



2010-2011 ARCHIVE

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

HAPPY HOLLOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2010-2011

Create a learning environment that encourages all children to reach their potential.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will improve in reading comprehension and comprehensive language with additional attention to practical passage. All students will score at the 50th percentile for MAPS in literacy for 2010-2011.

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to Geometry and Algebra. All students will score at the 50th percentile for MAPS in math for 2010-2011.

Priority 3: Wellness

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

Goal: Provide support for families looking for information on health and safety issues, parenting skills and programs available in our community.

Goal: : The new Happy Hollow playground and play area will be made accessible to persons with disabilities, including a track for school and community use.

Priority 4: ELL/Title 3

Goal: ELL students will improve in reading comprehension, fluency, written expression and mathematical skills. Improvement will be shown through increased scores in DIBELS, MAPS, ELDA, Benchmark and MAT-8.

Priority 5: Prevent Disproportionate Representation (Over-identification) 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 become proficient in Literacy achievement, specifically in the area of comprehensive language.

1. Combined Population:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 70 students were tested and 70.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 64 students were tested and 69.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 60 students were tested and 78.0% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area is practical passage.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 43 students were tested and 67.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 24 students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 77.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Caucasian:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 55 students were tested and 76.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 58 students were tested and 72.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 51 students were tested and 82.0% scored proficient or advanced.

LEP:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009 less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 60.0% scored proficient or advanced.

IEP:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009 11 students were tested and 23.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas are: content passage and practical passage.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. Combined Population:

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 66 students were tested and 80.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 59 students were tested and 92% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced.

The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: content passage, practical passage, and literary passage.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 32 students were tested and 65.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 31 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 15 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced.

Caucasian:

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 55 students were tested and 87.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 47 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.
less than 10 IEP students were tested.

1. Combined Population:

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 65 students were tested and 89.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 55 students were tested and 82.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 58 students were tested and 73.0% scored proficient or advanced.

In 2010, the trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: content passage and practical passage. In 2009, the trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area is: content passage. In 2008, the trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice

questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified area is: content passage and practical passage. In 2008, the trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: content passage.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 36 students were tested and 86.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 18 students were tested and 61.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 17 students were tested and 64.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Caucasian:

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 52 students were tested and 96.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 47 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 50 students were tested and 70.0% scored proficient or advanced.

LEP: In 2010, 11 students were tested and 63.0% scored proficient or advanced.

In 2009, 2008:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade K: In 2010, 65 students were tested and 58.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66 students were tested on the MAT8 and 67% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 60 students were tested on the MAT8 and 72% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade K NRT: In 2010, 34 students were tested and 41.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 24 students were tested on the MAT8 and 42% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 32 students were tested on the MAT8 and 69% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade K NRT: In 2010, 48 students were tested and 63.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 56 students were tested on the MAT8 and 75% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 50 students were tested on the MAT8 and 76% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

In 2010, 2009 and 2008:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.

less than 10 IEP students were tested.

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 1: In 2010, 71 students were tested and 54.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 64 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 45.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 54 students were tested on the ITBS and 48.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, 33 students were tested and 27.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 24.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 23 students were tested on the ITBS and 39.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, 61 students were tested and 62.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 52 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 50.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 42 students were tested on the ITBS and 48.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Hispanic:

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 10.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2009:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.
less than 10 LEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.

IEP: In 2010, 10 students were tested and 40.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, and 2008:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension, Grade 2: In 2010, 58 students were tested and 48.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 65 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 39.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 64 students were tested on the ITBS and 39.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, 35 students were tested and 37.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 34 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 32.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 25 students were tested on the ITBS and 20.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, 49 students were tested and 59.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 51 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 42.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 54 students were tested on the ITBS and 44.4% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

**Supporting
Data:**

Students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP):

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

Hispanic:

Grade 2 NRT: In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 10.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

IEP:

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 10.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

In 2010 and 2009:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.

In 2008 and 2010:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Comprehensive Language and Reading Comprehension, Grade 3: In 2010, 70 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 29.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 52.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 64 students were tested and 39.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 71.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 60 students were tested on the ITBS and 61.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above. An analysis of the 2010 data Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area of concern: practical passage.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, 43 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 27.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 23

students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 26 students were tested on the ITBS and 57.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above. An analysis of the 2010 data Content sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area of concern: comprehensive language.

Caucasian:

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, 54 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 57.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 57 students were tested and 74.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 51 students were tested on the ITBS and 64.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

LEP:

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, 10 students were tested on the ITBS and 40.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

IEP:

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, 10 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 20.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 20.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 18.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 30.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, and 2008:

less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension and Comprehensive Language Grade 4: In 2010, 66 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 35.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 74.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 59 students were tested and 45.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 75.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 54 students were tested on the ITBS and 77.8% had an NPR score of 50, or above. An analysis of the 2010 data Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area of concern: practical passage.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 4 NRT: In 2010, 32 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 29.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 31 students were tested and 87.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 16 students were tested on the ITBS and 56.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above. An analysis of the 2010 data Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area of concern: comprehensive language.

Caucasian:

Grade 4 NRT: In 2010, 55 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 40.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 94.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 47 students were tested on the ITBS and 80.9% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

In 2010, 2009, and 2008:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.
less than 10 LEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Reading Comprehension and Comprehensive Language Grade 5: In 2010, 65 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 52.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 73.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 55 students were tested and 57.0% scored proficient or advanced in Comprehensive Language and 71.0% in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 56 students were tested on the ITBS and 69.6% had an NPR score of 50, or above. An analysis of the 2010 data Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area

of concern: content.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 5 NRT: In 2010, 36 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 18 students were tested and 16.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 18 students were tested on the ITBS and 61.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above. An analysis of the 2010 data Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area of concern: comprehensive language.

