SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN TEMPLATE
Lisbon Elementary School

Division of School Standards, Accountability, and Assistance
Louisiana Department of Education

Submission Date: July 1, 2004

Lisbon Elementary School
PK-6
P. O. Box 158
Waterproof, LA 71375
Demetria R. Dix
318-749-3397
drdix.@nls.k12.la.us

Check where applicable:

X Louisiana Approved School

☐ Charter School

☐ Alternative School

☐ School in Corrective Actions

☐ School with Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration

☐ Title I School ___X__ School-wide _____Targeted Assistance

☐ Member of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

X Grant Application

Name of Grant: _ LINCS_____

Contact Person: __David Delaney_____

Phone: ____318-766-3272_____

Email: _____ddelaney@nls.k12.la.us_____

Principal's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Directions on What to Submit to the LDE and How to Complete the *Template*

- For schools in School Improvement, submit the plan with the state's Rubric *for the Evaluation of School Improvement Plans Summary Report* on disk to the designated division of the LDE.
- Mail the Cover Page, District Assurance, Faculty Assurance, and any non-electronic data attachments along with the plan on disk.
- Place requested data attachments in electronic form on the disk numbered and ordered as in Table of Contents.
- Mail any other non-electronic material – such as that required by SACS, entitlements, or grants – in a logical sequence with an appropriate cover page, numbered pages, and references in the Table of Contents.
- Use 11-point font.
- For any school in School Improvement and/or with Comprehensive School Reform Program (CSRP) grant, check applicable categories on the Cover Page of the *School Improvement Plan*.
- Insert page numbers in the Table of Contents.
- For SIPs that have been revised, indicate material that has changed on the Strategy Planning Worksheet with strikethroughs (lines inserted through the changes). Place revisions in bold after the strikethroughs.
- For any completed activity, write the word *completed* in parenthesis following the strikethroughs.
- If any item/activity is incomplete, explain in a brief note in parenthesis why the activity was not completed.
- For grant applications, place in bold Activities and Action Steps for targeted funding should the grant be awarded. Include the title of the grant as well as the name, address, and phone number of the contact person on the Cover Page of the *School Improvement Plan Template*.
- For original signatures, **USE BLUE INK**.
    - Principal's Signature
    - Superintendent's Signature
    - DAT Members' Signatures
    - School Improvement Team Chair's Signature

**Schools submit SIPs to the district for evaluation using the state's rubric.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<The page numbers for each component will change as information is added.>

DISTRICT ASSURANCE

- ❑ For schools in School Improvement, and for schools with CSRP models, I hereby certify that this plan was developed with the assistance of a District Assistance Team in collaboration of the School Improvement Team and/or School Support Team, as applicable.
- ❑ I hereby certify that this plan was designed to improve student achievement, with input from all stakeholders.
- ❑ I assure that the school level personnel, including subgroup representatives responsible for implementation of this plan, have collaborated in the writing of the plan.
- ❑ I hereby certify that this plan has all of the following components as required for schools identified to be in School Improvement:
- ❑ A statement of the school's mission
- ❑ A comprehensive needs assessment, which includes the following quantitative and qualitative data:
    - ❑ Student academic performances on standardized achievement tests (both CRT, NRT, and LAA)
    - ❑ Demographic indicators of the community and school to include socioeconomic factors
    - ❑ School human and material resource summary, to include teacher demographic indicators
    - ❑ Interviews with principals and teachers
    - ❑ Student and teacher focus groups
    - ❑ Questionnaires with stakeholders (principals, teachers, students, parents) measuring conceptual domains outlined in school effectiveness/reform research
    - ❑ Classroom observations
- ❑ Goals and measurable objectives
- ❑ Scientifically based research methods, strategies, and activities that guide curriculum content, instruction, and assessment
- ❑ Professional Development components aligned with assessed needs
- ❑ Parental and community involvement activities aligned with assessed needs
- ❑ Evaluation strategies that include methods to measure progress of implementation
- ❑ Coordination of resources and analysis of school budget (possible redirection of funds)
- ❑ An action plan with timelines and specific activities for implementing the above criteria
- ❑ I further certify that the information contained in this assurance is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

_____ _____

Superintendent's signature (in blue ink) Principal's signature (in blue ink)

_____ _____

District Assistance Team Leader (in blue ink) Chair, School Improvement Team (in blue ink)

_____ _____

_____ _____

District Assistance Team Members (original signatures in blue ink)

- ❑ Not Applicable (No District Assistance Team in place
- ❑

❑

▫ ASSURANCE OF FACULTY REVIEW OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Total Faculty in School: 19 Date: Click to Enter Date

The following faculty members have reviewed the School Improvement Plan and have discussed their part in implementing it.

	NAME	TITLE/POSITION	SIGNATURE (in blue ink)	SIGNATURE DATE
1	Mary Secrest	Teacher/Pre School		
2	Barbara Sidney	Teacher/Kindergarten		
3	Rachel Gray	Teacher/Second		
4	Audrey Poole	Teacher/Third		
5	Whitney Guthrie	Teacher/Fourth		
6	Dennis Finister	Teacher/Sixth		
7	Leona Hunt	Teacher. Inclusion		
8	Mary Martin	Speech Pathologist		
9	Bertha Brown	Tutor		
10	Loran Scott	Tutor/Success Maker Lab		
11	Kellie Turner	Para educators/PS		
12	Thelma Snowden	Para educators/Inclusion		
13	Patricia Wiley	Para educator/Inclusion		
14	Emma Bell	Para educator/Inclusion		
15	Debra Allen	Teacher/First		
16	Kenethia Johnson	Teacher/Preschool		
17	Jardana Brice	Teacher/Kindergarten		
18	Melvin Fernandez	Teacher/Spanish		

19	Yterial Moore	Teacher/Fifth		

MISSION STATEMENT

All For learning;
Learning for all
Through quality teaching and learning;
We'll grow tall.
Together we stand;
Divided we fall.

List the names and occupations of those persons who participated in developing the mission statement:

Dennis Finister- Teacher
Valarie Turner- Parent
Katrina Devine-Student
Alexis Turner-Student
Mariah Cooper-Mayor
Rosetta Clark- Library Aide/Parent
Leona Hunt-Teacher
Norma Bessye-Teacher
Patricia Wiley-Paraprofessional/Parent
Bertha Brown-Tutor/Councilwoman
Mary Martin-Speech Pathologist
Valarie Clark-Parent
Mary Secrest-Teacher
Patricia Bottley-Tutor
Demetria Dix-Principal
Audrey Poole-Teacher
Caldwell Flood/Asst. Principal, Feeder School
Bobby Wilkerson-DAT Leader
Mary Favorite-Teacher

Thelma Snowden-Paraprofessional/Parent
Rachea Beamer-Teacher

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS/CHARACTERISTICS

		Total #	# Certified	# Expected Vacancies	# in LA Principal Internship/Induction Program for SY 03-04
ADM	Principals	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**

		School Non-Title I		Title I				Total % in School		% Change from 2003	
				Schoolwide		Targeted Assistance					
TEACHERS*	**HIGHLY QUALIFIED***	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed
	# Highly Qualified Core Academic Teachers (Subtotal)			4	2			50	50	13	0
	NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed
	Non-Standard *** (TAT) (OFAT) (TEP) (EP)			4	2			50	50	13	0
	Other										
	Subtotal Not Highly Qualified			4	2						
TOTAL TEACHERS (Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified)				8	4						
PARAS	**HIGHLY QUALIFIED***	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed
	# Highly Qualified Paras			2	4			100	100		
	NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed
	# Not Highly Qualified Paras			0	0			0	0		
TOTAL PARAS (Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified								100	100		

* Teachers include all teaching in core academic courses (English/Reading/Language Arts; Math; Science; Civics/Government; Economics; Arts; History' Geography)

** Highly Qualified: Has met all requirements as specified by the La. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's definition of "Highly Qualified" under NCLB adopted June 19, 2003. (Copy provided under Consolidated Application Resource section on DOE website).

