



2010-2011 ARCHIVE

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

ASBELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2010-2011

Asbell Elementary is a community dedicated to becoming literate, self-motivated, life-long learners and productive members of society.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will show at least 1 years growth in reading comprehension and written expression as determined by the AR Benchmark Exam. 80% of students below the 50th percentile will meet or exceed their growth expectation on MAP testing.

Priority 2: Math

Goal: All students will show at least 1 years growth in geometry and numbers and operations, as determined by the AR Benchmark Exam.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: Provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices.

Priority 4: Title III/English Language Learners

Goal: Provide support for students that are English Language Learners.

Priority 5: Parent Involvement

Goal: Asbell will create positive school/parent/community relationships in order to strengthen student achievement.

Priority 6: Prevent Disproportionate Representation of African American Students

Goal: Reduce the relative proportion of African American Students to students of other ethnicity identified as Mentally Retarded.

Priority 1: We expect all students to improve in the area of Open Response in both Practical Passages and Content, since this was consistently identified as the weakest area in all subpopulations.

1. 2010 Grade 3 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

57 students: 56% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
19 students: 42% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 63% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;

24 students: 63% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
45 students: 49% of EDS scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 0% of LEP Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
11 students: 18% of IEP scored at, or above, Proficient.

2009 Grade 3 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

59 students: 56% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
12 students: 42% of African American Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
10 students: 20% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
34 students: 67% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
46 students: 48% of EDS scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 44% of LEP Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 38% of IEP scored at, or above, Proficient.

An insufficient number of LEP students and IEP students were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the EDS in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the African American Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for Hispanic Students in the five writing domains are Multiple Choice. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

2008 Grade 3 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

51 students: 45.1% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
10 students: 20% of African American Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 33.3% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
29 students: 58.6% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;

38 students: 39.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 14.3% of LEP Students scored at, or above,
Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 0% of Students with Disabilities scored at, or
above, Proficient.

An insufficient number of Hispanic students, LEP students, and Students with Disabilities were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the African American Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Writing and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Econ. Disadvantaged Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

1. 2010 Grade 4 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

61 students: 68% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 55% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
14 students: 43% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
29 students: 76% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
50 students: 64% of EDS scored at, or above, Proficient;
13 students: 46% of LEP Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 17% of IEP scored at, or above, Proficient.

2009 Grade 4 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

57 students: 55% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
18 students: 50% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 57% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
29 students: 56% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
45 students: 51% of ESD scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 40% of LEP Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 50% of IEP scored at, or above, Proficient.

An insufficient number of LEP students and IEP students were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Literacy Passage.

The lowest identified areas for the EDS in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Literacy Passage.

The lowest identified areas for the AFRICAN AMERICAN students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of open response questions is Literacy Passage and Content Passage.

The lowest identified areas for the AFRICAN AMERICAN students in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of open response questions is Literacy Passage and Content Passage.

The lowest identified areas for the CAUCASIAN students in the five writing domains are Multiple Choice. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of open response questions is Literacy Passage and Content Passage.

2008 Grade 4 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

50 students: 58% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
14 students: 50% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
11 students: 72.7% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
24 students: 54.2% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;

37 students: 51.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 75% of LEP Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 12.5% of Students with Disabilities scored at, or above, Proficient.

An insufficient number of LEP students and Students with Disabilities were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the African American Students in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic Students in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Writing and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Econ. Disadvantaged Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Writing and open response questions is Content.

1. 2010 Grade 5 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

53 students: 73% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
12 students: 67% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 67% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
29 students: 80% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
43 students: 75% of EDS scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 50% of LEP Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 29% of IEP scored at, or above, Proficient.

2009 Grade 5 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

50 students: 56% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
14 students: 50% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
11 students: 63% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
22 students: 55% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
37 students: 49% of EDS scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 57% of LEP Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 11% of IEP scored at, or above, Proficient.

An insufficient number of LEP and IEP students were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the EDS in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the AFRICAN AMERICAN students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the HISPANIC students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Literacy Passage.

The lowest identified areas for the CAUCASIAN in the five writing domains are Content. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

2008 Grade 5 Literacy Benchmark Exam:

40 students: 62.5% of Combined Population Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 100% of African American Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 55.6% of Hispanic Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
26 students: 57.7% of Caucasian Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
23 students: 52.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 50% of LEP Students scored at, or above, Proficient;
Less than 10 students: 0% of Students with Disabilities scored at, or above, Proficient.

An insufficient number of African American students, Hispanic students, LEP students and Students with Disabilities were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the five writing domains are Content and Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Writing and open response questions is Content.

The lowest identified areas for the Econ. Disadvantaged Students in the five writing domains are Style. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the three types of literacy passages in multiple choice is Practical and open response questions is Content.

1. Grade K-Metropolitan8 2010:
Combined Population: 87 students were tested and 51.7% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

African American: 10 students were tested and 50% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Hispanic: 17 students were tested and 35.3% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 45 students were tested and 51.1% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

IEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

LEP students: 14 students were tested and 35.7% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 64 students were tested and 46.9% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Grade K-Metropolitan8 2009:

Combined Population: 85 students were tested and 45.9% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

African American: 19 students were tested and 42.1% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Hispanic: 14 students were tested and 14.3% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 41 students were tested and 56.1% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

IEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

LEP students: 18 students were tested and 33.3% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 67 students were tested and 40.3% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Grade K-Metropolitan8 2008:

Combined Population: 81 students were tested and 57% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

African American: 18 students were tested and 47% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Hispanic: 14 students were tested and 23% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 44 students were tested and 67% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: Less than 10 students were tested and 25% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

LEP students: 13 students were tested and 38% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Economically Disadvantaged: 61 students were tested and 51% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade 1 - SAT 10 2010:

Combined Population: 100 Students were tested and 29% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 18 students were tested and 33.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 46 students were tested and 30.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 83 students were tested and 27.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

Supporting
Data:

LEP students: 15 students were tested and 6.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

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

IEP: 11 students were tested and 9.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1 - SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 84 Students were tested and 31% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 19 students were tested and 21.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 43 students were tested and 37.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 62 students were tested and 27.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP students: 14 students were tested and 21.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 15 students were tested and 26.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

Grade 1 - SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 69 Students were tested and 34.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 15 students were tested and 26.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 36 students were tested and 44.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED: 55 students were tested and 27.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT: 10 students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 13 students were tested and 15.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities were tested.

1. Grade 2 - SAT 10 2010:
Combined Population: 80 Students were tested and 28.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 14 students were tested and 21.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 34 students were tested and 35.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 63 students were tested and 25.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP: 21 students were tested and 19% scored above the 50th percentile.

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

IEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

Grade 2 - SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 42.6% scored above the

50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 20 students were tested and 15% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 32 students were tested and 68.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 55 students were tested and 38.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

HISPANIC: 11 students were tested and 9.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 11 students were tested and 27.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2 - SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 67 Students were tested and 50.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 10 students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 42 students were tested and 52.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED: 46 students were tested and 52.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT: 10 students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 10 students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities were tested.

1. Grade 3 - SAT 10 2010:
Combined Population: 57 Students were tested and 36.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 19 students were tested and 26.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 24 students were tested and 41.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 45 students were tested and 31.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: Less than 10 students were tested.

LEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

Less than 10 IEP students were tested.

Grade 3 - SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 61 Students were tested and 31.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 12 students were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 35 students were tested and 37.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 48 students were tested and 27.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 10 students were tested and 20% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP: 10 students were tested and 30% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP students were tested.

Grade 3 - SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 66 Students were tested and 43.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 14 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 37 students were tested and 51.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED: 50 students were tested and 36% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 11 students were tested and 18.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities and Limited English Proficient students were tested.

1. Grade 4 - SAT 10 2010
Combined Population: 61 Students were tested and 59% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: Less than 10 students were tested.

CAUCASIAN: 29 students were tested and 72.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 50 students were tested and 54% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP: 13 students were tested and 38.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 14 students were tested and 28.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: Less than 10 students were tested.

Grade 4 - SAT 10 2009
Combined Population: 57 Students were tested and 61.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 18 students were tested and 38.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 29 students were tested and 72.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 45 students were tested and 60% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP, LEP and Hispanic students were tested.