Caucasian:

Grade 5 NRT: In 2010, 52 students were tested on the ACTAAP and 57.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 47 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 50 students were tested on the ITBS and 70.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

LEP:

Grade 5 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 11 students were tested and 38.0% scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, and 2008:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

In 2010, LEP students were tested and 38% had a score of proficient or advanced on the ACTAAP exam. An analysis of the 2010 data Content Sub Skill and Skill Cluster performance reveals the following areas of concern: practical passage and content.

1. Attendance/Graduation Rate: In 2009, the attendance rate was 95.43%. In 2008, the attendance rate was 91.13%.

Goal All students will improve in reading comprehension and comprehensive language with additional attention to practical passage. All students will score at the 50th percentile for MAPS in literacy for 2010-2011.

Benchmark The combined population in grades 3-5 MET the 2010 AYP target of 71.2% scoring Proficient/Advanced in overall literacy. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP target of 75% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. Each of the sub populations met the AMO target of 71.2% for Literacy and it is expected that each sub population will meet the AMO target of 85.0% Proficient or Advanced in the 2011-2012 school year.

Intervention: To provide teachers with quality professional development that will promote and enhance learning opportunities for students; and for other purposes.				
Scientific Based Research: Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development" Joellen Killion ,2002, www.nsd.org; "Assessing Impact of Professional Development on Teaching and Students", Seth Aldrich, Ph.D, 2004, www.programevaluation.org				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: The following professional development will be provided: 6 hours of technology, 2 hours of parental involvement and 2 hours of Arkansas History for teachers. Administrators are required to attend 3 hours of parental involvement, 6 hours of technology and training in data disaggregation, instructional leadership and fiscal management.	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
Teachers are provided with weekly instructional meeting time in order to plan for the implementation of best practices chosen to help improve student achievement at each student's readiness level. This planning time will be provided during the course of the day. One faculty meeting date a month will be reserved for vertical and horizontal team meetings. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
HIGHLY QUALIFIED: The school will continue to hire and maintain "highly qualified" teachers, support staff and substitutes. 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. Title I funds will be used to supplement professional development training in the area of literacy by hiring qualified substitutes. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: ITBS, SAT-10, DIBELS, and Benchmark scores to determine training effectiveness and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Throughout the school year, professional development will be provided for teachers and staff: Technology training, Parent Involvement training, weekly instructional meetings to implement Best Practices, monthly faculty meetings for vertical/horizontal teaming, curriculum alignment development training as needed using ITBS, SAT-10, DIBELS, and Benchmark scores to determine training effectiveness. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012	Sharon Pepple, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation				
The following teachers: music, art, Physical Education, speech, Special Education, ESL and media specialist will attend professional development that will enhance student learning and support the Comprehensive Literacy Model, Everyday Math, Science and Social Studies curriculum in our ACSIP. Action Type: Professional Development	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$3000.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$3000
COLLABORATION among teachers will occur by holding frequent meetings where we obtain feedback and ask for guidance in policy making. Our teachers meet once monthly for the purpose of engaging in data analysis. We continually seek to support an educational climate whereby all our staff feels they have a voice in how we shape the instructional program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$3000

Intervention: Parent Involvement Plan ACT 307 National PTA Standards 1998. Family Literacy Involvement Act.

Scientific Based Research: Parent Involvement Plan ACT 307 National PTA Standards 1998.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The school will have a designated area to be used as the Parent Center. Parenting books, magazines and other informative material regarding responsible parenting will be available for parents to borrow for review. Parent Center materials, which may include, but not limited to brochures, pamphlets, or computers for use on site, will be designated by each building. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers and instructional aides will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parental involvement strategies. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Susan Lane, Parent Facilitator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
As required by Act 307, all parents will receive INFORMATIONAL PACKETS that include: *Parental Involvement Plan *School Calendar *A system encouraging the home and school connection. In addition to the state-required Family Kit, federal funds will supplement with reading and math manipulatives and children's book will be purchased for each student to take home and keep, and additional informational flyers will be copied and sent home to families as the school receives them in order to share information regarding community services and events. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Susan Lane, Parent Facilitator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

All parents will be invited to an Open House Night to welcome parents and students to our school and to share expectations for the school year. The SCHOOLS PROCESS FOR RESOLVING PARENTAL CONCERNS will be discussed at this meeting. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Ben Crozier, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
The PTO will hold Parent/Teacher meetings will be held throughout the year to discuss what students will be expected to learn, how they will be assessed and how parents can assist to make difference in his or her child's education. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Administrators, teachers, and parents will develop a parental involvement plan addressing the diverse needs of the parents and their children. The plan will be reviewed and updated annually. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Susan Lane, Parent Facilitator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
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 grade level newsletters thanking the parents as a group for attending the conferences. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Mary Margaret Fox, Speech Pathologist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
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 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. Effectiveness will be documented by results of parental involvement survey. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Under Act 1220, the school will form a health advisory committee that will meet two times a year. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PARENT EXPLANATION: An annual meeting will be held to inform parents of the right of parents to be involved in planning, review, and improvement of parent programs and a description and explanation will be given of the curriculum used in the school, types of assessment and proficiency levels. In addition, parents will be involved in the annual planning of school improvement programs. Annual surveys will evaluate the parent involvement activities. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
To help our parents in assisting their children our school shall: Schedule regular PARENTAL	Sharon Pepple,	Start: 07/01/2010		—————

<p>INVOLVEMENT MEETINGS at which parents are given a report on the state of the school and an overview of: A. What students will be learning. B. How students are assessed. C. What parents should expect for their child's education and D. How a parent can assist and make a difference in their child's education. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Principal	End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: parent surveys, memos, open house, emails, school newsletters, P/T conferences, parent resource center, school calendars, school website, student Thursday folders, and family night feedback and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Parent involvement data will be collected by the parent facilitator through parent survey, memos, open house, emails, school newsletters, P/T conferences, parent resource centers, school calendar, school website, student Thursday folders, and family night feedback through out the school year through documentation of attendance increase at PTO meetings, PTO membership, P/T conferences and website visitors. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 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>	Sharon Pepple, principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