*** Temporary Authority to Teach (TAT); Out-of-Field Authorization to Teach (OFAT); Temporary Employment Permit (TEP); Emergency Permit (EP)

School Support	
School Improvement Team Members	**Position**
Audrey Poole	Teacher
Leona Hunt	Inclusion Teacher
Dennis Finister	Teacher
Demetria R. Dix	Principal

District Assistance Team Leader: Kathy Wade	**Contact #:** 318-766-3272
Distinguished Educator: N/A	**Contact #:** N/A
Parish Homeless Liaison: David Delaney	**Contact #:** 318-766-3272

Learning-Intensive Networking Communities for Success (LINCS) Information (if applicable)	
Regional LINCS Coordinator	Terry Roberts
Content Leader(s)	Mordessa Corbin
Content Area of Focus for School	Mathematics
High Schools That Work (HSTW) Site Coordinator and Contact #	N/A
Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW) Site Coordinator and Contact #	N/A
Leadership Team Members/Position at School	Whitney Guthrie/Teacher, , Demetria R. Dix/Principal
	Leona Hunt/Inclusion Teacher
	Dennis Finister/Teacher
	Audrey Poole/Teacher
	Demetria R. Dix/Principal

Federal/State Instructional Programs and/or Initiatives (Place a check or X in the status area for each program implemented at your school)			
Program List: (including during and after school programs)	**Currently Using**	**Proposed Program**	**Deleted Program**
21st Century Community Learning Centers			
Big Buddy			
Career to Work			
DARE	x		
Early Reading First			
HIPPY			
INTECH			
INTECH 2 Science			
INTECH Social Studies			
K-3 Reading/Math Initiative	x		
La GEAR-UP			
LaSIP	x		
LEAD TECH		x	
Learning Intensive Networking Communities for Success (LINCS)	x		
LINCS/High School That Work (HSTW)			
LINCS/Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW)			
Louisiana Virtual School			
Making Middle Grades Work			
SAGE			
School Tech			
School to Work			
School wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Support			
The Louisiana Literacy Corps			
The Multisensory Structured Language Program	x		
The Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)			
Other: Voyager,	x		

List Supplemental Educational Services provided for your students (Title I schools, if applicable):

- Waterford

List the Distance Learning (i.e., web-based, satellite, etc.) courses provided for your students:

- N/A

School Policies		
Policy	**Yes**	**No**
Discipline Policy	x	
Security Procedures (metal detectors, etc.)	x	
Safe and Drug-Free Prevention Activities	x	
Student Code of Conduct	x	
Crisis Management (emergency/evacuation plan)		

School Partnerships (Place the name of each partner in the space provided)	
University	
Technical Institute	
Feeder School(s)	
Community	
Business/Industry	
Private Grants	
Other	

Student Information								
List the number of students in each area								
Total at School	**# of Grade 4 and above**	**Students with Disabilities**	**Gifted and Talented**	**504**	**Option III**	**LEP**	**Homeless**	**Migrant**
125	37	16	2	10	0	0		0

Number of Households Served by School	80

Subgroups by Ethnicity				
American Indian	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White
0	0	95%	0	5%
Poverty Profile				
# of Free/Reduced Lunch Students: 120		Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students: 96		

SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: CRT Trend Data							
Index Category	**Index** Year 1 _____	**Index** Year 2 _____	**Index** Year 3 _____	**Index** Year 4 _____	**Index** Year 5 _____	**# of Students**	**Index Objective*** for next year
English/Language Arts							
• 4th Grade CRT Index: ELA	39.3	42.3	73.5	37.5		15.0	85.1
• 8th Grade CRT Index: ELA	50.0	29.4	44.4	50.0		14.0	63.3
• 10th Grade CRT Index: ELA							
• School CRT Index: ELA	45.2	35.0	63.5	44.2		29.0	77.6
Math							
• 4th Grade CRT Index: Math	10.7	16.7	32.4	33.3		14.0	54.3
• 8th Grade CRT Index: Math	20.6	29.4	16.7	17.9		14.0	42.5
• 10th Grade CRT Index: Math							
• School CRT Index: Math	16.1	24.1	26.9	25.0		29.0	50.2
Science							
• 4th Grade CRT Index: Science	35.7	50.0	67.6	50.0		14.0	80.7
• 8th Grade CRT Index: Science	23.5	14.7	27.8	46.4		14.0	50.8
• 10th Grade CRT Index: Science							
• School CRT Index: Science	29.0	29.3	53.8	48.1		29.0	70.4
Social Studies							
• 4th Grade CRT Index: Social Studies	28.6	46.2	55.9	29.2		15.0	71.9
• 8th Grade CRT Index: Social Studies	32.4	44.1	61.1	42.9		14.0	75.8
• 10th Grade CRT Index: Social Studies							
• School CRT Index: Social Studies	30.6	45.0	57.7	36.5		29.0	73.3
All Subjects							
• 4th Grade CRT Index: All Subjects	28.6	39.0	57.4	37.5		58.0	73.0
• 8th Grade CRT Index: All Subjects	31.6	29.4	37.5	39.3		57.0	58.1
• 10th Grade CRT Index: All Subjects							
• School CRT Index: All Subjects	30.2	33.5	50.5	38.5		115.0	67.9

*Use Index Objective values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: NRT Trend Data							
Index Category	**Index** Year 1 **_2000_ ____**	**Index** Year 2 **__2001 ____**	**Index** Year 3 **_2002_ ___**	**Index** Year 4 **_2003_ ____**	**Index** Year 5 **2004__ ____**	**# of Students**	**Index Objective*** for next year- 2005
Grade 3							
• Reading Index	55.1	43.9	37.5	46.4		13.0	58.1
• Language Index	132.1	109.8	124.3	130.4		13.0	At Goal
• Math Index	67.3	57.2	56.8	56.3		13.0	72.6
• Science Index	50.0	45.6	53.8	60.1		13.0	70.4
• Social Studies Index	61.2	66.4	34.9	45.6		13.0	56.2
• Composite Index	73.4	63.6	59.5	68.5		13.0	74.6
Grade 5							
• Reading Index	26.1	27.4	21.6	35.5		18.0	46.2
• Language Index							
• Math Index	27.3	23.5	31.8	48.6		18.0	53.9
• Science Index	27.9	34.2	60.1	50.7		18.0	75.1
• Social Studies Index	40.4	38.8	29.7	53.0		18.0	52.3
• Composite Index	25.2	28.3	31.0	54.5		18.0	53.3
Grade 6							
• Reading Index	39.5	24.3	44.6	17.8		14.0	63.5
• Language Index	102.0	45.1	67.5	44.2		14.0	80.6
• Math Index	55.9	16.7	39.5	56.7		14.0	59.6
• Science Index	76.6	34.4	68.6	59.8		14.0	81.4
• Social Studies Index	57.3	27.2	66.3	39.5		14.0	79.7
• Composite Index	67.5	24.7	55.4	42.4		14.0	71.5
Grade 7							
• Reading Index	23.5	48.8	26.8	48.4		18.0	50.1
• Language Index	66.0	82.3	50.5	58.4		18.0	67.9
• Math Index	39.3	73.1	32.8	54.2		18.0	54.6
• Science Index	41.0	49.2	36.0	65.9		18.0	57.0
• Social Studies Index	31.7	51.7	47.4	42.7		18.0	65.6
• Composite Index	39.1	61.7	35.5	54.9		18.0	56.6

