

AR
 POTTSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 87 SOUTH B STREET
 POTTSVILLE AR 72858
 479-968-2133

**Arkansas Public District and School
 General Description for the use of State Categorical Funding**

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|
| School | Pottsville Elementary | LEA # | 5804013 |
|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|

Introduction

Act 841 of 2015 established that each district and school will develop and submit to the ADE a general description for the use of state categorical funds. This general description, the list of allowable expenditures found in Special Needs Funding rules, and the related detail in APSCN will be utilized by legislative audit to determine the appropriateness of expenditures. Thus, with the general description of a specific program, it is important to clarify how the funds are being utilized to meet the established intent of the funding, how the expenditure is supplementing above state requirements (except PD), and how the effectiveness of the program activities will be evaluated to determine future continuance or discontinuance of the program, position, or supplemental service.

The team developing the ACSIP plan should consider at a minimum the following rules:

[Student Special Needs Funding Rules](#)

[ACTAAP Rules](#)

In addition to reviewing the rules, the following statutes are applicable to the ACSIP development:

| Statute | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| A.C.A. § 6-15-425 | A.C.A. § 6-15-2106 | A.C.A. § 6-17-2402 |
| A.C.A. § 6-15-426 | A.C.A. § 6-15-2201 | A.C.A. § 6-20-2303 |
| A.C.A. § 6-15-431 | A.C.A. § 6-15-2202 | A.C.A. § 6-20-2305 |

Directions:

1. Enter your responses.
2. Click "Save" at the bottom of the form to save your responses.
3. To submit your report, return to the Statewide Field Test Dashboard, go to the Required Reports section, and click the Student Special Needs Funding General Description Report "submit" button.

Note: Please review your responses if you are copying and pasting from word. There may be some compatibility issues that will need to be edited. If you must copy and paste, please copy into notepad first.

2015-16 General Description Report for ALE- State 275

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| School: | Pottsville Elementary | LEA # | 5804013 |
| Revenue: | 32370 | Source of Funds: | 275 |
| Date of modifications: | | | |

Please provide a general description including the purpose and program evaluation of the ALE programs, positions, and other expenditures.

N/A

2015-16 General Description Report for ELL- State 276

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| School: | Pottsville Elementary | LEA # | 5804013 |
| Revenue: | 32371 | Source of Funds: | 276 |
| Date of modifications: | | | |

Please provide a general description including the purpose and program evaluation of the ELL programs, positions, and other expenditures.

PURPOSE:

- In addition to classroom instruction, an ESL Instructor will provide ELL students with language instruction. Appropriate materials/supplies will be purchased . Smartboard will be purchased and computers/projectors will be used and incorporated in instruction for ESL students to boost their language acquisition with interactive activities. Technology will allow us to individualize instruction for each student and accelerate acquisition of the

five components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension through software and internet applications. The ELL instructor will attend workshops specifically designed to improve the teaching/learning of ELL students. Students will be evaluated (MAC II) to monitor progress. To ensure understanding and increase parental involvement, translators will be provided when necessary.

PROGRAM EVALUATION:

- 2014-2015: The results of the English Language Development Assessment School Summary Report and Individual Student Report used to provide specific proficiency levels for specific students tested indicated the following: In K-3, 11 students scored a Level 4, Advanced; 4 students a level 3, Intermediate; and 2 students scored a level 2, beginning; no student scored a level 1 or level 5. Strengths: Kindergarten and 3rd grade - Listening and Speaking; 1st grade - Listening and Comprehension; 2nd grade - Speaking and Writing; Weaknesses: Kindergarten, 1st grade, and 3rd grade - Writing; and 2nd grade- Listening.

2015-16 General Description Report for NSLA- State 281

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| School: | Pottsville Elementary | LEA # | 5804013 |
| Revenue: | 32381 | Source of Funds: | 281 |
| Date of modifications: | | | |

Please provide a general description including the purpose and program evaluation of the NSLA programs, positions, and other expenditures.