Grade 4 - SAT 10 2008
Combined Population: 61 Students were tested and 57.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 15 students were tested and 53.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 27 students were tested and 59.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED: 48 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 16 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT: 10 students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities were tested.

1. Grade 5 - SAT 10 2010

Combined Population: 53 Students were tested and 66% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 29 students were tested and 72.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 43 students were tested and 67.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: Less than 10 students were tested.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 12 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP and LEP students were tested.

Grade 5 - SAT 10 2009

Combined Population: 50 Students were tested and 58% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 22 students were tested and 63.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 37 students were tested and 48.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 11 students were tested and 54.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 14 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP and LEP students were tested.

Grade 5 - SAT 10 2008

Combined Population: 53 Students were tested and 54.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN: 35 students were tested and 51.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED: 35 students were tested and 51.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC: 11 students were tested and 54.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT: 10 students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities and African American Students were tested.

1. Attendance Rate:

2010, 93.9%

2009, 94.52%

2008, 94.6%

Goal All students will show at least 1 years growth in reading comprehension and written expression as determined by the AR Benchmark Exam. 80% of students below the 50th percentile will meet or exceed their growth expectation on MAP testing.

Benchmark The following population(s): Caucasian and Economically Disadvantaged DID NOT meet the 2009 AYP target of 64% Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2010 AYP Target of 71.20% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make the necessary gains to invoke "Safe Harbor". The 2009 AYP status is ALERT for the sub populations of Combined, Caucasian and Economically Disadvantaged. The target for the 2009-2010 school year is 71.2% Proficient or Advanced for Literacy.

Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy Model				
Scientific Based Research: Ganske, Kathy, Word Journeys 2000; Adams, M., Beeler, T., Foorman, B. Lundberg, I. Phonemic Awareness in Young Children 1998; The Art of Teaching; Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First 2002. Measures of Academic Progress (MAP Testing).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>ALIGNMENT: Use Observation Survey, Developmental Reading Assessment, standardized tests, classroom assessments, Developmental Spelling Assessment, DIBELS, MAP Testing, and/or accuracy checks for formative and summative evaluations of student progress and plan instruction for students.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Carolyn Baughman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>SCHOOLWIDE REFORM: Participate in trainings and implement Literacy Lab, ELLA and Effective Literacy balanced-literacy skills and strategies in the appropriate classrooms including special education and ESL classrooms.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lindsey Cloutier	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF PROGRAMS: Classroom teachers, ESL teachers, special education teachers, Encore teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students to include but not limited to the use of formative assessments such as: MAP Testing, Accelerated Reader, and STAR testing software. For students who are below proficient, this will be documented in their AIP and IRI as an intervention. Provide upkeep and maintenance of ELMOs, projectors, and DVD/VCR combos for each classroom.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Melissa Harrell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
We will maintain personnel to work with families of educationally disadvantaged students to address family and student issues relevant to improving academic achievement. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sara Blickenstaff	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers and staff will participate in Comprehensive Literacy training such as, but not limited to ELLA, Effective Literacy, Arkansas Reading Association workshops, Model Schools Conference, and Literacy Lab to receive training in the 5 essential elements of literacy during the 10-11 school year as they become available. Teachers will also participate in trainings in how to plan and provide interventions for differentiated instruction. Provide teacher stipends or substitute pay for training. Purchase books, classroom literacy supplies/materials/centers to supplement classroom instruction and/or provide food for trainings. Literacy Centers will be built by district because of the cost effectiveness of it. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Kasi Davis	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	Title I - Purchased \$14554.00 Services: Title I - Materials \$69458.00 & Supplies: Title I - Capital \$10587.00 Outlay: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$94599
POINT IN TIME REMEDIATION: Progress Monitor below basic students in grades K-5 bi-monthly using DIBELS and other formative and summative assessment tools such as DRA, DSA, Peabody, PPVT, GORT-4 and TPRI. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Pat Shepard	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
HIGHLY QUALIFIED: The school will continue to hire and maintain "highly qualified" teachers and support staff. All instruction will be given by "highly qualified" staff. Teachers will work closely with Title I staff to implement school wide reform strategies. Data will be used to continue to monitor progress and point-in- time remediation. Interventionists will be hired to provide additional instruction for students at-risk for not meeting grade-level benchmarks in reading. Two full-time 1.0 FTE and six part-time .5 FTE interventionists will be hired.	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Title Teachers 	Title I - Employee \$84400.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$22000.00 Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$106400

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
COLLABORATION: Teachers are provided with weekly instructional meeting time in order to plan for the implementation of best practices that are chosen to help improve student achievement. This planning time is provided during the course of the day. One faculty meeting date a month will be reserved for vertical and horizontal team meetings. The actions described in our school's ACSIP plan are monitored to determine how closely aligned they are with the mission of our school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Ann Grigg	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
NEEDS ASSESSMENT: NRT, CRT, local achievement assessments and other relevant indicators will be analyzed by the faculty at each grade level with consideration to the combined population as well as each subpopulation in order to determine student learning needs and achievement gaps within subpopulations. NRT & CRT data will be analyzed annually. Local assessments will be analyzed quarterly. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	LaTayna Greene-Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
HIGHLY QUALIFIED: Strategies will be developed in conjunction with the central office staff for attracting highly qualified teachers to the Fayetteville school district. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	LaTayna Greene	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Substitute teachers will be utilized as needed, to provide supplemental release time in each grade level to work on the disaggregation of data to align curriculum and interventions to meet the needs of individual Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide after school tutoring in Literacy and Math for identified students who are at risk. The program will run at least 2 days a week from October through April. Students will be identified for the tutoring based on MAP testing,	Kasi Davis	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$3575.00 Title I - Employee \$13000.00

<p>Benchmark Exam, and teacher observation. The program will accomodate students 3-5. Funds will be used to pay stipends for certified teachers or highly qualified classified interventionist, materials, supplies, snacks and student transportation. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>				<p>Salaries: Title I - Employee \$3000.00 Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$19575</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Comprehensive Literacy Model by analyzing data from Dibels Scores and DRA levels for grades k-5 to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students grades k-5 will score "low risk" in all Dibels assessments and 75% of students grades k-5 will be reading on grade level based off of their DRA level. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Kelly Wade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM: Closing the Achievement Gap: Regular meetings of our ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building capacity within our school. Each meeting agenda will include the following Core Principles: A. The selection, and continuous evaluation, of research-based, scientifically validated, Interventions designed to improve our ability to improve student performance on the Literacy portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along with a sign-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention, and Action, is carefully monitored...through the collection of Formative and Summative Data....so that those strategies that prove</p>	<p>Ginger Mayes</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>ineffective can be revised, or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each spring, and fall, in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: OBSERVATION and SURVEY and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the SURVEY indicated that our staff follows the Comprehensive Literacy Model and would like more training that supports the Comprehensive Literacy Model. The results of the OBSERVATION indicate that the majority of our staff use curriculum and assessment based off of the Comprehensive Literacy Model in their classroom on a daily basis. Through OBSERVATION it was determined that the continued use of the Comprehensive Literacy Model is needed to continue to increase Literacy scores on summative and formative assessments. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of SURVEY and QUESTIONNAIRE in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Kelly Wade	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>A book room will be maintained with books and materials in order for staff members to have access to rich student material for familiar, shared, and guided reading. Shelving units,</p>	Kasi Davis	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>Title I - Materials & \$5025.00 Supplies:</p>

storage units, printed books, book making material, big books and any other material to enhance instruction will be purchased. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development				ACTION BUDGET: \$5025
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships strategies to improve literacy. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$225599

Intervention: Reading Across the Curriculum.