*Use Index Objective values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: NRT Trend Data

Index Category	**Index** Year 1 _____	**Index** Year 2 _____	**Index** Year 3 _____	**Index** Year 4 _____	**Index** Year 5 _____	**# of Students**	**Index Objective*** for next year
Grade 9							
• Reading Index							
• Language Index							
• Math Index							
• Science Index							
• Social Studies Index							
• Composite Index							

*Use Index Objective values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: Attendance and Dropout Trend Data							
Index Category	**Index** Year 1 **_2000**	**Index** Year 2 **_2001_**	**Index** Year 3 **_2002_**	**Index** Year 4 **2003_**	**Index** Year 5 **_2004_**	**# of Students**	**Index Goal** * for next year-2005
Attendance Index	170	145.5	108.3	109.3	110.3	168	111.2
Dropout Index		80.0	65.0	69.6	74.2	168	78.8

*Use Index Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

Summary of Special Education Student Dropout

Dropout Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	**1999-2000**	**2000-01**	**2001-02**	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Total Dropout Rate							

Summary of Special Education Student Suspension and Expulsion

Suspension Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	**1999-2000**	**2000-01**	**2001-02**	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Total Suspension Rate							

Expulsion Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	**1999-2000**	**2000-01**	**2001-02**	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Total Expulsion Rate							

Summary of Student Suspension and Expulsion

Suspension Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	**1999-2000**	**2000-01**	**2001-02**	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
Grade 6th	2/1.0%						
Grade 6, 7, 8th	0	23/11.8%	22/12.3%	32/18.3%			
Grade							
Grade							
Total Suspension Rate							

Expulsion Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	**1999-2000**	**2000-01**	**2001-02**	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
Grade 6th	1/0.5%	0	0	0	0		
Grade 7th	0	0	0	2/1.1%	0		
Grade							
Grade							
Total Expulsion Rate							

American College Test (Mean ACT Scores)							
Area	**1999-2000**	**2000-01**	**2001-02**	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
English							
Mathematics							
Reading							
Science							
Composite							

DEVELOPMENTAL READING ASSESSMENT SCORES

YEAR	GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER OF STUDENTS ASSESSED	% BELOW GRADE LEVEL	% ON GRADE LEVEL	% ABOVE GRADE LEVEL
Fall 2001	Grade 2	11	0%	55%	45%
	Grade 3	14	43%	36%	21%
Spring 2002	Grade 1	14	35.7%	28.5%	35.7%
	Grade 2	13	23%	46%	31%
	Grade 3	9	22%	44%	33%
Fall 2002	Grade 2	17	35%	35%	29%
	Grade 3	13	15%	54%	31%
Spring 2003	Grade 1	17	58.8%	17.6%	23.5%
	Grade 2	14	28.6%	48.8%	28.5%
	Grade 3	10	60%	20%	20%
Fall 2003	Grade 2	15	87%	13%	0%
	Grade 3	13	31%	31%	38%
Spring 2004	Grade 1	11	45.5%	45.5%	9%
	Grade 2	12	58.3%	41.7%	0%
	Grade 3	13	30.8%	38.5%	30.8%
Fall 2004	Grade 2				
	Grade 3				
Spring 2005	Grade 1				
	Grade 2				
	Grade 3				

SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 4)							
Index Category	**Index** Year 1 **2000**	**Index** Year 2 **2001**	**Index** Year 3 **2002**	**Index** Year 4 **2003**	**Index** Year 5 **2004**	**# of Students**	**Proficiency Goal** * for next year-2005
ELA – Grade 4							
• School	28.6%	15.4%	64.7%	18.2%		15	74.3%
• Native/Alaskan American							
• Asian							
• African American	30.8%	18.2%	60%	20%		13	70.8%
• Hispanic		0%				Less than 1	
• White	0%	0%	100%	0%		1	100%
• Limited English Proficient							
• Economically Disadvantaged	30.8%	15.4%	64.7%	18.2%		14	74.3%
• Students with Disabilities	0%	20%	50%	33.3%		4	63.5%
Math – Grade 4							
• School	7.1%	16.7%	17.6%	18.2%		14	40%
• Native/Alaskan American							
• Asian							
• African American	7.7%	18.2%	13.3%	20%		13	36.8%
• Hispanic							
• White	0%	0%	50%	0%		1	63.5%
• Limited English Proficient							
• Economically Disadvantaged	7.7%	16.7%	17.6%	18.2%		14	40%
• Students with Disabilities	0%	25%	0%	33.3%		4	27.1%

*Use Proficiency Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 8)							
Index Category	**Index** Year 1 **2000**	**Index** Year 2 **2001**	**Index** Year 3 **2002**	**Index** Year 4 **2003**	**Index** Year 5 **2004**	**# of Students**	**Proficiency Goal** * for next year-2005
ELA – Grade 8							
• School	23.5%	5.9%	11.1%	36.4%		14	35.2%
• Native/Alaskan American							
• Asian							
• African American	23.5%	5.9%	11.1%	36.4%		14	35.2%
• Hispanic							
• White							
• Limited English Proficient							
• Economically Disadvantaged	23.1%	6.7%	11.1%	36.4%		12	35.2%
• Students with Disabilities	0%	0%	0%	0%		4	27.1%
Math – Grade 8							
• School	11.8%	23.5%	11.1%	9.1%		14	35.2%
• Native/Alaskan American							
• Asian							
• African American	11.8%	23.5%	11.1%	9.1%		14	35.2%
• Hispanic							
• White							
• Limited English Proficient							
• Economically Disadvantaged	15.4%	26.7%	11.1%	9.1%		12	35.2%
• Students with Disabilities	0%	0%	0%	0%		4	27.1%

*Use Proficiency Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 10)							
Index Category	**Index** Year 1 _____	**Index** Year 2 _____	**Index** Year 3 _____	**Index** Year 4 _____	**Index** Year 5 _____	**# of Students**	**Proficiency Goal** * for next year
ELA – Grade 10							
• School							
• Native/Alaskan American							
• Asian							
• African American							
• Hispanic							
• White							
• Limited English Proficient							
• Economically Disadvantaged							
• Students with Disabilities							
Math – Grade 10							
• School							
• Native/Alaskan American							
• Asian							
• African American							
• Hispanic							
• White							
• Limited English Proficient							
• Economically Disadvantaged							
• Students with Disabilities							

*Use Proficiency Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

SPS – WHOLE SCHOOL TREND DATA ANALYSIS

This document presents some suggested steps for evaluating SPS data across several years. The steps do not cover all possible data analyses, but are intended to help uncover potential target areas for school improvement.

Step 1: ***Identify weakest area for current year***

- Look for the lowest index score across all areas (NRT, CRT, Attendance, and Dropout) for the current year.
- NOTE: This "current weakness" could be caused by a variety of factors (ex: "good class/bad class" syndrome) and may not necessarily reflect an immediate school improvement concern for the school.
- If the current year lowest index score has been low for the past few years (ex: 2000-2002), then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 2: ***Identify any declining trends***

- Look for indexes that have declined over the past year or two.
- NOTE: Some declining trends may be the result of population shifts and may not necessarily reflect problematic areas.
- If any index has steadily or substantially declined over recent years, then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 3: ***Identify any grade level weaknesses***

- Compare grade level academic indexes (NRT, CRT) and evaluate grade level performance (ex: Does one grade have substantially lower indexes than all other grades?).
- NOTE: Be sure to look at data across all years before concluding that a grade level weakness exists.
- If any grade level index is consistently lower than other grade indexes in the school, then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 4: ***Identify any subject level weaknesses***

- Compare CRT indexes by subject to NRT indexes that relate to that same subject (ex: compare CRT Math index to NRT Math Total index).
- Low index scores across grades within a particular subject should be noted as a potential weakness.
- Low scores in some grades and high scores in other grades in the same subject may also indicate grade level weaknesses within a particular subject (which should be noted along with other grade level findings in Step 3).