PURPOSE:

- To improve reading and math achievement, teachers will attend technology training to assist with learning new ways struggling students can use technology to target problems in verbal expressions, speech fluency, and math skills. Technology trainings and technology will be purchased as needed as well as the renewal of technology-based software, Education City and A-Z Learning, to support hands-on/real-world activities and student engagement strategies based upon trainings.
- Purchase books to expand choices including content and practical texts. Tumbleweed/software for e-books and audiobooks.
- Seven Highly Qualified and trained NSLA Paraprofessionals will work under the supervision of a classroom teacher to provide supplemental reading and math instruction (funds are set aside for): Salaries and benefits, any insurance benefits and estimated raises in salary (if possible).
- Student computers in the elementary classrooms will allow teachers the technology necessary to provide individualized instruction in reading, math, and writing. SmartBoards will also be purchased to assist in auditory learning to enhance listening performance and to allow children to learn more efficiently.
- In collaboration with classroom teachers, a K-3 Science Teacher, in a lab setting, will teach problem solving, data and measurement skills to all students through weekly scheduled hands-on science instruction.(fte. 1.0)
- Purchase access fee needed to use the Raptor Technologies V-Soft Program that will provide automatic badging and tracking of volunteers and visitors in the school.
- K-3 classroom teachers will complete ELLA/ ELF training at the Arch Ford Cooperative. Materials and Supplies will be purchased to implement training.
- To improve achievement for grades 1 - 3 students, reading software aligned with Common Core Standards will be used/purchased for the computer lab/classrooms.
- Instructional materials, supplies, and leveled books will be purchased in support of the K-3 bookroom and classrooms including practical and content texts.
- Professional Development Training such as MATH COGNITIVE GUIDED INSTRUCTION and EXTENDED MATH-salary/benefits for teachers. Materials and supplies will also be purchased as needed.

PROGRAM EVALUATION:

- The STAR and other developmentally appropriate assessments will be given as a pre/post test to measure student growth during each school year. Evaluation Results 2014-2015: 1st Grade GE pre-test = 1.57 and post-test = 2.07 (.5); 2nd Grade GE pre-test = 2.12 and post-test = 3.05 (.93); 3rd Grade GE pre-test = 3.12 and post-test = 4.07 (.95).
- Classroom teachers, reading teachers, and / or paraprofessionals will assess the reading progress of individual students by using pre/post data from one or more of the following: Dibels, DRA, STAR, Rigby, or formative/interim assessments. Evaluation Results: 2014-2015: 1st Grade GE pre-test = 1.57 and post-test = 2.07 (.5); 2nd Grade GE pre-test = 2.12 and post-test = 3.05 (.93); 3rd Grade GE pre-test = 3.12 and post-test = 4.07 (.95).
- Parents, teachers, and principal, if needed, will meet at least two times throughout the school year to monitor the progress made by students on an AIP/IRI using DIBELS, DRA, STAR, grade level assessments. (Act 35) EVALUATION RESULTS: Oct 23, 2014 & Feb 12, 2015 parent-teacher conferences. 100% contact with parents of students on AIP/IRI.
- Keep parent data on the number of parents who use or volunteer time throughout the school year. EVALUATION RESULTS: Volunteer hours: 2010-11: 1745; 2011-2012: 2161.35. An increase of 416.35 hours. 2012-2013: 1304.47 hours. A decrease of 856.88 hours. 2013-2014: 592.62 hours. A decrease of 711.85. 2014-2015: 788.92-an increase of 196 hours and 32 minutes.
- Analyze student samples and the math portion of the Augmented Benchmark exam/PARCC test data in the areas of math procedures, problem solving, geometry, data and measurement. Afterwards, adjust instruction to improve student achievement.(Weak area focus: data, geometric terms, elapsed time and probability of

events) Students progress will be monitored each nine weeks through formative and/or interim assessments. EVALUATION RESULTS: 2013-2014 (2015 pending) - geometry/open response and mult. choice, vocabulary of math, conservation of numbers, NPO, multi-step problems, measurement, and elapsed time were identified as weak areas. Contributing factors include: lack of consistent math terminology and multi-step problems overwhelming to students.

- At the beginning of school, teachers, principal and curriculum coordinator will meet to perform data analysis of augmented benchmark/PARCC and SAT 10 results. Activities will include: trend analysis, curriculum alignment, and development of instructional strategies to meet needs in identified weak areas. EVALUATION RESULTS: In 2013-2014 (2015 pending), content (open response), content (multiple choice) and writing (multiple choice) were identified areas of concern. Contributing factors include: lack of exposure to real world text, lack of experience writing across curriculum, and writing too structured. Suggestions for improving include: continuing RTI, utilizing different materials, focusing on prior knowledge and vocabulary, and making sure ESL students have materials at home to assist in their learning.