Total Budget:	\$0
---------------	-----

Intervention: Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum

Scientific Based Research: Barton, M.L. and Heidema, C., Teaching Reading in Mathematics (2002); Beers, K. and Samuels, B.G. (eds.), Teaching Reading in the Content Areas; Krashen, S.(2002), The Power of Reading; McLaughlin, M. and Vogt, M.E. (eds.)(1993), Harvey, Stephanie and Goudvis, Anne, Strategies that Work (1999)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Under guidance of highly qualified teachers, assistance from one .4 FTE highly-qualified Instructional Aide, provide opportunities for independent and group research projects that are integrated with classroom instruction and that result in demonstrations that show	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Office ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Public Library ● School Library ● Teachers 	Title I - Employee \$15752.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$4500.00 Benefits:

reading comprehension skills as well as content knowledge. Action Type: Technology Inclusion				ACTION BUDGET: \$20252
Learning teams/Grade level teams and technology staff will meet to review student work, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students to achieve proficiency in reading in the content areas using grade level checklists. Action Type: Professional Development	Jill Phillips, Literacy Coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will use formative performance assessments and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding to practical and content passages by finding the main idea, interpreting, analyzing, drawing conclusions, and providing examples and use of correct mechanics and usage. Action Type: Alignment	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Utilize Literacy Lab strategies to integrate instruction in reading comprehension strategies into science and social studies context through the use of supplemental texts. Action Type: Alignment	Randy VanVranken, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$4000.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$4000
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve reading skills. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Mary Margaret Fox, Speech Pathologist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Incorporate reading comprehension skills and strategies from the Arkansas Frameworks into the curriculum and align vertically from kindergarten through fifth grade using District Curriculum. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Angela Evans, Technology Curriculum Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All classroom teachers, Title I, ESL, Special Education, Media Specialist, and other support staff will participate in ongoing professional development in reading; (Step Up to Writing, Accelerated Reader, STAR Reading Program, Reading First program, and travel to observe at school sites). Title II funds will be used to	Jill Phillips, Literacy Coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$520.00 Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$2000.00 Title II-A - Purchased Services: \$3240.00

provide substitute pay so teachers can have vertical and grade level collaboration and provide opportunities to visit other classrooms. Action Type: Professional Development				ACTION BUDGET: \$5760
Use technology (Palm Pilots, Nokias, Elmos, projectors, i-pads, and computer lab) to access information for content learning, develop reading skills, and publish student work. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Angela Evans, Technology Curriculum Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Public Library School Library Teaching Aids 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$10692.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$10692
Provide access to a rich collection of diverse resources on curriculum topics for reading integration through the school library. Action Type: Collaboration	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office School Library Teachers Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$6000.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$6000
Purchase upgrades for formative programs like Accelerated Reader and STAR Literacy software, etc., and new books to supplement the Accelerated Reader program, which support reading comprehension and writing in all content areas. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers School Library Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$5000.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$5000
K-5 teachers will hold yearly Parent/Teacher meetings to introduce the parents of students to reading and writing curriculum. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Ben Crozier, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with the Fayetteville Public Library to provide tutoring services throughout the year and the Summer Reading Program to motivate students to read throughout the summer. Provide information to parents. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Leaders Public Library School Library Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Conduct Parent/Teacher special education conferences for Head Start students before enrollment in kindergarten. Action Type: Special Education	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Summative:K-5 identified as at-risk based on spring SAT-10 (total reading);Formative: DIBELS and or STAR; and 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Benchmark exam. At-risk students' progress discussed at weekly grade-level meetings. Interventions documented with strategies and support. (ie. Hawks' Retreat, Early Bird, Title I, ESL, Tutoring), DRA, DSA or STAR	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

assessments used to monitor yearly gains. Action Type: AIP/IRI				
Utilize a 1.0 FTE Literacy Coach trained using the AR Reading First Literacy Coach model and Smart Start Literacy Lab model. Literacy protocols will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of our comprehensive literacy plan using classroom visits, modeling of instructional practices, and providing focused professional development for teachers in areas of identified need. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	Title I - Employee \$38000.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$10175.00 Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$48175
We are currently collaborating with parents to develop student AIP's. Any student that scores below proficient on state mandated criterion referenced exams and any other student identified by classroom teachers will have an AIP. Action Type: AIP/IRI	Tammy Scribner, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Formative Assessments: 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 Arkansas Comprehensive Literacy Model, a scientifically based reading program. Summative Assessment: The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) will be administered to all K-2 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.	Tonya Lopez, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>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 small group and one on one tutoring using scientifically based reading interventions. 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-monthly until proficiency occurs. Students who are not meeting current expectations shall be provided additional interventions. Each parent, or guardian, will be notified in writing when their child has been identified with a substantial reading deficiency. Action Type: Equity</p>				
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: collection of written or oral responses, using a rubric, Diagnostic Reading Assessment, and DIBELS and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Daily, teachers collect written or oral response to Reaing Across the Curriculum using a rubric, Diagnostic Reading Assessment, DIBELS, and MAPS. We will use tabulation of rubrics and DRA scores at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to assess grade level progress. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

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: Program Evaluation				
Under guidance of highly-qualified teachers, assistance from one .6FTE highly-qualified behavior interventionist will help teachers by providing behavioral strategies for tier two and tier three students. These students will be identified through the SST team and certified teachers. Action Type: Collaboration	Lora Nanak, Behavior Interventionist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	Title I - Employee \$13894.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$3900.00 Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$17794
Total Budget:				\$117673

Intervention: Reading First trained Literacy Coach to assist staff.