% PROFICIENT - SUBGROUP TREND DATA ANALYSIS

Step 5: ***Identify weakest area for current year by subgroup***

- Look for the lowest % Proficient score across all subgroups (Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, LEP, Poverty, and Special Education) for the current year for both ELA and Math.
- If the current year lowest % Proficient score has been low for the past few years (ex: 2000-2002), then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 6: ***Identify any declining trends for subgroups***

- Look for subgroup % Proficient scores in ELA and/or Math that have declined over the past few years.
- NOTE: Some declining trends may be the result of population shifts and may not necessarily reflect problematic areas.
- If any subgroup % Proficient scores have steadily or substantially declined over the past few years, then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 7: ***Identify achievement gap issues***

- Compare each subgroup's % Proficient scores to the Whole School or other subgroup % Proficient scores in ELA and Math and evaluate subgroup performance (ex: Are any subgroups consistently below the Whole School proficiency score in ELA and/or Math?)
- NOTE: Be sure to look at data across all years before concluding that a subgroup weakness exists.
- If any subgroup % Proficient score is consistently or substantially lower than the Whole School or other subgroup % Proficient scores then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 8: ***Identify any subject level weaknesses by subgroup***

- Compare Math % Proficient scores to ELA % Proficient scores (ex: Is one subject typically higher than the other subject for the subgroups?)
- Low % Proficient scores ACROSS subgroups within a particular subject should be noted as a potential school wide weakness in that subject.
- Low % Proficient scores in ELA or Math for any subgroup across 2-3 years should be noted as a potential subject-level weakness for that subgroup.

Step 9: ***Determine major SPS and subgroup weaknesses for school***

- Analyze and discuss all potential weaknesses from steps 1 through 8 and determine 2 or 3 major SPS and/or subgroup weaknesses.

Trend Analysis

List the trends identified across the LEAP 21 data.
1. Overall yearly gains are being made in Math/ELA.
2. Greatest area of weakness is Math.
3. Fluctuation of scores in 8th grade indicate a grade level of weakness

List the trends identified across the GEE 21 data.
1. N/A
2. N/A
3. N/A

List the trends identified across the NRT data.
1. 5th grade students scored lower in all subjects than 3rd, 6th & 7th grade
2. Reading greatest area of weakness – 5th/7th
3. Fluctuation of scores in 5th, 6th & 7th grade indicate good class/bad class syndrome.

List the trends across the Developmental Reading Assessment data.
1. Yearly gains are being made on the % of 1st, 2nd, 3rd grade students reading on grade level.
2.
3.

List the trends across the Subgroup Percent Proficient data.
1. White subgroup scored better in Math than Black subgroup
2. Students with disabilities scored higher in ELA than Math
3. Poverty is steadily increasing.

List the trends across the Student Attendance and/or Dropout data.
1. Attendance is not a problem.
2. Dropout rate is on the decline.
3.

Note: Refer to Summary Report of Student Achievement Data Sheets.

DATA COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: SUMMARY REPORT

For Title I Schools: ELA and Math by subgroups should be primary when considering weaknesses that will lead to the goals in the SIP.

Rank-order the identified areas of strength (3-5) from the student performance and attendance and/or dropout data and indicate the supporting data sources:

STRENGTHS	DATA SOURCE
1. Attendance/Dropout	Archival Attendance/Dropout Data
2. Administrative Leadership	FNA, Parent Questionnaire TFG, SFG
3. Curriculum and Instruction	Classroom Observation Parent Questionnaire, SFG Administrative Questionnaire
4. School Climate	FNA, Parent Questionnaire, ,SFG, Student Questionnaire
5.	

Rank-order the identified areas of weakness (3-5) from the student performance and attendance and/or dropout data and indicate the supporting data sources:

WEAKNESSES	DATA SOURCE
1. Underachievement in Math LEAP and ITBS	State Test Results 04, School Report Card 03, ITBS
2. Underachievement in ELA LEAP and ITBS	State Test Results 04, School Report Card 03, ITBS
3. Parent School Relations	FNA, Parent and Student Questionnaire
4.	
5.	

List the underlying causes from the attitudinal/perceptual, behavioral, and archival data of the previously identified strengths:

UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE STRENGTHS	DATA SOURCE
1. Principal has been at this school for over 5 years	Administrative Questionnaire/Archival Data
2. Staff Development has been focused in this area	School Staff Development Plan
3. School has 125 students	Archival Data
4.	
5.	

List the underlying causes from the attitudinal/perceptual, behavioral, and archival data of the previously identified weaknesses:

UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE WEAKNESSES	DATA SOURCE
1. An over reliance of teacher domination instruction	Classroom observation summary form
2. Impoverished area both culturally and socially	Archival data, census data
3. Many parents do not value an education	Parent and student survey
4.	
5.	

The identified weaknesses will lead to the goals. The underlying causes of the weaknesses will lead to the strategies.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Extended Learning Time. (Derived from the underlying causes) An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Teachers will have additional time with students most in need of improving math skills.	1.a-Provide tutoring for students whose math skills are weak and in need of improvement.	Principal, Title I Director Reading Supervisor	K-6th students Teachers October 2004-March 2005 (3 days per week	Title I Title I K-3 K-3	**100** **200** **100** **200**	**1875** **946** **2813** **246**	Progress reports, Six weeks grades. After-School Tutorial Lesson Plans
2. Parents and families will be positioned to monitor and to assist in raising student achievement	**2.a-Provide information for families on skills required for students in math at each grade (K-6) **2.b-Send home weekly folders of student work for parental review and comments. **2.c-Provide calendars with activities for parents and students at home.	Title I Math Supervisor-Trudy Arnold, Principal-Demetria Dix Principal-Demetria.Dix Math Teachers K-6	K-6 students, Parents August 2004-April 2005 (Each 6 weeks) K-6 students, Parents Weekly, August 2004-April 2005 All students, Parents August 2004-April 2005	Title I Title I Title I	**600** **600** **600**	**100** **100** **200**	Portfolio of skills, Observations, *Weekly Skills sheets will be sent to parents to ensure that they know skills to be covered that week. Comment Sheets will be sent home to inform parents of students progress. (Weekly) A file will be kept for documentation. Copy of Calendars kept on file.
					Total Cost	**6280**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:
Formative evaluations: Principal Observations, Parent Surveys. Summative evaluation: Comparison of 2004-2005 ITBS Scores, School Performance Profile.

***** **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
****** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**
******* **Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable)**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 57.6 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Extended Learning Time. (Derived from the underlying causes) An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 2. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Students will increase their technology usage, both in school and at home.	1.a-Students will engage in weekly activities for enrichment and/or remediation.	Success Maker Tutor – Loran Scott Principal – Demetria Dix	All students, September, 2004-May 2005 (2-3 times weekly)	Title I Title I	**100** **200**	**14,244** **2671**	Lab Observations Summary Reports
2. Parents will have the capability to assist their students at home.	**2.a-Provide students with take-home Brainchild computer to provide additional skills practice.		K-6 students, Parents September 2004-May 2005 (2 days/ week)	Title I	**600**	**150**	Observation, Parental Feedback (Surveys, 1st Sem., (End-of year) Sign-Out Sheets
					Total Cost	**17065**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:
Formative evaluations: Lab Summative evaluation: Pre/Post Summary Reports. Comparison of 2004-2005 ITBS Scores

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**
*** **Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable)**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** The district will support the professional development strategies outlined in each school's School Improvement Plan. (Derived from the underlying causes) An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 3. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Teachers will be trained to plan year-round effective instruction, with accountability as a focus.	*1.a-Engage all teachers in 31/2 day inservices, focusing on GLEs, Data analysis, Higher Order Thinking Skills, Differentiated Instruction to meet individual student needs and enhance instruction.	Principal- Demetria Dix Title I Director- David Delaney Accountability Supervisor- Bobby Blount	August 2004-November 2005 Principal Teachers Para-professionals Tutors	Title I Title II	**600**	**160** **0**	• Evaluation forms at the end of training • Professional portfolios for self progress • Principal observations documenting use of GLE,s, HOTS, and Differentiated Instruction
					Total Cost	**160**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:
Personnel Evaluations, Professional Portfolios, Comparison of 2004-2005 LEAP Test Scores, School Performance Score.