Scientific Based Research: Houghton Mifflin, Soar to Success, 2001; Routman, R., Conversations, 2000; SRA, Scholastic Research Associates, Multiple Skills Services; Clay, M., An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, 2002; Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training Measures of Academic Progress (MAP Testing)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans, Individual Reading Intervention Plans, and/or special needs to improve literacy. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Melissa Harrell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Hire an ELL instructional assistant to provide supplemental instruction to ELL students. This instructional assistant will work under the direct supervision of a certified/highly qualified ELL teacher. Action Type: Equity	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Integrate instruction in writing strategies and require students to write to demonstrate their learning in every content area, using the Arkansas Writing Rubric, in non-language arts classes taught by certified teachers. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kasi Davis	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff School Library Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Purchase and use varied instructional methodologies, techniques, and resources in the classroom, library, and music program to address the needs of all students, including students with special needs and ELL students. Examples of the products to purchase would include trade books, literature sets, Scholastic News, Weekly Readers, computer, computer software, and other supplies to support instruction.	Janette Harris	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff School Library Teachers Teaching Aids Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$6900.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$6900

<p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>ALIGNMENT: Analyze the scores on the literacy portion of the benchmark exam, and SAT-10 to the aligned curriculum to identify areas of weakness and gaps in the curriculum. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Ginger Mayes</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>ALIGNMENT: Kindergarten students, who score delayed in both written and oral communication, on the Qualls Early Learning Inventory (QELI), and first and second grade students who score "below basic", in reading, on the SAT 10 will be considered to have a substantial reading deficiency. These children will be provided Intensive Reading Instruction utilizing the Comprehensive Literacy Model. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) will be administered to all K-5 students who are shown to have a substantial reading deficiency. The DIBELS will be used as: A. The evaluation instrument to determine which areas of reading the child is deficient. B. The progress-monitoring instrument to document progress toward grade level proficiency, and C. The assessment instrument used for discontinuing services. The DIBELS evaluation will be administered within thirty days after the beginning of the school year, for applicable first and second grade students, and within 30 days after receiving the QELI report, for applicable kindergarten students. Intensive reading interventions will be comprehensive in nature and will be targeted to remediate the area of deficiency. For those affected students, school personnel will develop an Intensive Reading Improvement Plan (IRI) that will describe our intervention program. Intervention will be provided in the form of more intensive one on one and small group instruction from the teacher and Title I and Guided Literacy aides using ELLA and Phonics Connection strategies. These intervention strategies and methods will continue until each student has reached grade level proficiency in all essential areas of reading. Student achievement in each of the essential elements shall be monitored bi-weekly until proficiency occurs. Students who are not meeting current expectations shall be provided additional interventions. Each parent, or guardian,</p>	<p>Kasi Davis</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>will be notified in writing when their child has been identified with a substantial reading deficiency. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Reading Across the Curriculum by ANALYZING DATA from Qualls, SAT-10, Benchmark Scores for students grades k-5 and MAP testing for students grades 2-5 to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students grades k will score "Developing" on the Qualls assessment, 75% of students grades 1-2 will score "above the 50th percentile" on the ITBS, and 75% of students grades 3-5 will score "Proficient" on the Benchmark assessment and 75% of students grades 2-5 will increase their RIT score in MAP testing. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Sandi Rommel</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: OBSERVATION and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results obtained through OBSERVATION indicate that classroom teachers are using test data and speciality teachers to help guide instruction in all areas of literacy. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of OBSERVATION in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in</p>	<p>Kelly Wade</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Collaboration				
Use formative assessments such as System 44 and Read 180 in the Resource classroom to guide instruction to meet the needs of Special Education students. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Melissa Harrell	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$6900

Intervention: Professional Development

Scientific Based Research: Report of the National Reading Panel, 2000: Teaching Children to Read, Put Reading First, 2002; National Institute for Literacy, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; The U.S. Department of Education, Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children; National Research Council, Beginning to Read, Marilyn J. Adams. NSDC, Learning Teams; Loucks-Horsley, S., Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics, 2003 Measures of Academic Progress (MAP Testing)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Elect a professional development committee that offers broad representation of teachers throughout the school to evaluate professional development activities bi-annually based on teacher growth (documented changes in teacher practice and assessment of student learning) and teacher response to an evaluation survey. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluate the implementation of the professional development plan annually by assessing its involvement of teachers, focus on teacher and student needs, and implementation efficiency and effectiveness. Conduct an individualized needs assessment with teachers to enable them to identify their own needs in relation to the targeted special education and ELL areas. Assess professional development needs in the targeted areas of prereferral interventions, positive behavioral supports, integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms (general curriculum content, modifications, differentiated instruction, multiple intelligences, and co-teaching), conflict resolution and negotiation skills, assistive technology, and learning disabilities. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Sandi Rommel	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: All teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the school and district professional development plan. Teachers will use an instrument developed by the district professional development committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the professional development plan, the course offerings and the effectiveness of the knowledge gained. Annually, upon review of the test data, the professional development committee, working under the guidelines of the district professional development plan, will develop a professional development plan for the school and individual teachers based on information obtained through data analysis. All new teachers (first 3 years) and teachers in need of assistance will be assigned a mentor to assist them in reaching their professional development goals and needs. All teachers will have the opportunity to have input on the district and building level professional development plan. The district will provide all teachers and administrators will no less than 60 hours of professional development including 6 hours of technology and 2 hours of parental involvement development (3 hours of Parental Involvement for Administrators) and for those who teach Arkansas History, 2 hours of training in that subject. Teachers will have the opportunity to evaluate the benefit of the professional development activities and provide feedback on needed changes. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>LaTayna Greene</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● School Library ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Retain a trained 1.0 FTE Literacy Coach to assist staff in implementing a comprehensive reading program utilizing the essential elements: comprehension; fluency; phonemic awareness; phonics; and vocabulary. The Literacy Coach will provide professional development for teachers, including modeling lessons in the classroom, working with teams of teachers to identify at-risk students, supporting the</p>	<p>La Tayna Greene</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>Title I - Employee \$38748.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$10074.00 Benefits:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$48822</p>

<p>implementation of researched best practices for literacy instruction. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>Create a Professional Development Training Space to be used for weekly grade level and team meetings to disaggregate data and PD in areas of student need. These training hours are over and above the 60 required hours. Training materials, copies, professional literature, and food for trainings will be purchased. This action is supplemental in nature for professional development at the school level. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Kasi Davis	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$3352.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$3352
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Professional Development by implementing the District Focus Plan and conducting a staff survey to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 80% of staff members will complete a staff survey which will identify the professional development needs of our building. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Community Leaders ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: QUESTIONNAIRE and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the QUESTIONNAIRE indicated that a majority of our staff had Literacy Based Professional Development training they wanted to receive to help guide instruction in their classroom. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of QUESTIONNAIRE in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention.</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 3-5 grade Augmented Benchmark and K-2 SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, and norms in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Literacy Priority: MULTIPLE CHOICE in PRACTICAL PASSAGES, and OPEN RESPONSE in CONTENT. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. IN addition, we meet in grade level teams, weekly and as an entire faculty monthly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction. We chart progress on our "Assessment/Intervention" wall. Action Type: AIP/IRI</p>	<p>Lindsey Cloutier</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development				
To improve teacher quality by providing reimbursements for college courses taken in the field of Education and by sending team of teachers to Model Schools Conference. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● School Library ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	Title II-A - Purchased \$8460.00 Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$8460
Total Budget:				\$60634

Priority 2: All students will improve in the area of Open Response in all strands, since this was consistently identified as the weakest area in all subpopulations.

1. 2010 Grade 3 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

57 Students: 65% of Combined Students
 19 Students: 53% of African American Students
 Less than 10 Students: 50% of Hispanic Students
 24 Students: 80% of Caucasian Students
 45 Students: 58% of EDS
 Less than 10 Students: 33% of LEP Students
 11 Students: 45% of IEP Students

2009 Grade 3 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

59 Students: 66% of Combined Students
 12 Students: 41% of African American Students
 10 Students: 30% of Hispanic Students
 34 Students: 82% of Caucasian Students
 46 Students: 60% of EDS
 Less than 10 Students: 55% of LEP Students
 Less than 10 Students: 51% of IEP Students

An insufficient number of LEP and IEP students were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the analysis of Open Response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data and Probability.

The lowest identified areas for the EDS in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Numbers and Operation.

The lowest identified areas for the AFRICAN AMERICAN students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Data and Probability and Numbers and Operation.

The lowest identified areas for the HISPANIC students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data and Probability.

The lowest identified areas for the CAUCASIAN in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Numbers and Operation.