Scientific Based Research: Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read, Put Reading First (2000); National Institute for Literacy, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; The US Department of Education, Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children (1998); National Research Council, Beginning to Read,(1994) Marilyn J. Adams.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
District Liaison will work with building liaison to build community and parent support and involvement activities. (i.e. Developing Capable People, Watchdog Dads) Action Type: Parental Engagement	Susan Lane, Classroom Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Leaders • Public Library • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
SCHOOLWIDE REFORM STRATEGIES: Compare and analyze the summative and formative scores on the literacy portion of the benchmark, SAT-10, DRA, Reading 3D, and DIBELS exams to the aligned curriculum to identify areas of weakness and gaps in the curriculum during weekly grade-level block schedule. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use formative performance assessments and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding to practical, content, and literary passages by finding the main idea, interpreting, analyzing, drawing conclusions, and providing examples and evidence. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Susan Lane, Classroom Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, Literacy Coach, and other support staff and Great Expectations staff, Reading First, and Literacy Lab will differentiate strategies for students. Action Type: Collaboration	Jill Phillips, Literacy Coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Utilize a highly qualified aide to assist students with independent and group library research projects that are integrated with classroom instruction and that result in demonstrations that show reading comprehension skills as well as content knowledge. Action Type: Alignment	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use technology to access information, develop reading skills, and publish student work. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use technology to motivate students to read through Accelerated Reader, Playaways, and other district-approved software. This will enrich the comprehensive literacy instruction in the classrooms and provide a variety of opportunities for students to improve their skills. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Pam Skelton, Classroom Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers 	Title I - Materials \$5000.00 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$5000
Teachers map their instruction in reading and collaborate to evaluate alignment with district curriculum and state frameworks on in-service days. Action Type: Professional Development	Jill Phillips , Literacy Coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Provide access to a rich collection of diverse resources and leveled books through the school library and Literacy Lab. Action Type: Equity	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Library • Teachers 	Title I - Materials \$5000.00 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$5000
K-5 teachers will hold parent meetings to introduce parents to the reading curriculum, and to provide handouts and take home materials. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Ben Crozier, Classroom Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers and support staff will participate in ongoing professional development including training in programs such as the Arkansas Reading First, Early Success, Step Up to Writing, Smart Start, Literacy Lab, CEC and Special Education Conferences, Library Inservices and Conferences, Literacy Coach, Year Round Education Conference, Reading Conference, ELLA, ELL, Effective Literacy, Accelerated Reader, and Reading First workshops/training, Reading First Annual Conference, National Pre-K Conference and other Pre-K Conferences, and other support staff workshops for teachers of at-risk students, Workshop registration and substitute teachers will be paid in order for staff to attend. Action Type: Professional	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	Title I - Purchased \$1790.00 Services: Title I - Materials \$170.00 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$1960

Development				
Conduct Parent/Teacher special education conferences for Head Start students before enrollment in kindergarten. Action Type: Special Education	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: the Professional Development Assistant from the state monitors and observation protocols and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Once a month the Professional Development Assistant from the state monitors the Literacy Coach's observation protocols of the classroom teachers by reviewing and comparing observed protocol to observed teaching of core instruction, test scores, and implementation of a comprehensive literature program in the classroom. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$11960
Intervention: Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas (ELLA) and Effective Literacy				
Scientific Based Research: Atwell, N., In the Middle, (1998); Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S., Guiding Readers and Writers for Grades 3-6,(2001)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Formative Assessment: Monitor use of CAPS Skills , Developmental Reading Assessment, DIBELS, standardized tests, and classroom assessments to evaluate student progress, pre, mid, and post grades. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
During grade level meetings	Sharon	Start:	• Central Office	

classroom, Resource, ESL, Literacy Coach, Music, Art and Library teachers will work together with principal and Title I instructional assistants to support ELLA and EL strategies. Action Type: Collaboration	Pepple, Principal	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • School Library • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implement Literacy Lab, Arkansas Comprehensive Literacy Model, ELLA, EL balanced-literacy skills and strategies in K-5 (when appropriate). We will purchase leveled reading materials to support these programs. Action Type: Professional Development	Jill Phillips, Literacy Coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & \$2257.00 Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$2257
Provide materials to inform parents of the Arkansas Comprehensive Literacy Model, ELLA and EL strategies and programs used for reading and writing at parent/teacher meetings. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Tammy Scribner, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & \$200.00 Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$200
Purchase guided reading books, leveled Accelerated Reader books, and writing supplies for implementation. Action Type: Alignment	Jill Phillips, Literacy Coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff 	Title I - Materials & \$3508.00 Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$3508
Identify highly-qualified K-1 teachers and Title I instructional assistants to be trained in Literacy Lab, ELLA, and EL, the Arkansas Comprehensive Literacy Model, and Let's Talk About It. (oral language) Action Type: Professional Development	Jill Phillips, literacy coach	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Purchase well-reviewed trade books for the library and professional library to support implementation of ELLA, EL, and the Arkansas Comprehensive Literacy Model strategies. Action Type: Professional Development	Dana Troutt, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • School Library • Teachers 	Title I - Materials & \$2500.00 Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$2500
Utilize highly qualified .55 FTE instructional aide to provide supplemental instruction to "at risk" students . Instructional aide will be under the direction of literacy coach. Action Type: Equity	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	Title I - Employee \$5459.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$1500.00 Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$6959
Learning teams/ Grade level teams will meet to review student work, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and align instructional objectives to assist all students to achieve proficiency in literacy skills.	Tonya Lopez, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Professional Development				
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve literacy skills. Action Type: Special Education	Mary Margaret Fox, Speech Pathologist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Use summative standardized tests and classroom formative assessments to evaluate student progress. Use SAT 10, the Primary Benchmark Exam (grade 4), and the K-5 DIBELS Assessment to evaluate student progress in literacy. Document pre, mid and post grade level. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Performance Assessments 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
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 formative assessment techniques based upon the theories of early childhood growth and development. Each kindergarten classroom will have a ½ or full-time instructional assistant to support this process. Parent meetings will be held with all parents and students at the beginning of the school year and teachers will maintain contact with the parents on a regular basis and arrange for additional conferences with parents as needed. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Tonya Lopez, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
MEASURES TO INCLUDE TEACHERS IN DECISIONS: 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: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers • Title 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.	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: progress monitoring performance of at risk learners and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Every two weeks teachers/instructional aides progress monitor student performance of at risk learners in reading, using DIBELS, and compare growth in reading comprehension and fluency rates. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