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning** **Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**
*** Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** The district will support the professional developmentstrategies outlined in each school's School Improvement Plan. (Derived from the underlying causes) An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 4. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
2. Teachers will become knowledgeable of and implement the use of materials to instruct students.	*2aEngage teachers in 2 workshops focusing upon instructional strategies designed to promote proficiency in utilizing materials to enhance understanding of math concepts/skills (Measurement, Algebra) Mordessa Corbin, LINCS	Principal- Demetria Dix Title I Supervisor	PK-6 teachers Principal Teachers Tutors Para-Educators September 2004 November 2004	LINCS LINCS	**100** **200**	**2245** **244**	• Evaluation forms at the end of training • Principal Observations – teacher/student use of materials/manipulatives PK-6th
					Total Cost	**2498**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Personnel Evaluations, School Performance Score and Comparison of ITBS/ LEAP Scores Spring 2004/2005, School Performance Score.

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**
*** **Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** The district will support the professional development strategies outlined in each school's School Improvement Plan. (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction. 2. Parents do not value an education	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 5. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
3. Teachers will provide hands-on mathematical learning activities throughout the school year.	*3a Provide teachers with appropriate Math materials, K-6th	Principal- Demetria Dix	PK-6 students September 2004 March 2005 (Ongoing)	Title I LINCS	**600** **600**	**3000** **6888**	• Principal Observations • Surveys (Effectiveness of materials) • Lesson Plans • Student Work Samples
4. Parents will be exposed to hands on Math activities and will become actively involved in assisting their children with their homework.	*4a- Engage parents/students in a family math session Lisbon Elementary Faculty, Mordessa Corbin	Principal- Demetria Dix	All K-6 students/Parents October 2004	Title I	**600**	**696**	Students and parents will complete the assigned activities during family night. Evaluations will be given to assess the impact of the activities and to provide suggestions for improvement
					Total Cost	**10584**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Classroom observations, surveys, School Performance Score and Comparison of ITBS/ LEAP Scores Spring 2004/2005

*** Indicates Professional Development Learning**
**** Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

*** **Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable**

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** The district will support the professional developmentstrategies outlined in each school's School Improvement Plan. (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction. 2. Parents do value an education	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 6. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
4. Parents will be exposed to hands on Math activities and will become actively involved in assisting their children with their homework.	*4b- Engage parents in a workshop to increase knowledge of assisting students with homework & problem solving activities to meet state and parish standards in Math	Principal- Demetria Dix Teachers	Parents of PK-6 September 2004	Title I Title I	**100** **200**	**696** **946**	Parents will demonstrate their understanding of activities during the workshop. A parent survey will be given in November to assess the impact of the workshop. Sign-In Sheets to document number of households involved.
					Total Cost	**1642**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Classroom observations, surveys, School Performance Score and Comparison of LEAP/ITBS Index Scores Spring 2004/2005

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**
*** **Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Extended Learning Time (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction. 2. Parents do not value an education	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 7. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Parents will work with students to embed the test taking strategies.	**1a- Send home Problem-of-the-Week for parents and students to solve together.	Principal- Demetria Dix Teachers K-6	All Students, Parents August- 2004-May –2005 (Weekly)			0	Pre/Post Test Teacher Observations Samples of Problem-of-the-Week (K-6) kept on file. Students will return them to their teacher for immediate feedback.
					Total Cost	0	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Problem –of-the-Week samples, Weekly test, Comparison of ITBS/LEAP Index Scores Spring 2004/2005

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**

** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

*** Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Whole Faculty Study Groups/Learning Communities(Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction. 2. Parents do not value an education	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 8. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Teachers will strengthen content knowledge,instruction , technology integration and assessment practice to improve student achievement.	*1. Regional LINCS Coordinator will work with School/District LINC Content Leader to help address classroom and school issues in educational reform (content, instruction, assessment.) They will model lessons and coach personnel in connecting, technology with instruction and assisting study groups with job embedded staff development. *2. School/District LINCS Content Leader will provide professional development to participating classroom teachers through inclass assistance, including modeling lessons, assisting in lesson planning, observing, coaching and providing the necessary follow-up and one-on-one assistance required to implement standard-based teaching and learning strategies.	Regional LINCS Coordinator School/District LINCS Content Leader. School/District LINCS Content Leader Mordessa Corbin	Whole Faculty (PK-6) August- 2004-May –2005 Math Teachers Whole Faculty (PK-6) 1 day each week August 2004-May 2005	LINCS Title II Title II	 **100** **200**	 **10750** **1073**	• Documentation of activities of Regional LINCS Coordinator. • Classroom Observations • Report Cards • Test Scores • WFSGs Notebooks
					Total Cost	**11823**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Formative: Sign-Ins Summative: LEAP 2004-2005							

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

*** Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Whole Faculty StudyGroups/Learning Communities(Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 9. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
3.Content leader and Content teams will increase their content knowledge and skills. 4. LINCS Leadership Team members will return to School and lead implementation of the Whole Faculty Study Group professional development process to involve the entire faculty in content knowledge and skill growth.	***3.** School/District LINCS Content Leader and Content Teams will attend Summer and academic year professional development activities (Content-rich, Standards-based) held at universities who partner with LINCS. 4. LINCS Leadership Teams (Principal, 3 teachers including on Special Ed. Teacher, 1 member of DAT Team or District office staff member from a local university) will participate in 1 day of LINCS School Leadership Follow-up	School/District LINCS Content Leader Principal-Demetria Dix	Content Leader Content Teams (minimum of 2 days per month August- 2004-May –2005 LINCS Leadership Team Members Summer 2004 May, 2005	Title II Title I Title II LINCS	**500** **500** **300**	**375** **2208** **108** **0**	• Agendas • Sign-In Sheets, Evaluations • Sign-In-Sheets • Agendas Successful Implementation Of Whole Faculty Study Groups.
					Total Cost	**2691**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Formative: Sign-Ins Summative: LEAP 2004-2005							

*** Indicates Professional Development Learning** **Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.**

**** Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

*** Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in Mathematics Schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 33.3 to 54.3 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 56.3 to 72.6, in 5th grade from 48.6 to 53.9 and in 6th grade from 56.7 to 59.6 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Whole Faculty Study Groups/Learning Communities(Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 10. Context: Learning Communities, Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, Collaboration 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
5.Teachers will integrate effective teaching and learning practices to increase content knowledge, student learning and positive student behavorial	***5.** Whole Faculty Study Groups, each consisting of 3 to 5 faculty members, will meet for one hour every two weeks to deepen their content knowledge, plan lessons, and analyze student work. (Job embedded professional development.)	Demetria Dix School/District LINCS Content Leader.	Whole Faculty (PreK-6) August- 2004- May –2005 Meeting once every 2 weeks	LINCS		**0**	• Sign-In Sheets, • Classroom Observations to assess the effective use of strategies in classroom instruction • Report Cards • Test Scores • WFSG Notebooks
6.The LINCS Comprehensive evaluation will measure improvements in teacher practice, student achievement and overall school performance.	6. A comprehensive evaluation will be conducted using the model developed by the LINCS LDE/LaSip Professional Development Partnership.	School Leader University Leader	August 2004- May, 2005 (Monthly)	LINCS		**0**	• Evaluations • Report Cards (Each 6 weeks) • Test Scores ITBS/LEAP
					Total Cost	**0**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Formative: Classroom Observations Evaluation. Summative: Report Cards, Test Scores 2004/2005, School Performance Score, School Profile