2008 Grade 3 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

51 Students: 64.7% of Combined Students
 10 Students: 50.0% of African American Students
 Less than 10 Students: 55.6% of Hispanic Students
 29 Students: 69% of Caucasian Students

38 Students: 63.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
Less than 10 Students: 57.1% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 60% of Students with Disabilities

An insufficient number of Hispanic Students, LEP Students, and Students with Disabilities were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the African American Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and in the multiple choice questions in Geometry.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the Econ. Disadvantaged Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

1. 2010 Grade 4 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

61 Students: 77% of Combined Students
Less than 10 Students: 55% of African American Students
14 Students: 72% of Hispanic Students
29 Students: 83% of Caucasian Students
50 Students: 76% of EDS
13 Students: 69% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 50% of IEP Students

2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

57 Students: 69% of Combined Students
18 Students: 61% of African American Students
Less than 10 Students: 57% of Hispanic Students
29 Students: 72% of Caucasian Students
45 Students: 62% of EDS
Less than 10 Students: 40% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 75% of IEP Students
An insufficient number of LEP Students and IEP Students were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the analysis of the Open Response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the EDS in the analysis of the Open Response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operation and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the AFRICAN AMERICAN in the analysis of

the Open Response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operation and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the HISPANIC students in the analysis of the Open Response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operation and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the CAUCASIAN in the analysis of the Open Response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement.

2008 Grade 4 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

50 Students: 76% of Combined Students
14 Students: 64.3% of African American Students
11 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students
24 Students: 70.8% of Caucasian Students
37 Students: 70.3% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
Less than 10 Students: 100% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 37.5% of Students with Disabilities

An insufficient number of LEP Students and Students with Disabilities were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability and in the multiple choice questions in Geometry.

The lowest identified areas for the African American Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability and in the multiple choice questions in Geometry.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and in the multiple choice questions in Geometry.

The lowest identified areas for the Econ. Disadvantaged Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability and in the multiple choice questions in Geometry.

1. 2010 Grade 5 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

53 Students: 55% of Combined Students
12 Students: 41% of African American Students
Less than 10 Students: 33% of Hispanic Students
29 Students: 62% of Caucasian Students
43 Students: 52% of EDS

Less than 10 Students: 50% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 14% of IEP Students

2009 Grade 5 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

50 Students: 64% of Combined Students
14 Students: 50% of African American Students
11 Students: 81% of Hispanic Students
22 Students: 63% of Caucasian Students
37 Students: 57% of EDS
Less than 10 Students: 72% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 11% of IEP Students

An insufficient number of LEP and IEP Students were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Data and Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the EDS in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Data and Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the AFRICAN AMERICAN students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Data and Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the HISPANIC students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Data and Probability and Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the CAUCASIAN students in the analysis of the open response questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Data and Probability and Measurement.

2008 Grade 5 Mathematics Benchmark tested & percent of students scoring proficient/Advanced:

40 Students: 52.5% of Combined Students
Less than 10 Students: 25% of African American Students
Less than 10 Students: 66.7% of Hispanic Students
26 Students: 50% of Caucasian Students
23 Students: 43.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
Less than 10 Students: 62.5% of LEP Students
Less than 10 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities

An insufficient number of African American Students, Hispanic Students, LEP Students and Students with Disabilities were tested.

The lowest identified areas for the COMBINED POPULATION in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

The lowest identified areas for the Econ. Disadvantaged Students in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five math strands

revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified areas in the analysis of the open response questions, in the five math strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and in the multiple choice questions in Measurement.

1. Grade K-Metropolitan8 2010:

Combined Population: 87 students were tested and 28.7% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

African American: 10 students were tested and 30% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Hispanic: 17 students were tested and 17.6% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 45 students were tested and 31.1% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: less than 10 students were tested.

LEP Students: 14 students were tested and 21.4% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 64 students were tested and 25% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Grade K-Metropolitan8 2009:

Combined Population: 85 students were tested and 31.8% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

African American: 19 students were tested and 15.8% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Hispanic: 14 students were tested and 0% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 41 students were tested and 43.9% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: less than 10 students were tested.

LEP Students: 18 students were tested and 27.8% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

EDS: 67 students were tested and 28.4% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Grade K-Metropolitan8 2008:

Combined Population: 81 students were tested and 46% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

African American: 18 students were tested and 44% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Hispanic: 14 students were tested and 14% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Caucasian: 44 students were tested and 50% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

IEP Students: less than 10 students were tested and 14% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

LEP Students: 13 students were tested and 31% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

Economically Disadvantaged: 61 students were tested and 43% scored at or above the 50th percentile.

1. Grade 1 - SAT 10 2010:

Supporting
Data:

Combined Population: 100 Students were tested and 36% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:

18 Students were tested and 27.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:

46 Students were tested and 45.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:

83 Students were tested and 32.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:

15 Students were tested and 13.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:

20 Students were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP: 11 students were tested and 27.3 % scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 1 - SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 84 Students were tested and 26.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:

19 Students were tested and 15.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:

43 Students were tested and 34.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:

62 Students were tested and 21% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:

14 Students were tested and 14.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:

15 Students were tested and 6.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP Students were tested.

Grade 1 - SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 69 Students were tested and 43.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:

15 Students were tested and 20% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:

36 Students were tested and 55.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:

55 Students were tested and 38.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT:

10 Students were tested and 60% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:

13 Students were tested and 30.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities were tested.

1. Grade 2 - SAT 10 2010:
Combined Population: 80 Students were tested and 58.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:
14 Students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
34 Students were tested and 64.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
63 Students were tested and 57.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:
21 Students were tested and 42.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
20 Students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP:
Less than 10 students were tested.

Grade 2 - SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 68 Students were tested and 79.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:
20 students were tested and 65% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
32 Students were tested and 87.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
55 Students were tested and 76.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:
Less than 10 Students were tested.

HISPANIC:
11 Students were tested and 72.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP:
11 students were tested and 45.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 2 - SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 67 Students were tested and 64.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:
10 Students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
42 Students were tested and 61.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:
46 Students were tested and 56.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT:
10 Students were tested and 90% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
10 Students were tested and 70% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 Students with disabilities were tested.

1. Grade 3 - SAT 10 2010:
Combined Population: 57 Students were tested and 50.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 19 Students were tested and 42.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
24 Students were tested and 62.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
45 Students were tested and 42.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
Less than 10 Students were tested.

LEP:
Less than 10 students were tested.

IEP:
11 Students were tested and 9.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 3 - SAT 10 2009:
Combined Population: 61 Students were tested and 50.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 12 Students were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
35 Students were tested and 68.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
48 Students were tested and 47.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
10 Students were tested and 20% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:
10 students were tested and 40% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP Students were tested.

Grade 3 - SAT 10 2008:
Combined Population: 66 Students were tested and 48.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 14 Students were tested and 57.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
37 Students were tested and 54.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
50 Students were tested and 42% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
11 Students were tested and 9.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:
Less than 10 students were tested.

IEP:
Less than 10 Students were tested.
1. Grade 4 - SAT 10 2010:
Combined Population: 61 Students were tested and 68.9% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:
Less than 10 students were tested.

CAUCASIAN:

29 Students were tested and 82.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:

50 Students were tested and 66% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:

13 students were tested and 46.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP:

Less than 10 students were tested.

HISPANIC:

14 students were tested and 35.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

Grade 4 - SAT 10 2009:

Combined Population: 57 Students were tested and 56.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:

18 Students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:

29 Students were tested and 62.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:

45 Students were tested and 51.1% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 LEP, IEP and HISPANIC Students were tested.

Grade 4 - SAT 10 2008:

Combined Population: 61 Students were tested and 67.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:

15 Students were tested and 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:

27 Students were tested and 55.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:

48 Students were tested and 58.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:

16 students were tested and 81.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

LEP:

10 students were tested and 80% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP:

Less than 10 students were tested.

1. Grade 5 - SAT 10 2010:

Combined Population: 53 Students were tested and 56.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:

29 Students were tested and 69% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:

43 Students were tested and 51.2% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:

Less than 10 Students were tested.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:

12 students were tested and 33.3% scored above the 50th percentile.

Less than 10 IEP and LEP students were tested.