Total Budget:	\$15424
---------------	---------

Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy Model

Scientific Based Research: National Diffusion Network (2000), Fountas, Pinnell, Guiding Readers and Writers (1995)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Utilizing certified staff,implement one week Intersession remediation classes three times per year to assist all students to achieve proficiency in reading and writing in the content areas. These services are supplemental instructional services for students, and they are offered at four times during the school year during school breaks. Students are invited to participate in these special classes based upon targeted needs and certified staff will be hired to provide the remediation. Action Type: Equity	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	Title I - Employee \$4000.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$1100.00 Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$5100
Parent/Student Evaluation survey for Intersession and CLC will provide information needed to extend learning	Pam Skelton, classroom	Start: 07/01/2010 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Leaders Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

through Intercession remediation classes. Action Type: Parental Engagement	teacher	06/30/2011		
Use formative performance assessments and open-ended (constructed) responses with rubrics to enable students to demonstrate proficiency in responding in writing to literary, practical and content passages by finding the main idea, interpreting, analyzing, drawing conclusions, and providing examples of evidence using Arkansas rubrics to analyze progress and Arkansas Scoring Guide. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Tammy Scribner, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and/or special needs to improve writing skills. Action Type: Special Education	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Performance Assessments • School Library • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Integrate instruction in writing strategies into every content area using response journals, learning logs, story tablets, and to instruct students on quick writes, district writing prompts, math constructed (open) response questions, etc. Action Type: Alignment	Randy VanVranken, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers map their writing instruction as a separate component of their content instruction maps and check their maps for alignment with the K-12 curriculum. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Pam Skelton, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Participate in ongoing professional development in writing, including training in programs such as Arkansas Comprehensive Literacy Model, Literacy Lab, and Step Up to Writing. Action Type: Professional Development	Tonya Lopez, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: DIBELS, writing prompts, DSA and DRA whole group classroom screeners and summative Benchmark scores determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the	Tammy Scribner, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Three times a year or as needed, the Literacy Coach/classroom teachers will use DIBELS, writing prompts, DSA and DRA whole group classroom screeners to determine data for grouping students according to their literacy needs. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

Total Budget:	\$5100
---------------	--------

Intervention: Curriculum Mapping and Alignment

Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Curriculum. Big Picture (1997), and Active Literacy Across the Curriculum (2006)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Align the curriculum with the Arkansas Content Frameworks through vertical and horizontal mapping during weekly grade level meetings. Action Type: Collaboration	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Performance Assessments Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Communicate expectations and student progress to parents through classroom assignment sheets, parent-teacher conferences, graded work, newsletters, and Web access to the curriculum. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ben Crozier, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Performance Assessments Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the school's curriculum. Action Type: Equity	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
POINT IN TIME REMEDIATION: There will be an annual review of data from SAT 10 and Benchmark scores to analyze areas of weakness and address sub skills, content clusters, subtest and subgroups that may need to be addressed in the curriculum mapping process. Other indicators will also be analyzed. An annual review and adjustment to the curriculum maps will be made according to gaps and/or duplications noted from the data analysis. Progress will be monitored using formative classroom running records, quarterly assessment and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance for children scoring below proficiency.	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>Evaluate vertical and horizontal mapping of curriculum in the classroom with district curriculum and state frameworks on a semester basis. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Randy VanVranken, classroom teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</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>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: annual review of data from running records, DIBELS, SAT 10, and Benchmark scores and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: During weekly grade level meeting, teachers will align the district Literacy curriculum with the Arkansas Content Frameworks through vertical and horizontal mapping. Annual review of data from running records, DIBELS, SAT 10, and Benchmark</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>scores will be used to analyze areas of weakness. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program."</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Closing the Achievement Gap (Literacy): Regular monthly meetings of our (Literacy) ACSIP Leadership Committee will continue to be held. These meetings will focus on building capacity within our school. Each meeting agenda will include the following Core Principles: A. The selection, and continuous evaluation, of research-based, scientifically validated, Interventions designed to improve our ability to improve student performance on the Literacy portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along with a sign-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention, and Action, is carefully monitored...through the collection of Formative and Summative Data....so that those strategies that prove ineffective can be revised, or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each spring, and fall, in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$-</p>
<p>ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS (AIP): Appropriate teachers and/or other school personnel knowledgeable about the student's academic performance shall evaluate students identified as scoring below proficient on the State Criterion Reference (CRT) exams. The student's parents will be contacted for the purpose of working jointly with school personnel in developing an Academic Improvement Plan. (AIP) Formative and Summative Assessment Data will be used to create a plan that includes standards-based, supplemental, remedial strategies designed to assist the student in scoring proficient on the next administration of the CRT Exam. Regular classroom teachers will be the first to implement the components of these plans. A variety of additional resources will also be used to support the student. Highly qualified staff will provide instruction. The AIP will be monitored and adjusted as the student makes progress. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM/PROCESS USED TO REMEDIATE STUDENTS: Early Bird, computer lab, reading</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

specialists, Title I instructional aides, ESL, Speech, Special Education Action Type: AIP/IRI				
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the K-5 grade Augmented Benchmark and 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, Disciplinary, 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. Our 2009 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. 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. 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.</p> <p>Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 2: Improving mathematics achievement, specifically in the area of Open Response.