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Universal Literacy A Reading Program (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Faculty, staff and administration will gain knowledge of new concepts and strategies for the improvement of reading instruction schoolwide.	***1a.** Faculty and staff will engage in Universal Literacy by Voyager training presented by a Voyager consultant to implement Voyager in the 3rd grade. *1b. Teachers of K,1, 2 will engage in a 1 day follow up session for Voyager. Ongoing professional development will continue throughout the year to enhance teachers' expertise.	Principal-Demetria Dix Kathy Wade, Title I/Reading Supervisor	Teachers (K-3) Principal July/August 2004 October 2004-May 2005	K_3 FIE FIE K-3 K-3 FIE K-3	**100** **600** **300** **200** **100** **300** **200**	**240** **14900** **892** **246** **480** **446** **246**	The principal will conduct classroom observations to assess the degree of implementation of Voyager. Principal will check lessons plans weekly to ensure that Voyager activities are documented.
				Total Cost		**17450**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Formative: Compare benchmark scores from Fall 2004 to Spring 2005 to look for growth in students achievement. Reviewing each 6 weeks report cards to compare loss –gain in Reading grades.							

***** **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
****** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Universal Literacy A Reading Program (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Faculty, staff and administration will gain knowledge of new concepts and strategies for the improvement of reading instruction schoolwide.	*1c. Faculty and staff will engage in a Dibels training presented by a Dibels consultant to familiarize teachers with proper procedures of administering Dibels. Teachers will use data to effectively drive individual instruction.	Principal-Demetria Dix Kathy Wade, Title I/Reading Supervisor	Teachers (K-3) Principal July/August 2004	K-3 Title I FIE FIE K-3 K-3 K-3	**100** **100** **600** **300** **200** **600** **300**	**1440** **240** **14900** **1348** **246** **7501** **135**	Principal will observe teachers during the school year to insure that Diebels results are being used to provide individual instruction.
					Total Cost	**25810**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Dibels results, Reviewing each 6 weeks Report Cards to compare loss-gain in Reading Grades.							

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** The District will support the professional development strategies outlined in each school's School Improvement Plan/Extensive Reading (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction. 2. Impoverished Area	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1.Faculty, staff and administration will gain knowledge of new concepts and strategies for the improvement of reading instruction schoolwide.	*1d. Kindergarten will engage in a 1 day follow-up session for Waterford.	Kathy Wade, Title I/Reading Supervisor	K Teachers July 2004	K-3 FIE K-3	**100** **300** **200**	**120** **446** **246**	• Classroom observations documenting student use of Waterford • Summary reports
2. Students will be motivated to participate in the Accelerated Reader for improvements in their reading abilities.	2. Posters, banners, and various other activities will be organized to emphasize the Accelerated Reader Program	Bertha Brown AR Tutor Principal Demetria Dix		Title I	**600**	**150**	• Teachers Display AR materials for Student browsing (daily) Tally sheet of AR books Read by students
					Total Cost	**962**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Observations, Summary reports, reviewing each 6 weeks Report Cards to compare loss-gain in Reading grades.

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning** **Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.**

** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Extensive Reading (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
3. Students will receive individual assistance in improving reading skills through the use of the Accelerated Reader Program.	3. Students will use the AR program for the reinforcement of reading skills.	AR Tutor Bertha Brown	All 1st –6th grade students September, 2004-May, 2005 (Weekly)	Title I	**100** **200**	**17844** **3354**	Examination of 6-weeks report cards for evidence of impact of Reading Grades. Weekly Review of the # of points students earn by successfully completing AR tests.
4. Students will be exposed to a safe and drug-free environment.	4. Students will receive awareness instruction on drug related topics	Safe and Drug Free School Coordinator Arthur Johnson	All PK-6 students and teachers August 2004-May 2005	**Title IV**	**300** **500** **600** **700**	**125** **125** **1744** **2000**	Principal/Supervisor Observation SIS Data report documenting reduction in suspensions.
					Total Cost	**25192**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Summative: Dibels scores, comparison of Spring 2004/2005 Test scores, Review total number of points earned by each student, SIS End of Year Report							

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning** **Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Small group instruction (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction. 2. Parents do not value an education.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1.. Students will have more individual attention through the use of small-group instruction.	1. Summer School	Title I Supervisor Principal Demetria Dix	Summer School June, 2004-Monday-Friday for 4 weeks	K-3 K-3	**100** **200**	**6600** **246**	Teachers will conduct a Pre/Post test for evidence of improvement of Reading level.
2. At-Risk students will apply Project Read Strategies in everyday learning experiences.	2. At-Risk students will receive instruction in Project Read learning strategies.	Principal Demetria Dix	At-Risk students August, 2004-May, 2005	K-3		**0**	Classroom Observation By the Principal to ensure that Project Read learning strategies are evident (Weekly) Report Cards-Reading Grades
3. Parents will have available varied games and activities to use with their children at home.	**3. Family Night where parents are actively involved in making learning games for hoe use. Teachers will assist parents in developing activities.	Principal Teachers PK-6	Teachers Pk-6	Title I	**600**	**696**	Parents will complete Questionnaires on the use of activities at home.
				Total Cost		**7542**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Comparing 2004/2005 LEAP/ITBS Scores, Dibels Results, Surveys from parents.							

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Extended Learning Time (Derived from the underlying causes)1. An over reliance of teacher dominated instruction.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
4. Teachers will spend additional time with students mostly in need of improving academic skills.	4. Provide tutoring for students whose reading/math skills are weak and in need of improvement.	Principal Title I Supervisor	All students October, 2004-April, 2005 2 to 3 times a week	K-3 K-3 Title I Title I	**100** **200** **100** **200**	**1450** **145** **2875** **946**	Examination of Progress Reports/Report cards for evidence of impact on Reading/Math grades. After-School Tutorial Lesson Plans/Attendance Logs.
				Total Cost		**5416**	

Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Comparison of Spring 2004/2005 LEAP/ITBS Scores.

* **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide	**School SPS 2003:** 55.1 **School SPS 2004:** **School SPS 2005:**	**School GT 2003:** 12.3 **School GT 2004:** **School GT 2005:**
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 37.5 to 85.1 by Spring 2005 **Objective 2:** To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 46.4 to 58.1, in 5th grade from 35.5 to 46.2 and in 6th grade from 17.8 to 63.5 by Spring 2005.	**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:** Direct, systemic vocabulary instruction (Derived from the underlying causes) Impoverished Area both culturally and socially.	
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Leadership 2. Process: Design, Evaluation, Learning, 3. Content: Quality Teaching, Family Involvement		

ACTION PLAN

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Students will increase their comprehension and vocabulary development.	1. Students will engage in weekly ITBS and LEAP Practice Test Booklet activities for enrichment and / or remediation.	Principal Demetria Dix	All K-6 students August, 2004- May, 2005 Weekly	Title I Title I Title I Title V	**600** **100** **200** **600**	**597** **7830** **4772** **2254**	• Lesson Plans • Classroom Observation documenting teacher and student use of ITBS and LEAP Practice Test Booklet activities. • Principal daily observation of students use. • Vocabulary in everyday conversation.
					Total Cost	**15453**	
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Classroom observations, comparison of Spring ITBS/LEAP 2004/2005 Test Scores.							

