ELL teacher (.50 FTE) to provide instruction and intervention for those sudents identified by ELDA for service. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Rhonda Moore	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school Year, we evaluated this Intervention/Program through Conducting an individualized needs assessment with certified staff to enable them to identify classroom curriculum needs in relation to student achievement and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to follow the same protocol in evaluating and adjusting the programs, process, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program while seeking a percentage gain across all populations. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report these results in our 2015-2016 ACSIP plan, and will use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: While all populations did not meet their AMO growth goal, the greatest majority of students in these populations did. As such, we will continue with this intervention/program with more intensive interventions targeted toward the students who did not meet AMO growth. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Olivia Murphy	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Priority 6: We will work to increase Parental Involvement.

Supporting Data:

1. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Root Elementary examined and analyzed data from various surveys and modes of feedback regarding parental involvement. Results for both this particular parent group were examined to identify specific areas of weakness in parental involvement strands. Our data analysis identified the following focus areas for improvement: parent communication, parent/volunteer training, and providing creative ways for all our parents to volunteer during the school year. We examined current strategies, classroom structure/grouping, and classroom walkthrough data and are modifying our parental involvement plan to better meet the needs of all of our students. We will use available funds to implement appropriate interventions and programs that will best address the needs of our students.

Goal: Root Elementary acknowledges that parents play an integral role in assisting student learning, and will therefore seek to increase parental involvement in a variety of ways.

Benchmark: Our goal for the 2014-2015 is active partcipation by parents and family to help promote the success of all students.

Intervention: Root School will comply with the Parental Engagement requirements as outlined in ACT 397 of 2009. The Parental Involvement Plan will include the following: parent involvement meetings,parent/volunteer training,teacher/administrator training, parent/teacher conferences, use effective communication strategies.				
Scientific Based Research: Griffith, J. Relation of parental involvement, empowerment, and school traits to student academic performance. The Journal of Educational Research. vol. 90 (1)1996 (33-41).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Utilize volunteers to support instruction. Summative evaluation will show an increase of volunteers. Action Type: Collaboration	Elizabeth Mitchell	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Community	ACTION BUDGET: $

Action Type: Parental Engagement			Leaders • Computers • Teachers	
Collaborate with and support Root Parent Advisory Council (first Monday of every Month)Parent contacts are: Michelle Senlicki (president) and Amanda Rogers (president-elect). Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
We will continue to schedule two parent teacher conferences per school year. These conferences will be widely advertised and scheduled in such a manner that as many parents as possible may visit our campus and interact with their student's faculty. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Molly Kuhl	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The school will have a designated area to be used as the Parent Information Center (in hallway near the office). Parenting books, magazines and other informative material regarding responsible parenting will be available for parents to borrow for review in each building. Parent Center material, which may include, but not limited to brochures and pamphlets. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Jennifer Lavender	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants	ACTION BUDGET: $
Teachers and administrators will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parental involvement strategies Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Nicky Anderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
In order to encourage communication with parents our school will prepare an INFORMATIONAL PACKET to be distributed annually to the parents of each child in the school. These packets will describe: The school's parental involvement program; The recommended role of the parent, student, teacher and school; Ways for parents to become involved in the school and their child's education; A survey for the parent regarding their interests concerning volunteering at the school; A schedule of activities planned throughout the school year to encourage parental involvement; and Procedures to allow the parents and teachers to communicate in a regular, two-way, and meaningful manner with the child's teacher and principal. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kerry Hayes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
To help our parents in assisting their children our school shall: Schedule PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT MEETINGS at which parents are given a report on the state of the school and an overview of: A. What students will be learning. B. How students are assessed. C. What parents should expect for their child's education and D. How a parent can assist and make a difference in their child's education. Curriculum Night, Family Math night, Testing Strategies Night, Literacy Night, and ELL night. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
In order to welcome parents our school shall	Molly Kuhl	Start:		