2015-16 General Description Report for PD- State 223

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| School: | Pottsville Elementary | LEA # | 5804013 |
| Revenue: | 32256 | Source of Funds: | 223 |
| Date of modifications: | | | |

Please provide a general description including the purpose and program evaluation of the PD programs, positions, and other expenditures.

PURPOSE:

- Based upon the 2014 ESEA performance results (2015 results still pending), to narrow the achievement gap between All Students and TAGG Students and in order to improve instruction and increase student learning, the instructional facilitator and federal programs coordinator will coordinate alignment and curriculum activities with teachers, both horizontally and vertically. A data analysis will be completed on state test scores, CWT's/TESS results, etc. After areas of concern and weaknesses are determined, teachers will participate in PD activities to improve instructional strategies. Subs (will be purchased through SUBTEACH) as well as materials and supplies.
- K-3 classroom teachers will complete ELLA/ ELF training at the Arch Ford Cooperative (as needed).
- Provide district in-service training in RTI for Title I para-professionals, support staff, and classroom teachers.
- To improve instruction, teachers will meet in vertical and horizontal teams to compare maps and assessments in order to find gaps and repetitions and create common terminology. Teachers will integrate instruction designed to reach out to students of various learning styles. Benchmarks from Common Core Standards will be set for each grade level. After areas of concern are determined, teachers will be given the opportunity to attend PD activities to improve student achievement. Subs (will be purchased through SUBTEACH) as well as materials and supplies.
- Research based high yield instructional strategies will be taught to staff and an integrated instruction will be set forth to accommodate the needs of the various learning styles of students: identifying similarities and differences; nonlinguistic representation; generating/testing hypotheses; and cooperative learning.
- To improve reading achievement, teachers will attend technology training to assist with learning new ways struggling students can use technology to target problems in verbal expressions and speech fluency.
- Train all teachers, para-professionals, principal and other support staff in writing strategies for open response, balanced assessment reading items to improve student achievement.
- Teachers will meet in vertical/horizontal teams to develop curriculum and compare curriculum maps in order to find gaps and/or repetitions. Benchmarks from Common Core Standards will be set for each grade level.
- K-3 Reading Teachers trained in Reading Recovery will attend continuing contact meetings, conferences, and other researched based staff development.
- Teachers will meet in grade levels, vertical teams, and during USA Days to discuss instructional strategies in writing and math, share results of formative/interim assessments, and samples of students' writing on open response reading items.
- Professional Development Training such as MATH COGNITIVE GUIDED INSTRUCTION and EXTENDED MATH-salary/benefits for teachers to improve instructional strategies in the classroom.
- Train teachers/PD on anti-bullying procedures and prevention, crisis management, etc..., to reduce student absenteeism, discipline concerns, and foster a safe learning environment for all students and faculty.
- Teachers and Building Administrators will receive professional development (Act 603) designed to enhance understanding of effective parental involvement strategies and the importance of effective communication, value and utility of contributions of parents, and address any parent barriers.

PROGRAM EVALUATION:

- Principal will conduct classroom walk throughs/TESS, collect data and establish baseline results. Teachers and principal will analyze data to determine areas of growth and weakness in the implementation process. Adjustments will be made in instruction to support teaching and student learning. EVALUATION RESULTS 2014-2015: CWT data and areas of focus: Weak areas include: generating/testing hypothesis; cooperative learning; handheld technology; non-linguistic representation; websites; synthesis; and evaluation. Areas of improvement: non-linguistic representation. Areas of strength: identifying similarities and differences; summarizing/note-taking; setting objectives and providing feedback; overhead and flip char; published print materials; and understanding information.
- Teachers will meet in grade levels, vertical teams, and during USA Days to discuss instructional strategies in

writing, share results of formative/interim assessments, and samples of students' writing on open response reading items. EVALUATION RESULTS: Teachers met: K = 25 times; 1st = 30 times; 2nd = 38 times; and 3rd = 35 times.