***** **Indicates Professional Development Learning**
****** **Indicates Family Involvement Activities**

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Extended Learning Time
Goal 1:	To improve student achievement in Mathematics schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 47.0 to 54.3 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 67.4 to 72.6 in 5th grade from 46.5 to 53.9, and in 6th grade from 52.9 To 59.6 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	Green, Charles A (1998). The Extended School Year Program Consolidated Report: Achievement test scores and survey findings
Brief Summary of Research:	Research supports teaching one student or a small number of students with the same abilities and instructional needs can be remarkably effective. Because it gears instruction to needs, extended learning time has yielded large learning effects in several dozen studies. It yields particularly large effects in mathematics-perhaps because of the subject's well-defined sequence and organization.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Extended Learning Time will address the needs of the students in the District who do poorly on standardized test because of deficient in mathematics

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

This strategy addresses the needs of all of this LEA's subgroups: African Americans, Whites, Poverty and SPED students. Research suggest that underachievers can be in the position of teaching others if they are given the extra time and practice that may be required to master a skill.

.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Computer Based Instruction
Goal 1:	To improve student achievement in Mathematics schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 47.0 to 54.3 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 67.4 to 72.6 in 5th grade from 46.5 to 53.9, and in 6th grade from 52.9 To 59.6 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	Leiker, Mary, "School Technology Solutions", Future Kids, McClain, Marilyn, "Using Technology For Diagnosis and Intervention in Reading" Media & Math Magazine, Jan/Feb 2000.
Brief Summary of Research:	Studies have shown that: Technology plays a key role in raising test scores through the development of higher-order thnking skills. Students using instruction gain in individual reading scores on national standardized test along with improvements in attendance and behavior were noted.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Students typically are deficient in HOTS and Reading.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

This strategy addresses the needs of all of this LEA's subgroups: This strategy will improve test performance.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Small Group Instruction
Goal 1:	To improve student achievement in Mathematics schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 47.0 to 54.3 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 67.4 to 72.6 in 5th grade from 46.5 to 53.9, and in 6th grade from 52.9 To 59.6 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	(Slaven, 1990, 1995), (Webb, Troper and Fall 1995) http://www.nyssba.org/adnews/issues0020700.html
Brief Summary of Research:	Research finding support small group instruction in mathematics. Finding showed that student learning not only increased, but also that students improved in their ability to communicate, resolve conflicts and relate to others.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

This strategy should enable the student population to improve their academic performance in the classroom, on the LEAP and on the ITBS.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

The subgroups in this LEA (Whites, African Americans, SPED and Poverty) should be better served by this strategy.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy: The District will support the professional development strategies outlined in each school's School Improvement Plan.

Goal 1: To improve student achievement in Mathematics schoolwide.

Objective 1: To increase 4th grade CRT Math Index Scores from 47.0 to 54.3 by Spring 2005.

Objective 2: To increase NRT Math Index Scores in 3rd grade from 67.4 to 72.6 in 5th grade from 46.5 to 53.9, and in 6th grade from 52.9 To 59.6 by Spring 2005.

Bibliographic Notation: Murphy, C.U. & Lick, D>W>(1998). Whole-Faculty Study Groups. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. Desimone, L.M., Porter, A.C., Garet, M.s., Yoon, K.S., & Birman, B.F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. Educatonal Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24(2)

Brief Summary of Research: The use of whole-faculty study groups is, the authors point out, "a holistic practical process for facilitating major schoolwide change and for enhancing student learning in the schools." These groups make it possible for teachers to "explicate, invent and evaluate practices that have the potential to meet the needs of their students and the community their schools serve", Murphy and Lick write. "As teachers work together in these study group approaches, they alter their practices to provide new and innovative opportunities for their students to learn in challenging and productive new ways. Consider the power of whole-faculty study groups in improving student learning. The faculty begins by committing itself to extended study by an overwhelming vote in favor of the study group process. The faculty gathers and analyzes data to determine the focus of its efforts. The teachers form groups that will meet weekly for about an hour to discuss research, consider alternatives for actions, and acquire instructional skills. Because everyone is involved in the study, the faculty develops a common vocabulary and strategies to address the student learning goals it had identified. Because of the meeting, barriers that isolate teachers are removed, and norms of collaboration., experimentation, and risk taking are nurtured. Whole-faculty study groups teach their participants through example that professional learning must be an ongoing, focused process if it is to affect student learning. Additionally, a longitudinal study by Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, and Birman has shown that. Professional development is more effective in changing teachers' practice when it is organized around the collective participation of teachers (from the same school, department, or grade levels), focused on active learning activities (teachers are allowed to apply what they are learning), and coherent (aligned with teachers' professional knowledge or community, as well as with state or district standards and assessments).

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

The use of Whole Faculty Study Groups encourage schools to gather and analyze student data then determine the focus of reform efforts to meet the needs of the student population which they serve. Collaboration of this nature allows each school within the district to create an individualized prescription plan, which will enhance student performance for their particular population.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

Using the format of Whole Faculty Study Groups, the needs of the various subgroup within each school will be analyzed. As collaborative teams are formed to address the determined needs an action plan will be designed that specifies the content or curriculum that will be pursued.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy: Extensive Reading

Goal 2: To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide.

Objective 1: To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 81.3 to 85.1 by Spring 2005.

Objective 2: To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 51.3..to 58.1 in 5th grade from 38.0 to 46.2, and in 6th grade from 57.2 To 63.5 by Spring 2005.

Bibliographic Notation: Allington 1994; Fielding and Pearson 1994; Guthrie el al.1995

Brief Summary of Research: Research has demonstrated that time spent reading both inside and outside of school, is essential to developing cognitive abilities such as comprehension and vocabulary development, students with both low-and high-level literacy skills benefit from time spent reading with vocabulary learned from context and comprehension improved if the difficulty of the material presented is appropriate to the current reading level.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

DRA results show that a significant number of students are reading below grade level. It is evident that Lisbon needs to encourage reading of many types of students. Young people need large blocks of time within the school day to read with time for text reading considered an essential aspect of comprehension instruction.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

This strategy addresses the needs of all of this LEA's subgroups: African Americans, Whites, Poverty and SPED students. This will increase growth in vocabulary and comprehension.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Universal Literacy A Reading Program
Goal 2:	To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 81.3 to 85.1 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 51.3..to 58.1 in 5th grade from 38.0 to 46.2, and in 6th grade from 57.2 To 63.5 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	Simmons and Rame'enui (2001); National Reading Panel (2000), National Research Council (1998), Put Reading First (2001), Hecht and Forgesen (2001-2002)
Brief Summary of Research:	Researchers Simmons and Rame'enui and the 2000 National Reading Panel list the five critical componetnts of reading as (1) phonemic awareness, (2)phonics, (3) Fluency, (4) vocabulary and (5) reading comprehension. The voyager Universal Literacy System meets all of the criteria set forth in these studies. Independent researchers, Hecht and Forgesen found that students using the Universal Literacy Reading Program showed improvements in performance of 5%, 15%, 22% , and 12% over the group in word attack, phonological awareness-blending, phonological awareness-segmenting and phonological awareness-Ellison, respectively.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

The Universal Reading Systems directory addresses the weaknesses found in the LEA subgroup: fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. According to the research the program has proven to be effective with African American, Whites, Hispanics, Poverty and SPED students which are this LEA's subgroups.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