compile a VOLUNTEER RESOURCE BOOK listing the interests and availability of volunteers so that school staff may determine how frequently a volunteer would like to participate; including options for those who are available to help at home and help match school needs with volunteer interests. For easy access to this book, it is currently stored in the lounge area. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement		07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: surveys (both oral and written) as well as sign-in data from parental involvement activities and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The following EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrate that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning that are part of this program: parents and staff reported back through parental survey, they feel informed about all curricular matters in terms of frameworks/standards, expectations, how to support student learning, and how to access information about school. During the 2014-2015 school year, we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: surveys (both oral and written) and sign-in data from parental engagement events. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2015-2016 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Nicky Anderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The Assisstant Principal will serve as a PARENT FACILITATOR in order to help organize meaningful training for staff and parents; promote and encourage a welcoming atmosphere to foster parental involvement in the school and to undertake efforts to ensure that parental participation is recognized as an asset to the school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Nicky Anderson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
In order to encourage parents to participate as a full partner in the decisions that affect their child and family, our school will include in our district's student handbook the SCHOOL'S PROCESS FOR RESOLVING PARENTAL CONCERNS, including how to define a problem, who to approach first and how to develop solutions Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Staci Dellet	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Teachers are provided with weekly instructional meeting time in order to plan for the implementation of best practices chosen to help improve student achievement at each student's	Jennifer Lavender	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

readiness level. This planning time will be provided during the course of the day to allow Administrators, teachers and parents of the identified students to participate in the construction of an apporpriate plan for the child. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement				
An opportunity for giving formative feedback is offered to all parents through the Parent Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Organization. Parent contacts are: Michelle Senlicki (president) and Amanda Rogers (president-elect) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Karen Rosso	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Continue and develop the Watch D.O.G.S. program (Dads Of Great Students). Parent contact: Tom Hapgood. Formative assessments are derived from the goal of having 1 Watch D.O.G. Dad on their child's birthday. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Molly Kuhl	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
A PARENT TEACHER ORGANIZATION exists to foster parental and community involvement within the school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kerry Hayes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

- Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Adriane Hapgood	Music	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Ali Mangrum	Grade K	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Anne Garrett	Grade K	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Ashley Parette	Grade 3	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Bo Mabry	PE	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Brady Carman	Grade 1	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Bright East	Grade 1	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Cathy VonHatten	Art	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Cheri Murphy	Grade 2	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Crissa Mitchell	Instructional Facilitator	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Deanna Martin	Grade 3-5 Autism Resource	Literacy- Reading
Classroom Teacher	Delia Gorder	Grade 1	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Irene Adams	Grade 2	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Jake Beers	Grade 3	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Jeanne King	Gifted and Talented	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	John Griesse	Grade 4	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Karen Rosso	Grade 2	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Kerry Hayes	Grade 2	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Maggie Kelley	Gifted and Talented	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Mallory Alderson	Grade 1	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Melinda Jorn	Grade 5	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Molly Kuhl	Grade 5	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Olivia Murphy	ESL	ELL
Classroom Teacher	Sarah Sullivan	Grade 4	Literacy - Reading
Classroom Teacher	Shania Moseley	Grade K	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Shannon Nickell	Grade 5	Literacy - Writing
Classroom Teacher	Spencer Pineda	Grade 3	ACSIP Chair
Classroom Teacher	Tony Bishop	PE	Wellness-Chair

District-Level Professional	Carla Curtis	Special Ed Coordinator	Special Education
District-Level Professional	Christie Jay	Federal Programs Coordinator	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Ellen Johnston	Mathematics Specialist	Mathematics
District-Level Professional	Kay Jacoby	Supt. Administrative Assistant	Mathematics,Literacy
District-Level Professional	Marjo Burk	Grade 4	Literacy - Reading
District-Level Professional	Nicky Anderson	Assistant Principal	Parental Involvement Chair
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Cindy Ratcliff	Resource	Literacy - Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Diane Carpenter	Librarian	Literacy - Reading
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Elizabeth Williams	Speech Pathologist	Mathematics
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jennifer Lavender	Counselor	Parental Involvement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mindy Duell	Special Education	Literacy - Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Tina Moretz	Math Coach	Math
Parent	Dena Kniesl	Parent Advisory Committee	Parental Involvement
Parent	KC Pummill	Parent Advisory Committee	Parental Involvement
Parent	Liz Rusher	Parent Advisory Committee	Parental Involvement
Parent	Michelle Kieklak	Parental Advisory Committee	Parental Involvement
Parent	Soner Senlikci	Parental Advisory Committee	Parental Involvement
Principal	Rhonda Moore	Principal	ACSIP Leadership