Grade 5 - SAT 10 2009:
 Combined Population: 50 Students were tested and 58% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
 22 Students were tested and 54.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
 37 Students were tested and 51.4% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
 11 Students were tested and 72.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:
 14 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

Fewer than 10 IEP and LEP students were tested.

Grade 5 - SAT 10 2008:
 Combined Population: 53 Students were tested and 52.8% scored above the 50th percentile.

CAUCASIAN:
 35 Students were tested and 48.6% scored above the 50th percentile.

EDS:
 35 Students were tested and 45.7% scored above the 50th percentile.

HISPANIC:
 11 Students were tested and 54.5% scored above the 50th percentile.

AFRICAN AMERICAN:
 Less than 10 students were tested.

LEP:
 10 students were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile.

IEP:
 Less than 10 students were tested.

1. Attendance Rate:
 2010, 93.9%
 2009, 94.52%
 2008, 94.6%

1.

Goal All students will show at least 1 years growth in geometry and numbers and operations, as determined by the AR Benchmark Exam.

Benchmark The Combined Population and each Subpop MET the 2009 AYP target of 62.50% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2010 AYP Target of 71% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Computation and Problem-Solving				
Scientific Based Research: Carpenter, T.P., E. Fennema, P.L. Peterson, and D. Carey (1988).; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Principles and Standards for School Mathematics; Everyday Mathematics (2007). Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, 1997. Measures of Academic Progress Assessment (MAP Testing)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will be trained in the best practices and will implement mathematics problem-solving, (open-response), strategies for all students. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Lorie Huff	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Professional Development				
<p>Teachers will evaluate students using formative and summative assessments to determine the effectiveness of problem-solving strategies using performance assessments, and open-ended math prompts at each grade level. This includes but is not limited to STAR Math, Math Facts in a Flash, and Mastering Math Facts. Results will be shared with parents through grade reports, progress reports, and parent teacher conferences.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Allison Helton	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Funds will be used to purchase materials and supplies to supplement Science Inquiry as related to problem-solving.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Sandi Rommel	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Strategies and Practices for Developing Competency by analyzing data from the Arkansas Benchmark to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students grades 3-5 will score Proficient or Advanced in Math on the AR Benchmark Exam.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Kelly Wade	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: OBSERVATION and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the OBSERVATION indicated that classroom teachers were guiding instruction to develop competency and understanding of problem solving in all grade levels. It was further noted that classroom teachers feel this intervention is necessary to help guide instruction in the classroom. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of OBSERVATION in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our</p>	Kelly Wade	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the MAT 8 for kindergarten, 3-5 grade Augmented Benchmark and 1-2 SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, and norms in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Math Priority: Geometry and Measurement in OPEN RESPONSE. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. IN addition, we meet in grade level teams, weekly and as an entire faculty monthly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Jennifer Ebert</p>	<p>Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Implement Everyday Mathematics lessons and assessments in kindergarten through fifth grade classrooms. Supplement curriculum with online Everyday Math supplemental package. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Jennifer Ebert</p>	<p>Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Grade level learning teams will meet quarterly to review student work, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students to achieve proficiency in mathematics. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Jennifer Ebert</p>	<p>Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
Teachers will collaborate with special education teachers and the ELL teachers to use differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sandi Rommel	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Mathematics & Procedural Fluency

Scientific Based Research: McREL. Standards in Classroom Practice Research Synthesis. 2001. USDE OERI. Burns, Marilyn; Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics, 1999. Everyday Mathematics, third edition, 2007 (Wright Group/McGraw-Hill); A Research-Based Curriculum: The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell; Student Achievement Studies, Everyday Learning, 2001. Measures of Academic Progress Assessment (MAP Testing)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will review available research on instructional strategies and instructional materials proven to be effective in improving math computation. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Dianna Reyes	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers • Outside Consultants • School Library • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implement the following summative and formative assessments through pre-, mid-, and post-testing in STAR Math, Mastering Math Facts grades 1-5, Math Facts in a Flash, CBM grades K-1, and MAP Testing grades 2-5 to assess and improve math problem-solving and computation skills and to provide guided practice and tutoring on identified areas of weaknesses. Implement supplemental computational strategies and materials into the daily math program based on the needs indicated by the pre-test. Communicate progress and continuing areas of development to parents. Purchase paper for these summative and formative assessments. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sandi Rommel	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$1177.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1177
HIGHLY QUALIFIED: The school will continue to hire and maintain "highly qualified" teachers and support staff. All instruction will be given by "highly qualified" staff. Teachers will work closely with Title I staff to implement school wide reform strategies. Data will be used to continue to monitor progress and point -in- time remediation. Instructional aides will be hired to provide additional instruction for students at-risk for not meeting grade-	Mignonne Scarbrough	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>level benchmarks in math. Two full-time 1.0 FTE and 6 part-time .5 FTE instructional assistants will be hired. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Mathematics & Procedural Fluency by analyzing data from the Mastering Math Facts Assessment and the MAP Testing to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students grades 1-5 will meet or exceed their individual goal at each level for the Mastering Math Facts Assessment and 75% of students grades 2-5 will increase their RIT score in MAP testing. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: SURVEY and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the SURVEY indicated that a majority of the teachers feel this intervention helps guide instruction in all 3 Tiers of instruction in the classroom. This intervention is necessary to help achieve our goal in the Math Priority based off of summative and formative assessment results. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of SURVEY in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Teachers will follow the scope and sequence of the District math</p>	Jill Jackson	Start: 07/31/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments 	<hr/>

Curriculum and identify areas of weakness from the results of the ITBS, Benchmark Exam scores, and MAP Testing. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide		End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will be provided professional development opportunities to address the area of best practices for all students in math. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
We will assess annually using summative assessments such as: ITBS, Benchmark, and formative assessments such as: MAP Testing, CBM, and/or Accelerated Math to determine gaps and redundancies in our curriculum. We will create student Academic Improvement Plans for all students below proficient. Our ACSIP plan will be modified based on these assessments and appropriate professional development activities will be addressed according to the results. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sandi Rommel	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships strategies to improve math. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$1177

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

1. 2008-2009: 173 students in the school population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of becoming overweight or overweight: Grade K: Males 19.2%, Females 26.3% Grade 1: Not Tested Grade 2: Males 44.8%, Females 41.7% Grade 3: Not Tested Grade 4: Males 44%, Females 48.4% Grade 5: Not Tested The lowest two areas are Kindergarten Males and Kindergarten Females. 2007-2008: 189 student population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight or overweight: Grade K: Males 26.1%, Females 30.3% Grade 1: Not Tested Grade 2: Males 38.7%, Females 42.9% Grade 3: Not Tested Grade 4: Males 47.8%, Females 35.7% Grade 5: Not Tested The lowest two areas are Kindergarten Males and Kindergarten Females. 2006-2007: 325 student population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight or overweight: Grade K: Males 45.2%, Females 43.2% Grade 1: Males 29.2%, Females 37.8% Grade 2: Males 29.2%, Females 35.7% Grade 3: Males 33.3%, Females 36.0% Grade 4: Males 68.0%, Females 36.0% Grade 5: Males 50.0%, Females 39.3% The lowest 2 areas are 4th and 5th grade males. 2005-2006: 374 student population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight or overweight: Grade K: Males 35.0%, Females 21.6% Grade 1: Males 33.3%, Females 36.4% Grade 2: Males 41.4%, Females 30.0% Grade 3: Males 58.8%, Females 36.7% Grade 4: Males 48.4%, Females 44.4% Grade 5: Males 20.9%, Females 43.5% The lowest 2 areas are 3rd and 4th grade males. 2004-2005: 365 student population assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight or overweight: Grade K: Males 35.0%, Females 35.9% Grade 1: Males 32.0%, Females 28.9% Grade 2: Males 35.9%, Females 37.0% Grade 3: Males 44.0%, Females 32.0% Grade 4: Males 34.7%, Females 45.5% Grade 5: Males 44.4%, Females 29.1% The lowest areas are 4th Grade females and 5th grade males.