1. Combined Population:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 70 students were tested and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 64 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 40 students were tested and 78.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Economically Disadvantaged:

In 2010, 43 students were tested and 76.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 24 students were tested and 63.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 77.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Caucasian:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 55 students were tested and 92.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 57 students were tested and 86.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 51 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced.

IEP:

In 2010, 10 students were tested and 27.0% scored proficient or advanced.
In 2009, 10 students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced.
In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

LEP:

Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. Combined Population:

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 66 students were tested and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 59 students were tested and 93.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 32 students were tested and 75.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 31 students were tested and 94.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 15 students were tested and 67.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Caucasian:

Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 55 students were tested and 90.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 96.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 43 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. Combined Population:

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 65 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 55 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 58 students were tested and 73% scored proficient or advanced.

Economically Disadvantaged:

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 36 students were tested and 86.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 22 students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 17 students were tested and 47.0% scored proficient or advanced.

Caucasian:

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 52 students were tested and 92.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 47 students were tested and 82.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 50 students were tested and 78.0% scored proficient or advanced.

LEP:

Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 11 students were tested and 81.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.
less than 10 African-American students were tested.
less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade K: In 2010, 65 students were tested on the MAT8 and 38% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 66 students were tested on the MAT8 and 55% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 60 students were tested on the MAT8 and 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade K NRT: In 2010, 34 students were tested on the MAT8 and 20% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 24 students were tested on the MAT8 and 29% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 32 students were tested on the MAT8 and 56% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade K NRT: In 2010, 48 students were tested on the MAT8 and 41% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 56 students were tested on the MAT8 and 63% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 50 students were tested on the MAT8 and 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

In 2010, 2009 and 2008:

less than 10 LEP students were tested.

less than 10 IEP students were tested.

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 1: In 2010, 71 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 59% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 64 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 52.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 54 students were tested on the ITBS and 61.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, 33 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 35% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 38 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 40.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 23 students were tested on the ITBS and 47.8% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, 61 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 62% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 52 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 62.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 42 students were tested on the ITBS and 66.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Supporting
Data:

LEP:

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 10.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

Hispanic:

Grade 1 NRT: We have no data for 2010. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 0.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

IEP:

Grade 1 NRT: In 2010, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, and 2008:

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 2: In 2010, 58 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 63.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 65 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 70.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 64 students were tested on the ITBS and 70.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, 35 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 51.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 34 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 64.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 25 students were tested on the ITBS and 56.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, 49 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 75.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2009, 51 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 78.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above. In 2008, 54 students were tested on the ITBS and 72.2% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP):

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2009, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

IEP:

Grade 2 NRT: In 2010, fewer than 10 students were tested. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 30.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Hispanic:

Grade 2 NRT: In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 30.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 3: In 2010, 70 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 64 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 60 students were tested on the ITBS and 81.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES): In 2010, 43 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 76.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 24 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 62.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested on the ITBS and 80.8% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, 55 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 92.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 57 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 86.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 51 students were tested on the ITBS and 82.4% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

LEP:

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, less than 10 students were tested. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, 10 students were tested on the ITBS and 80.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

IEP:

Grade 3 NRT: In 2010, 10 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 27.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 10 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 African-American students were tested.

less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 4: In 2010, 66 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 59 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 93.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54 students were tested on the ITBS and 77.8% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 4 NRT: In 2010, 32 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 75.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 31 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 93.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 16 students were tested on the ITBS and 56.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 4 NRT: In 2010, 55 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 90.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 96.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 47 students were tested on the ITBS and 78.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.

less than 10 LEP students were tested.
 less than 10 African-American students were tested.
 less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Total Math, Grade 5: In 2010, 65 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 87.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 55 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 85.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 56 students were tested on the ITBS and 69.6% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Economically Disadvantaged (SES):

Grade 5 NRT: In 2010, 36 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 86.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 18 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 61.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 18 students were tested on the ITBS and 66.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Caucasian:

Grade 5 NRT: In 2010, 52 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 92.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 47 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 50 students were tested on the ITBS and 72.0% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

LEP:

Grade 5 NRT: In 2010, 11 students were tested on the ACTAAP exam and 81.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested.

In 2010, 2009, 2008:

less than 10 IEP students were tested.
 less than 10 African-American students were tested.
 less than 10 Hispanic students were tested.

1. Attendance/Graduation Rate: In 2009, the attendance rate was 94.95%. In 2008, the attendance rate was 91.13%.

Goal All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to Geometry and Algebra. All students will score at the 50th percentile for MAPS in math for 2010-2011.

Benchmark The combined population in grades 2-5 MET the 2010 AYP target of 62.5% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet or exceed the 2011 AYP target of 77.0% scoring proficient/advanced or make the necessary gains to invoke "Safe Harbor" or "Growth."

Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (McGraw-Hill); A Research-Based Curriculum (2007)				
Scientific Based Research: The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell (2005)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Implement Everyday Mathematics lessons and grade-level formative assessments in kindergarten through fifth grade classrooms. Action Type: Alignment	Sara Alderson, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Learning teams/Grade level groups will meet weekly to review student work, share effective teaching and assessment strategies, and research-based materials, and align instructional objectives to assist all students to achieve proficiency in mathematics. Action Type: Professional Development	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff will	Angela Evans,	Start: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff 	Title I -

collaborate to implement differentiated strategies for students with Academic Improvement Plans and /or special needs to improve mathematics skills through mathematics tutorial software. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Technology Curriculum Specialist	End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments 	Materials & Supplies: \$1000.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$1000
Summative- Use of norm-referenced tests and the "release items" from the Benchmark Exam (Grades 3,4,5) to evaluate student achievement. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Krishna Crawford, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will be provided math professional development training to better assist low performing students within intervention groups. Programs including Mastering Math, and test-taking strategies. Action Type: Equity	Gail Willits, Counselor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with parents and other community leaders to provide enrichment classes and point in time remediation in order to extend learning beyond the required school calendar. These Intersessions will occur three times per year; one week each session. Title I funds will be used to provide bus transportation for intersession field trips. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Leaders • Public Library 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Conduct Parent/Teacher special education conference for Head Start students before enrollment in kindergarten. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluate implementation of Everyday Math program in classroom instruction using various assessment tools including quarterly formative assessments. Analysis of data will be presented and discussed regularly. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sara Alderson, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each teacher will follow a curriculum map for their classroom mathematics instruction. Teachers will use MAPS assessments to monitor alignment Action Type: Alignment	Angela Evans, Technology Curriculum Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Summative 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	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: During the 2009-2010 School Year we used Benchmark scores as the evaluation tool to determine whether this Intervention/Program was effective in improving student achievement. We plan to use the same protocol for assessing the Intervention/Program and making decisions that impact the various activities, as described in the action descriptions, during the 2010-2011 School Year. In order to measure student growth and determine the EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INTERVENTION/PROGRAM We will administer MAPS Assessments. We will report the results in our 2011-2012 Plan and use the results to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) reached and to set a standard for future expectations. The evaluation results will be used to impact the decisions we make that affect our future instructional program. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Sara Alderson, classroom teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$1000</p>

Intervention: Mathematics Open-Ended Problem-Solving Strategies

Scientific Based Research: Smart Step, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Principles and Standards for School Mathematics, and Assessment Standards for School Mathematics (2004)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Teachers will implement mathematics problem-solving strategies during Intersession and in the classroom to measure student growth and development of problem solving skills, and post formative -assessment each quarter to monitor growth. Action Type: Alignment</p>	<p>Sara Alderson, classroom teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF PROGRAMS: K-5 students identified as at-risk based on spring summative assessments, and or 4th grade Benchmark Exam. At-risk student interventions and progress discussed at weekly grade-level meetings. (i.e. Hawks' Retreat, Intersession, Title I, BLT, Math Resource Library, tutor, ESL, Early Bird) Supplemented math materials, manipulatives, and copy cost will be purchased to support intervention programs. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Teachers will attend math workshops or conferences that address district curriculum and state standards. Then contribute samples to the library of math resources for each grade level for teachers to use.</p>	<p>Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● Teachers 	<p>Title I - Materials \$1500.00 & Supplies:</p> <p>_____</p>

Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development					ACTION BUDGET: \$1500
Evaluate effectiveness of problem-solving strategies using formative performance assessments, open-ended math prompts, etc., on a quarterly basis. Share results with parents through grade reports, progress reports, parent/teacher conference, Thursday folders including special education students. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers 		ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: using the Benchmark Prep grades 3-5 and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Weekly, teachers and students work together using the Benchmark Prep and MAPS results grades 3-5, to develop strategies to work open ended Problem-solving math questions and determine effectiveness using whole group observations, scoring and progress on Benchmark exams. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011			ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:					\$1500
Intervention: Computation/Procedures: Utilizing Everyday Math Games and small group instruction,					
Scientific Based Research: The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell (2005)					
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds	
Utilize technology staff to review available research on instructional strategies and instructional materials proven to be effective in improving math computation through district-approved software.	Linda Fritz, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers • Outside Consultants • Public 		ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Technology Inclusion			Library ● Teachers	
Integrate supplemental computational strategies and materials into the daily math program through Everyday Math games, Accelerated Math, and Math Worksheet Factory. Action Type: Alignment	Krishna Crawford, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Computers ● Teachers	Title I - Materials & \$2500.00 Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$2500
Collaborate with parents and other community leaders to provide support through Watchdog Dads and parent tutoring program. Information flyers, refreshments for meetings, and tutoring notebooks of resources will be provided. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Community Leaders ● Computers ● Public Library ● School Library ● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Evaluate student progress in grade level appropriate computation on a regular basis supplemented with Early Bird lab. Communicate progress and continuing areas of development to parents using a quarterly checklist, interim reports, and weekly take home folders and parent conferences. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Block schedule weekly grade level meetings to evaluate effectiveness of supplemental computation strategies in improving overall math achievement. Action Type: Collaboration	Cheryl Sewell, classroom teacher; Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Teachers ● Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Certified staff, will progress monitor at risk students and provide intervention strategies. A highly qualified 1.0 FTE instructional aide will provide interventions. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sara Alderson, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	● Performance Assessments ● Teachers	Title I - Employee \$16653.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$4700.00 Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$21353
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: collection of individual student data using Benchmark test scores and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: MAPS computer	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

print-outs showing student progress of individually programmed math interventions. Teachers will collect individual student data three times a year using MAPS. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				\$23853