- Analyze annually the open-response items on the mathematics portion of the Third Grade Augmented Benchmark/PARCC exam and IOWA. After findings are documented, adjust instruction to improve student achievement. EVALUATION RESULTS 2013-2014 (2015 PARCC results still pending): geometry (multiple-choice) and geometry (open response) as well as vocabulary, conservation of numbers, NPO, multi-step and measurement are identified areas of weakness. Contributing factors include: lack of consistent math terminology and multi-step problems overwhelming to students.
- Attendance at our parent nights will be documented to determine participation. EVALUATION RESULTS: For 2014-2015, 202 families were represented by attendance at Family Fun Night including Literacy activities; 47 dads attended Watchdog Pizza Night; 487 parents attended the annual open house.
- The STAR and other developmentally appropriate assessments will be given as a pre/post test to measure student growth during each school year. Evaluation Results 2014-2015: 1st Grade GE pre-test = 1.57 and post-test = 2.07 (.5); 2nd Grade GE pre-test = 2.12 and post-test = 3.05 (.93); 3rd Grade GE pre-test = 3.12 and post-test = 4.07 (.95).
- Classroom teachers, reading teachers, and / or paraprofessionals will assess the reading progress of individual students by using pre/post data from one or more of the following: Dibels, DRA, STAR, Rigby, or formative/interim assessments. Evaluation Results: 2014-2015: 1st Grade GE pre-test = 1.57 and post-test = 2.07 (.5); 2nd Grade GE pre-test = 2.12 and post-test = 3.05 (.93); 3rd Grade GE pre-test = 3.12 and post-test = 4.07 (.95).
- Parents, teachers, and principal, if needed, will meet at least two times throughout the school year to monitor the progress made by students on an AIP/IRI using DIBELS, DRA, STAR, grade level assessments. (Act 35) EVALUATION RESULTS: Oct 23, 2014 & Feb 12, 2015 parent-teacher conferences. 100% contact with parents of students on AIP/IRI.
- Using APSCN reports and baseline data, analyze and compare numbers and types of discipline referrals to determine the effectiveness parent communication regarding character education and academic achievement. EVALUATION RESULTS: 2014-2015- The discipline referral process was revised to include parent contact and enhanced communication as a part of the process. Referrals decreased by 3 compared to 24 in 2013-2014.
- Compare yearly data (APSCN)/baseline data on discipline referrals to determine effectiveness of the implementation of school wide rules and academic achievement. EVALUATION RESULTS: In 2014-2015, the number of discipline referrals decreased by 3. In 2013-2014, the number of discipline referrals decreased by 21: 45 discipline referrals in 2012-2013 compared to 24 in 2013-2014. In 2013-2014 - The discipline referral process was revised to include parent contact and enhanced communication as a part of the process.
- At the end of the school year, survey parents and teachers on the effectiveness of academic achievement. Use collected data to adjust curricula to meet the needs of students, parents and teachers. EVALUATION RESULTS: Parents were surveyed at the end of the 2014-2015 school year: 100% of parents responding to survey indicated parents feel welcome in our school. 97% of those responding indicated the school provides adequate opportunities for parent involvement.86% felt their views are considered when decisions are made. 95% feel they receive the information they need about school programs. A few concerns noted: E-School Grading System does not keep parents adequately informed to their child's academic progress as much as they would like and parents would like webpages updated in a more timely fashion. This was addressed during beginning of the year ACSIP meeting in August. Continued high levels of satisfaction with parent involvement program. Parent suggestions and identification of any barriers that prevent parent participation will be evaluated for revision to the program.
- Keep parent data on the number of parents who use or volunteer time throughout the school year. EVALUATION RESULTS: Volunteer hours: 2010-11: 1745; 2011-2012: 2161.35. An increase of 416.35 hours. 2012-2013: 1304.47 hours. A decrease of 856.88 hours. 2013-2014: 592.62 hours. A decrease of 711.85. 2014-2015: 788.92-an increase of 196 hours and 32 minutes.
- Average daily attendance for SY 2014-2015: 96.37%; SY 2013-2014: 96.37%; SY 2012-2013: 97.54%; SY 2011-12 96.4%; SY 2010-11 96%; SY 2009-10 96.7%; SY 2008-09 96%; SY 2007-08 95.4%; SY 2006-07 95.6%; SY 2005-06 94%.
- At the beginning of school, teachers, principal and curriculum coordinator will meet to perform data analysis of augmented benchmark/PARCC and SAT 10 results. Activities will include: trend analysis, curriculum alignment, and development of instructional strategies to meet needs in identified weak areas. EVALUATION RESULTS: In 2013-2014 (2015 pending), content (open response), content (multiple choice) and writing (multiple choice) were identified areas of concern. Contributing factors include: lack of exposure to real world text, lack of experience writing across curriculum, and writing too structured. Suggestions for improving include: continuing RTI, utilizing different materials, focusing on prior knowledge and vocabulary, and making sure ESL students have materials at home to assist in their learning.]
- Teacher Survey: 2014-2015: More ideas for instructional strategies and time for collaborating were the top priorities.