2. 2008 The two weakest areas for our School Health Index were in module 4: Nutrition Services 61-80%(Food Service Collaboration) and module 5: Health Services 81-100% (Unintentional injuries, Violence, and Suicide). 2007 The two weakest areas for our School health Index were in module 2: Health Education (Asthma Training) 79% and module 5: Health Services (Emergency Crisis Plan) 88%. 2006 The two weakest areas for our School Health Index were in module 7: Health Promotion for Staff (0-22%) and module 8: Family and Community Involvement (21-40%).

3. Free and Reduced Lunch Population

2009 = 78.6% of our total population was on free/reduced lunch

2007 = 75% of our total population was on free/reduced lunch

2006 = 74% of our total population was on free/reduced lunch

2005 = 67% of our total population was on free/reduced lunch

Supporting Data:

Goal Provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices.

Benchmark The number of students being considered overweight or at risk of overweight, according to their BMI, will decrease by 1/2% during the 2010-2011 school year when compared with the 2009-2010 school year.

Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of physical activity for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: Kids for Health, 2004-2005				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All students receive 120 minutes of Physical Education each week and 75 minutes of Physical Activity each week. Action Type: Wellness	Carlena Lambert	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 100%;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk of overweight or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Ana Ritter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 100%;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implement and encourage participation in physical education program taught by a highly qualified teacher that supports physical activity. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Cheyenne Plunkett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr style="width: 100%;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Promote reduction of time children spend engaged in sedentary activities such as watching television and playing video games by sending home informational packages that include tips for parents/caregivers. Action Type: Collaboration	Becky Roberts	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<hr style="width: 100%;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness				
Encourage participation in family oriented, community-based physical activity program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Clarisa Pierce	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
To assess Asbell Elementary School's physical education program, parents, students, and faculty members will be invited to participate in a survey. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Mary Tannehill	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Increase Awareness and Knowledge for Lifelong Health and Wellness through an INTERVIEW to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students will make healthy lifestyle choices. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Cheyenne Plunkett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Title Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: INTERVIEWS and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the INTERVIEWS indicated that a majority of the staff and Asbell Community feel they aren't fully aware of benefits of physical activity and believe that students would benefit from this knowledge. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of INTERVIEWS in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of	Angie Schuld	Start: 07/01/2010 End:		————— ACTION

<p>the 3-5 grade Augmented Benchmark, K-2 SAT 10 Exams, and the School Health Index. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, and norms in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Wellness Priority: MODULE 4 NUTRITION SERVICES. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. Action Type: Collaboration</p>		06/30/2011		BUDGET: \$
<p>Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships strategies to improve wellness. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of sound nutritional practices for lifelong health and wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: Kids for Health, 2004-2005				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Implementation of Kids for Health. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness</p>	Lucious Selmon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Increase Awareness and Knowledge for Lifelong Health and Wellness through an INTERVIEW to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students will make healthy lifestyle choices. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Cheyanne Plunkett	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Wellness				
PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: INTERVIEW and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the INTERVIEW indicated faculty and Asbell families need an increased awareness of sound nutritional practices to help lower the rate of high BMI in all students. It is necessary to continue to educate staff and families to help ensure BMI will decrease in overweight students. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of INTERVIEW in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$	
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4: District will provide support to English Language Learners.

1. 2010 CRT Data

In 3rd grade, fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 0% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

In 4th grade, 13 LEP students were tested. 38.5% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

In 5th grade, fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 25% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

1. 2009 CRT Data

In 3rd grade, fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 44% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

In 4th grade, fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 40% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

In 5th grade, fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 57% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

1. 2008 CRT Data

In 3rd grade, fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 14.3% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

In 4th grade, Fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 75% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

In 5th grade, Fewer than 10 LEP students were tested. 50% of LEP students scored at or above proficient.

1. 2010 3rd Grade ELDA Data

3 LEP students were tested.

1 student scored a composite level of 1,

1 student scored a composite level of 2,

and 1 student scored a composite level of 3.

1. 2010 4th Grade ELDA Data

- 14 LEP students were tested.
 1 student scored a composite level of 1,
 1 student scored a composite level of 2,
 6 students scored a composite level of 3,
 5 students scored a composite level of 4,
 and 1 student scored a composite level of 5.
- 2010 5th Grade ELDA Data
- 4 LEP students were tested.
 1 student scored a composite level of 2,
 1 student scored a composite level of 3,
 and 2 students scored a composite level of 4.
- 2009 3rd Grade ELDA Data
- 11 LEP students were tested.
 1 student scored a composite level of 1,
 4 students scored a composite level of 2,
 1 student scored a composite level of 3,
 2 students scored a composite level of 4,
 and 1 student scored a composite level of 5.
- 2009 4th Grade ELDA Data
- 5 LEP students were tested.
 1 student scored a composite level of 1,
 2 students scored a composite level of 3,
 and 2 students scored a composite level of 4.
- 2009 5th Grade ELDA Data
- 6 LEP students were tested.
 1 student scored a composite level of 2,
 1 student scored a composite level of 3,
 3 students scored a composite level of 4,
 and 1 student scored a composite level of 5.
- 2008 3rd Grade ELDA Data
- 7 LEP students were tested.
 3 students scored a composite level of 2,
 and 4 student scored a composite level of 3.
- 2008 4th Grade ELDA Data
- 9 LEP students were tested.
 2 students scored a composite level of 2,
 2 student scored a composite level of 3,
 and 5 students scored a composite level of 4.
- 2008 5th Grade ELDA Data
- 10 LEP students were tested.
 1 students scored a composite level of 2,
 3 student scored a composite level of 3,
 and 6students scored a composite level of 4.
- Attendance Rate:
 2010, 93.9%
 2009, 94.52%
 2008, 94.6%

Supporting Data:

Goal Provide support for students that are English Language Learners.
Benchmark It is expected that this population will meet, or exceed, the 2009 AYP Target of 62.50% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy Model				
Scientific Based Research: Ganske, Kathy, Word Journeys 2000; Adams, M., Beeler, T., Foorman, B. Lundberg, I. Phonemic Awareness in Young Children 1998; The Art of Teaching; Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First 2002				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

<p>Hire a Highly Qualified Certified ELL Teacher to provide supplemental instruction to ELL students. Title III and ELL Monies necessary for this intervention are budgeted in the District Plan.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>La Tayna Greene</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Hire an ELL instructional assistant to provide supplemental instruction to ELL students. This instructional assistant will work under the direct supervision of a certified/highly qualified ELL teacher.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>La Tayna Greene</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Teachers and staff will participate in Comprehensive Literacy training such as, but not limited to ELLA, Effective Literacy, Arkansas Reading Association workshops, and Literacy Lab to receive training in the 5 essential elements of literacy. Teachers will also participate in trainings in how to plan and provide interventions for differentiated instruction. The Title III/ELL monies are budgeted in the District Plan to pay for one full-time staff member. Provide substitute pay for training. Purchase books and supplies/materials to supplement classroom instruction.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Ginger Mayes</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> <p>Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$500</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to evaluate the action: Comprehensive Literacy Model by analyzing data from Dibels Scores and DRA levels for grades k-5 to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. Our goal is that 75% of students grades k-5 will score "low risk" in all Dibels assessments and 75% of students grades k-5 will be reading on grade level based off of their DRA level.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Ginger Mayes</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 3-5 grade</p>	<p>Ginger Mayes</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>Augmented Benchmark and K-2 SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results from both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of Attendance, Formative and Summative Achievement Data across grade levels within our building. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of establishing student learning and behavioral goals. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the specific areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, and norms in order to dig deeper for the root cause why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. We are modifying our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Literacy Priority: MULTIPLE CHOICE in PRACTICAL PASSAGES, and OPEN RESPONSE in CONTENT. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following areas reflect our greatest need within the Math Priority: Geometry and Measurement in OPEN RESPONSE. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address these areas. IN addition, we meet in grade level teams, weekly and as an entire faculty monthly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our Classroom Instruction. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: OBSERVATION and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the OBSERVATION indicated that a majority of the staff and Asbell Community feel they aren't fully aware of benefits of physical activity and believe that students would benefit from this knowledge. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all</p>	<p>Ginger Mayes</p>	<p>Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of INTERVIEWS in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships strategies to improve literacy. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Ginger Mayes	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$500

Priority 5: To increase positive relationships with parents and increase parent involvement building wide.

Supporting Data:

Goal Asbell will create positive school/parent/community relationships in order to strengthen student achievement.