This strategy addresses the needs of all of this LEA's subgroups: African Americans, Whites, Poverty and SPED students. Research show that Voyager students demonstrate superior performance on the word analysis, letter sound knowledge, print concepts, phonemic segmenting and phonemic blending tasks.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Small Group Instruction
Goal 2:	To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 81.3 to 85.1 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 51.3..to 58.1 in 5th grade from 38.0 to 46.2, and in 6th grade from 57.2 To 63.5 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	(Slaven, 1990, 1995), (Webb, Troper and Fall 1995) http://www.nyssba.org/issues0020700.html
Brief Summary of Research:	Research finding support small group instruction in reading. Finding showed that student learning not only increased, but also that students improved in their ability to communicate, resolve conflicts and relate to others.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

This strategy should enable the student population to improve their academic performance in the classroom, on the LEAP and on the ITBS.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

The subgroups in this LEA (Whites, African Americans, SPED and Poverty) should be better served by this strategy.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Computer Based Instruction
Goal 2:	To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 81.3 to 85.1 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 51.3..to 58.1 in 5th grade from 38.0 to 46.2, and in 6th grade from 57.2 To 63.5 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	Leiker, Mary, "School Technology Solution", Future Kids, McClain, Marilyn "Using Technology For Diagnosis and Intervention in Reading" Media & Math Magazine, Jan/Feb 2000
Brief Summary of Research:	Studies have shown that: Technology plays a key role in raising test scores through the development of higher-order thinking skills. Students using instruction gain in individual reading scores on national standardized test along with improvements in attendance and behavior were noted.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Students typically are deficient in HOTS and Reading.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

This strategy addresses the needs of all of this LEA's subgroups. This strategy will improve test performance.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Extended Learning Time
Goal 2:	To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 81.3 to 85.1 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 51.3..to 58.1 in 5th grade from 38.0 to 46.2, and in 6th grade from 57.2 To 63.5 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	Green, Charles A (1998) The Extended School Year Program Consolidated Report: Achievement test scores and survey findings;
Brief Summary of Research:	Research supports teaching one student or a small number of students with the same abilities and instructional needs can be remarkably effective. Because it gears instruction to needs, extended learning time has yielded large learning effects in several dozen studies. It yields particularly large effects in mathematics-perhaps because of the subject's well-defined sequence and organization.
Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?	Extended Learning Tme will address the needs of the students in the District who do poorly on standardized test because of deficients in Reading.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

This strategy addresses the needs of all of this LEA's subgroups. African Americans, Whites, Poverty and SPED students. Research suggest that underachievers can be in the position of teaching others if they are given the extra time and practice that may be required to master a skill.

RATIONALE FOR SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Strategy:	Direct, Systemic vocabulary instruction
Goal 2:	To improve student achievement in reading schoolwide.
Objective 1:	To increase 4th grade CRT ELA Index Scores from 81.3 to 85.1 by Spring 2005.
Objective 2:	To increase NRT ELA Index Scores in 3rd grade from 51.3..to 58.1 in 5th grade from 38.0 to 46.2, and in 6th grade from 57.2 To 63.5 by Spring 2005.
Bibliographic Notation:	(Stahl and Fairbanks 1986), (Jenkins, Stein and Wyscoki, 1984), (Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock, 2001)
Brief Summary of Research:	Stahl and Fairbanks: direct vocabulary teaching increases student comprehension by 33 percentile points. Jenkins, et al found that minimal direct vocabulary instruction increased student performance by 33 percentile points. Marzano et al analyzed and synthesized existing research to conclude that direct vocabulary instruction enhanced student achievement significantly.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Many students in the District who do poorly on standardized test are deficient in reading and vocabulary skills. Direct vocabulary instruction will improve reading comprehension and test results.

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:
All student subgroups in the LEA can benefit from direct instruction in vocabulary. This includes African Americans, Whites, Poverty and SPED.

Duplicate (copy and paste table) as needed

TOTAL SCHOOL BUDGET FOR RESTRICTED AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

Indicate the total funds per Funding Source, per object category. See *SAM 2000* for clarity on operational definitions.

FUNDING SOURCES*	TITLE I	TITLE II	K-3	TITLE V	LINCS	TITLE IV	FIE	8G	TOTAL
SALARIES (100)	39917	10750	13143		2245				66055
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS (200)	11397	1073	1721		244				14435
PURCHASED PROFESSIONAL and TECHNICAL SERVICES (300)		108	135			125	3125		3493
PURCHASED PROPERTY SERVICES (400)									
OTHER PURCHASES SERVICES (500)	7008	375				125			7508
SUPPLIES (600)	8974		7501	2254	6888	1744	29808		57169

INDIRECT COSTS (If applicable)									
PROPERTY (700)						2000			2000
OTHER OBJECTS (800)									
OTHER USES OF FUNDS (900)									
TOTAL	67296	12306	22500	2254	9377	3994	32933		150660

***Funding Sources: Title I – Part A, Part B (Even Start), Part C (Migrant), Part D (N & D), Part F (CSRP); Title II – Part A (Professional Development), Part D (Technology); Title III – English Language Proficient; Title V – Parental Choice and Innovative Programs; Title VII – Part A (Indian Education), Part B (Native Hawaiian Education), Part C (Alaska Native Education); Learn and Serve America; Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; State Funding; 8(g); LaSIP; Foreign Languages; IDEA; K-3 Initiatives; Early Reading First; MSL; Education Excellence Act; School Choice; miscellaneous funding sources; foundations/grants, etc.**

BUDGET WORKSHEET BY ACHIEVEMENT GOAL AND FUNDING SOURCE

FUNDING SOURCES*	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT				FAMILY INVOLVEMENT				OTHER			
	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Total	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Total	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Total
TITLE I		240		240	1392	696		2089	32484	32483		67296
TITLE II									1236			12306
K-3		2280		2280						20220		22500
LINCS	4453			4453					4924			9377
Title IV										3994		3994
FIE		3125								29808		32933
Title V									1127	1127		2254
TOTALS	4453	5645		6973	1392	696		2089	50841	87633		150660

***Funding Sources: Title I – Part A, Part B (Even Start), Part C (Migrant), Part D (N & D), Part F (CSRP); Title II – Part A (Professional Development), Part D (Technology); Title III – English Language Proficient; Title V – Parental Choice and Innovative Programs; Title VII – Part A (Indian Education), Part B (Native Hawaiian Education), Part C (Alaska Native Education); Learn and Serve America; Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; State Funding; 8(g); LaSIP; Foreign Languages; IDEA; K-3 Initiatives; Early Reading First; MSL; Education Excellence Act; School Choice; miscellaneous funding sources; foundations/grants, etc.**

TOTAL EXPENDITURE PER ACHIEVEMENT GOAL		TOTAL EXPENDITURE PER FUNDING SOURCE	
GOAL 1	**56686**	**FUNDING SOURCE 1**	**Title I 67296**
GOAL 2	**93974**	**FUNDING SOURCE 2**	**Title II 12306**
GOAL 3		**FUNDING SOURCE 3**	**K-3 22500**
ETC.		**ETC. Others**	**48558**

DATA ATTACHMENTS

The following items should be included in the data attachments:

- Principal's Report Card
- Summary of Findings of Survey Data (Teachers, Parents, Students, and Principal)
- Summary of Findings of Interview Data (Principal, Counselor, Students, Teachers) (**Not Optional for Schools in School Improvement/CSRP**)
- Summary of Findings of Focus Group Data (Teachers, Students, Parents) (**Not Optional for Schools in School Improvement/CSRP**)
- Data Triangulation Form or *SAM 2000* Vote-Counting Method: Strength/Weakness Summary Sheet
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment: Final Report
- Data Notebook (for schools participating in *School Analysis Model-SAM 2000*)
- Cognitive Summary Data (ITBS/ITED, ACT, PSAT, etc.)
- Citation from monitoring of Federal Programs – if applicable (e.g., Special Education and corresponding Corrective Action Plans)