Benchmark 85% of parents will attend their scheduled parent-teacher conference.

Intervention: Parent Involvement Plan ACT 307 National PTA Standards, 2007				
Scientific Based Research: National PTA Standards,2007 Learning Early to Achieve program for preschool students; Report from Arkansas Blue Ribbon Commission 2003; No child Left Behind 2003; Act 49 of the 2nd Extraordinary Session of the Arkansas Legislature 2003; Harms, Clifford, Cryar, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale 1998.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT: A school-parent compact will be created by staff and parents to reflect the school's responsibility to provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables children to meet the state's student academic achievement standards. The compact will include ways in which parents will be responsible for supporting their children's learning, as well as stating the importance of communication between teachers and parents on an ongoing basis. The compact will be a tool for parents because it will provide assistance to parents in understanding how to monitor their child's progress through school curriculum by providing standards and academic assessments. Parents will be provided with	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>materials and training which will help them work with their children to improve academic achievement, as well as receive information related to school and parent programs and provide additional reasonable support for parental involvement activities as requested by parents. The compact will be a tool for educators because it focuses on the importance of effective communication as well as value and utility of contributions of parents. The compact will be available for viewing online on our school website and will be sent home in print for parents to view in a language that is practical to understand. The compact encompasses parent involvement because it coordinates and integrates parent involvement programs and activities. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol of a Parent SURVEY and VERIFICATION OF ATTENDANCE at the Fall and Spring Parent-Teacher Conference in evaluating this intervention program: Parent Involvement Plan ACT 307 National PTA Standards, 2007. We will use this information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention was achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>TRANSITION: (Pre-K) Kindergarten teachers will collaborate to incorporate research/best practices related to early childhood development so that there will be a seamless transition for students between preschool and kindergarten environments. The kindergarten curriculum includes instructional strategies, teaching methodologies, and assessment techniques based upon the theories of early childhood growth and development. Parents and students are introduced to kindergarten and the student expectations at the beginning of the year at a Kindergarten Round-up. Teachers will maintain contact with the parents on a regular basis and arrange for additional conferences with parents as needed. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Christina Brown	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PARENT INVOLVEMENT: Parents and highly qualified teachers will collaborate to develop and distribute a School Information Resource Guide for each family in the fall of each school year. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
The building principal will designate one certified staff member to serve as a parent facilitator to organize meaningful training for staff and parents and to undertake efforts to ensure that parental participation is recognized as an asset to the school. The district will pay the parent facilitator a stipend for assuming duties as required by ACT 307 of 2007. Action Type: Parental Engagement	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Administrators, teachers, and parents will develop a parental involvement plan addressing the diverse needs of the students and their parents to increase the school's ability to provide for the educational success of their children. The plan will be reviewed and updated annually. Funds will be used to purchase student planners and Communication Folders to facilitate in increasing communication between school and home. Funds will also be used to purchase additional walkie talkies to use during dismissal time. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	Title I - Materials \$3000.00 & Supplies: _____ ACTION BUDGET: \$3000
The district will designate two PARENT/TEACHER CONFERENCES each school year. At the end of the school year, the school will publish a notice in the local newspaper thanking the parents as a group for attending the conferences. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement	Jill Jackson	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
VOLUNTEER RESOURCE BOOK: Administrators, teachers and parents will develop a volunteer resource book including: a parent interest survey, an option for parents to designate how frequently they would participate in the program, and include opportunities for parents to assist from home. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
As required in Act 307, PARENT INVOLVEMENT MEETINGS will be held twice a year to discuss what students will be expected to learn and what the academic standards are, how student's learning will be assessed and how parents can assist to make a difference in his or her child's education. Parents will be provided instruction on how to incorporate developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment. The school's process for RESOLVING PARENTAL CONCERNS will also be discussed, including but not limited to parental concerns in the handbook. To supplement the materials provided by the school for these meetings, the PARENT FACILITATOR will work with grade-level teams to select and purchase	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>curriculum resource materials, appropriate for each grade level, which will support and scaffold student learning at home. These supplemental materials will be provided for low-income families, who otherwise would not be able to purchase them. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>				
<p>The school will engage in other activities to help a parent assist in his or her child's learning which include, but are not limited to hosting PARENT INVOLVEMENT events such as Kindergarten Round Up, Family Week, a Math Club, Curriculum Nights, Book Clubs, Musicals (for grades 1,3,and 5), Back to School Night, Field Day, Kite Day, Spelling Bee, Geography Bee, Read Across America, Graduation, Awards Assembly, and Family Fun Night as ways to raise parent and community involvement and to help parents assist in their child's learning. Funds will be used to purchase any materials, supplies, and prepackaged food needed. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Jennifer Ebert	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<p>Title I - Materials \$8150.00 & Supplies:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$8150</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention through: SURVEY and QUESTIONNAIRE and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The results of the Parent SURVEY/QUESTIONNAIRE indicated that a majority of parents felt there was open communication between parents and teachers through many different outlets, but that teachers needed to continue to offer ways parents can help their children at home with curriculum being taught in the classroom. The above EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrated that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning process of all involved. During the 2010-2011 school year, we plan to use the following protocol of SURVEY and QUESTIONNAIRE in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention. We will use the information obtained to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results in our 2011/2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>ANNUAL TITLE ONE MEETING: Our school will host an annual community meeting to discuss the Title I program. This meeting will be scheduled during the fall of each school</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>year. A sign-in sheet will be kept to document attendance. An agenda will be provided that includes: Goals for the program, Rights of parents to be involved in the planning, review and revision of parent programs (including the school parental involvement policy) School accreditation, coordination of federal programs, the schools academic performance report, overview of the curriculum along with an explanation of the kinds of assessments used. There will be a time for dialogue with our parents and they will be encouraged to ask questions and offer suggestions as they relate to budgeting of all federal monies. Parents will be encouraged to form a partnership with the school. A committee will be formed for the purpose of, annually, revising our school parental involvement policy. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>BUILDING CAPACITY #1: To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership between the school, parents and community, for the purpose of improving student academic achievement we will provide assistance to parents of children served at our school as appropriate in understanding such topics as the State's academic content standards and State academic achievement standards, State and local academic assessments, the requirements of this part, and how to monitor a child's progress and work with educators to improve the achievement of their children. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>BUILDING CAPACITY #2: To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership between the school, parents and community, for the purpose of improving student academic achievement we will provide materials and training to help parents to work with their children to improve their children's achievement, such as literacy training and using technology, as appropriate, to foster parental involvement. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>BUILDING CAPACITY #3: To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership between the school, parents and community, for the purpose of improving student academic achievement we will educate teachers, pupil services personnel, principals, and other staff, with the assistance of parents, in the value and utility of contributions of parents and in how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners, implement and coordinate parent programs, and build ties between parents and the school. Action Type: Equity</p>	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Parental Engagement				
BUILDING CAPACITY #4: To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership between the school, parents and community, for the purpose of improving student academic achievement we will to the extent feasible and appropriate, coordinate and integrate parent involvement programs and activities with Head Start, Reading First, Early Reading First, Even Start, The Home Instruction Programs for Preschool Youngsters, the Parents as Teachers Program, and public preschool and other programs, and conduct other activities, such as parent resource centers, that encourage and support parents in more fully participating in the education of their children. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
BUILDING CAPACITY #5: To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership between the school, parents and community, for the purpose of improving student academic achievement we will insure that information related to school and parents programs, meetings, and other activities is sent to the parents of participating children in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language the parents can understand. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
BUILDING CAPACITY #6: To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership between the school, parents and community, for the purpose of improving student academic achievement we will provide such other reasonable support for parental involvement activities under this section as parents may request. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kelly Wade	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships strategies to improve parent involvement. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	La Tayna Greene	Start: 07/31/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$11150

Priority 6:

1. An analysis of the 2009-2010 data for Fayetteville suggests that there is a possible disproportionate representation of Black students (overrepresented) and White students (underrepresented) within the category of mental retardation. A district identified for disproportionality must under Federal regulations ensure that its current policies, procedures and practices used to identify students for SPED are sound and free of bias with regard to a student's race, ethnicity or linguistic diversity.
2. The comparison between risk rates of African American SPED students to Caucasian

students who are labeled Mentally Retarded:
 African American:
 2007-2008 5.21% 2008-2009 5.33% 2009-2010 5.21%
 Caucasian:
 2007-2008 .34% 2008-2009 .27% 2009-2010 .21%

- Supporting Data:
3. African American Students Labeled MR: 20/50 or 40%. All other ethnicity: 30/50 or 60%.
 4. Referrals 2009-2010: 15% of students referred are African American. 66% of students referred are Caucasian. Placements 2009-2010: 16% of placed students are African American. 66% of placed students are Caucasian.
 5. Currently served students in early-intervention district-wide:
 11/99 = 11% African American
 53/99 = 54% Caucasian

Goal Reduce the relative proportion of African American Students to students of other ethnicity identified as Mentally Retarded.

Benchmark Fayetteville Public Schools will reduce the risk ratio of African American students labeled as Mentally Retarded to below the state target for the 2010-2011 school year.

Intervention: Fayetteville Public Schools will monitor and maintain the number of African American students referred for special education services and identified as mentally retarded by using EARLY INTERVENTION STRATEGIES (Lit coach, Leap Ahead, Read180/System 44), SCHOOL-BASED INTERVENTION TEAMS (Lit coach, interventionist, classroom teacher) and EARLY LITERACY STRATEGIES (ICLE Lin Kuzmich training).

Scientific Based Research: RESEARCH For MAPS testing: Kingsbury Center at NWEA, State Standards and Student Growth: Why State Standards Don't Matter as Much as We Thought, Cronin, Dahlin, Durant and Xiang, Feb. 1, 2010. Linking MAP to State Tests: Proficiency Cut Score Estimation Procedures, NWEA For Early Intervening: Early Intervening An Administrators Guide, National Alliance of Black School Educators, IDEA partnerships, IDEAS that Work, US Office of Special Education Programs, Council for Exceptional Children, ADE, Sped., Coordinated Early Intervening Services Workshop, Hardin, Watkins, Fields, and Smart. October 13, 2008. RTI Guide: Development of Response to Intervention Model in Your School, John McCook, 2006. Coordinated Early Intervention Policy, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, P. Burdette, 2008. For Lit Coaches: The Literacy Coach, A Key to Improving Teaching and Learning in Secondary Schools, E. Sturtevant, Alliance for Excellent Education Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse Program Evaluation – ALL levels Data will be collected on Early Intervening Services provided to all students K-7 Individual Progress Monitoring by RTI teams and Literacy Coaches and analyzed. Instruction and Interventions will be assessed and modified based on analysis of data. Data on Referrals, Evaluations, Disability Categories, and Placements including the race will be collected and analyzed. Curriculum department/Curriculum leaders will review district data routinely regarding progress in core curriculum and Interventions to assess progress. Lit Coaches will review data routinely to assess progress. Modifications to Professional Development plans, Intervention Plans and Intervention Team process will be identified in relation to progress on data and Referral data.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
IDEA Title VI-B (CEIS) funding will be used to partially pay for the LEAP AHEAD program at Owl Creek School. This 3-week summer program will target students district wide who are at least one year behind grade-level in Reading. Students will receive targeted, intensive interventions in small groups. These students will be tracked to monitor progress. This is an early-intervention program meant to prevent students from being inappropriately placed in SPED programs and inappropriately labeled. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Fayetteville Schools will conduct a book study exploring the issues related to cultural diversity and race in the educational realm. The book study will focus on targeted staff, and include "The Courageous Conversation about Race". These efforts will keep all CIAA staff aware of issues related to diverse cultural and ethnic and	Deborah Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

linguistic backgrounds. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education				
The AYP targets for the 2010-2011 year in Literacy in Mathematics will be met by all Special Education Student Sub Populations in the Fayetteville Schools. The AMO targets are as follows: K-5: Literacy: 78.40% Math: 77.50% 6-8: Literacy: 75.70% Math: 73.41% 9-12: Literacy: 75.81% Math: 73.45% Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The district will implement K-2 MAP assessments in order to provide more targeted and explicit instruction in Literacy and all content areas. (Software and Hardware) These materials will be purchased using DISTRICT IDEA title VI-B, coordinated early intervening services funds. Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Elementary, Middle School and Secondary teachers will receive training in core instruction to improve early-intervening Literacy strategies across the district. Elementary Literacy coaches will be involved with the training and coaching and this will be coordinated with SPED cultural diversity and learning environment awareness. Interventionists and Aides will also be involved. Kelly Brown, our specialist involved with coordinated early intervening services, will enhance and expand the problem solving teams work. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who are evaluated for Special Education within the state established time line of 60 days (CHILD FIND) will be 100% for the overall district, the early childhood ages 3-5 and school age 5-21. In the 2009-2010 school year, the school age percentage was 100% which meets the goal from 2009. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Fayetteville Schools will purchase early intervention materials, including Read 180 and System 44 kits, that will be proactive in meeting the needs of all learners in hopes of preventing inappropriate SPED referrals. Action Type: Special Education	Deborah Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Fayetteville schools will employ a national consultant to provide training in improvement of our co-teaching model. These sessions will be aimed at both SPED and general education teachers. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Deborah Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Funding from Title VI-B Coordinated Early	Debra	Start:		

<p>Intervening Services at Asbell Elementary will be used to purchase the following items: English Primary Curriculum Blends and ABC Charts Good Habits/Great Readers Oral Language Reading Word Study and Vocabulary MAP testing licenses Drops for MAP computers MAP testing equipment Total for ASBELL budgeted at the district level: \$18,788.54 Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	Wilson	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Program Evaluation – ALL levels Data will be collected on Early Intervening Services provided to all students K-7 Individual Progress Monitoring by RTI teams and Literacy Coaches and analyzed. Instruction and Interventions will be assessed and modified based on analysis of data. Data on Referrals, Evaluations, Disability Categories, and Placements including the race will be collected and analyzed. Curriculum department/Curriculum leaders will review district data routinely regarding progress in core curriculum and Interventions to assess progress. Lit Coaches will review data routinely to assess progress. Modifications to Professional Development plans, Intervention Plans and Intervention Team process will be identified in relation to progress on data and Referral data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

- Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Business Representative	Joyce Prowell	Ozark Guidance Counselor	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Allison Helton	3rd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Andrea Kitchen	4th Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Ashley Lester	1st Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Becky Roberts	2nd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Carolyn Baughman	2nd Grade	ELL
Classroom Teacher	Christina Brown	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Clarisa Pierce	1st Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Dianna Reyes	2nd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Doyle	3rd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Ebert	1st Grade	ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Jill Jackson	Kindergarten	ELL
Classroom Teacher	Kay Greenwood	2nd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Kelly Wade	4th Grade	ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Lindsey Cloutier	1st Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lorie Huff	5th Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Maranda Seawood	Kindergarten	Parental Engagement
Classroom Teacher	Mary Tannehill	3rd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Pat Shepard	5th Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Priscilla Davenport	Kindergarten	Math
Community Representative	Adriana Kitchen	Student	Wellness
Community Representative	Isaiah Greene	Student	Wellness

District-Level Professional	Christie Jay	Federal Programs Coordinator	ASCIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Sandi Rommel	3rd Grade	ACSIP Leadership
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Ana Ritter	Psych. Examiner	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Ann Grigg	Speech Pathologist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Carlena Lambert	Music	Parental Engagement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Cheyenne Plunkett	Physical Education	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	DJ Rush	Technology Curriculum Specialist	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Ginger Mayes	ESL Teacher	ELL
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jane Skinner	Art	Parental Engagement
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Janette Harris	Media Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Joy Pitts	Cafeteria Manager	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kasi Davis	Literacy Coach	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Katie Young	Resource	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Lucious Selmon	Physical Education	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mary Mitchell	Counselor	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Melissa Harrell	Resource	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mignonne Scarbrough	Gifted Teacher	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sara Blickenstaff	Social Worker	Parental Engagement
Parent	Angie Schuldt	Parent	Wellness
Parent	John Collier	Parent	Parental Engagement
Parent	Kathy Collier	Parent	Community Representative
Principal	La Tayna Greene	Principal	ACSIP Leadership