Intervention: Curriculum Mapping and Alignment				
Scientific Based Research: Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, 1997.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
There will be an annual review of data from summative ITBS and Benchmark scores to analyze areas of weakness. An annual review and adjustment to the curriculum maps will be made. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
After 2010 curriculum maps are completed, grade level teams, special areas:(special education, speech, ESL, counselor, music, P.E., art, technology), special education, and cross grade-level meetings will be held to correct gaps and duplications. District horizontal and vertical alignment will align to the Arkansas State Frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will identify and apply grade level correlations of all academic areas. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will plan and coordinate instructional objectives for specific instructional units at grade level meetings. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the school's curriculum.	Nicole Geopfert, Special Education Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: annual review of data from SAT 10 and Benchmark scores and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. WE believe the	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		————— ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the MAPS assessments in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: During weekly grade level meetings, teachers will align the district math curriculum with the Arkansas Content Frameworks through vertical and horizontal mapping. Annual review of data from MAPS, SAT 10, and Benchmark scores will be used to analyze areas of weakness. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program." Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Closing the Achievement Gap (Math): Regular monthly meetings of our (Math) 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 Math portion of all Assessments. B. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. C. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. D. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Written minutes of each meeting, along with a sign-in sheet, will be kept and made available upon request. The intent is that each Intervention, and Action, is carefully monitored... through the collection of Formative and Summative Data....so that those strategies, which prove ineffective, can be revised, or abandoned. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised each spring, and fall, in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/30/2009 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS (AIP): Appropriate teachers and/or other school personnel knowledgeable about the student's academic performance shall evaluate students identified as scoring below proficient on the State Criterion Reference (CRT) exams. The student's parents will be contacted for the purpose of working jointly with school personnel in developing an Academic Improvement Plan. (AIP) Formative and Summative Assessment</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Data will be used to create a plan that includes standards-based, supplemental, remedial strategies designed to assist the student in scoring proficient on the next administration of the CRT Exam. Regular classroom teachers will be the first to implement the components of these plans. A variety of additional resources will also be used to support the student. Highly qualified staff will provide instruction. The AIP will be monitored and adjusted as the student makes progress. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM/PROCESS USED TO REMEDIATE STUDENTS: Math Busters, Hawks Retreat Action Type: AIP/IRI				
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Conduct Math Family Involvement Activities

Scientific Based Research: National Standards for Parent/Teacher Involvement Programs (1997) The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell (2005)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
K-5 teachers will provide Everyday Math parent information, handouts, Study Links, Home Links, Family Letter, math journals, student reference books, or supplies to help parents engage in math curriculum with their children. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sara Alderson, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/0007 End: 06/30/0008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$500
Parents will be aware of and have access to the Everyday Math School curriculum map through the district web page. Teachers will be trained in utilizing School Center to develop classroom webpages in order to communicate with parents. Materials and supplies will be purchased in order to provide teacher trainings and to provide additional print materials for families without access to computers and the internet. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Sara Alderson, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: math Homelinks for grades K-2 and math Studylinks for grades 3-5 and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program. Teachers will send home with students math Homelinks for grades K-2 and math Studylinks for	Sara Alderson, classroom teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>grades 3-5 to be completed by students and parents and monitor family involvement with a return ratio of 80%. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 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>				
<p>COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the K-5 grade Augmented Benchmark and 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, Disciplinary, 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. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. 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 is geometry. We will select Interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address this area. 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: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>_____ \$ ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$500</p>

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

1. Body Mass Index Data 2009-2010: of the 394 student population, 201 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and obese: Total: Males 36.3%, Total: Females 36.9% Grade K: Males 36.1%, 35.7% Females Grade 2: Males 38.1%, 32.3% Females Grade 4: Males 35.3%, 44.0% Females Body Mass Index Data 2007-2008: of the 357 student population, 147 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and obese: Total: Males 34.6%, Total: Females 34.8% Grade K: Males 37.5%, 32.0% Females Grade 2: Males 33.3%, 27.8% Females Grade 4: Males 33.3%, 42.3% Females
2. Body Mass Index Data 2008-2009: of the 374 student population, 177 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Total: Males 31.3%, Total: Females 29.5% Grade K: Males 42.9%, 27.6% Females Grade 2: Males 18.8%, 29.2% Females Grade 4: Males 31.2%, 29.5% Females Body Mass Index Data 2007-2008: of the 357 student population, 147 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Total: Males 34.6%, Total: Females 34.8% Grade K: Males 37.5%, 32.0% Females Grade 2: Males 33.3%, 27.8% Females Grade 4: Males 33.3%, 42.3% Females Body Mass Index Data 2006-2007: of the 418 student population, 329 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Total: Males 33.3%, Total: Females 32.9% Grade K: Males 28.6%, 40% Females Grade 1: Males 37.9%, 23.1% Females Grade 2: Males 35%, 34.4% Females Grade 3: Males 29.6%, 45.2% Females Grade 4: Males 38.9%, 20.8% Females Grade 5: Males 30.4%, 28.6% Females
3. School Health Index Data 2009-2010 showed weakness in Family and Community Involvement and School Health and Safety Policies and Environment. School Health Index Data 2008-2009 showed weakness in Health Promotion for Staff and Family and Community Involvement. School Health Index Data 2007-2008 showed weakness in Health Promotion for Staff, School Health and Safety Policies and Environment.
4. Prudential Fitnessgram Test Results Spring 2010: 30 nine-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 37 nine-year old boys were tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 30 nine-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 37 nine-year old boys were tested in abdominal strength and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 nine-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 80% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 37 nine-year old boys were tested in upper body strength and 84% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 nine-year old girls were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 83% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 37 nine-year old boys were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 81% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 nine-year old girls were tested in hamstring flexibility and 93% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 37 nine-year old boys were tested in hamstring flexibility and 92% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 nine-year old girls were tested in shoulder flexibility and 90% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 37 nine-year old boys were tested in shoulder flexibility and 81% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 65 ten-year old students were tested in aerobic capacity. 30 ten-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 35 ten-year old boys were tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 ten-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 97% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 ten-year old boys were tested in abdominal strength and 89% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 ten-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 77% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 35 ten-year old boys were tested in upper body strength and 89% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 ten-year old girls were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 ten-year old boys were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 ten-year old girls were tested in hamstring flexibility and 97% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 ten-year old boys were tested in hamstring flexibility and 94% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 30 ten-year old girls were tested in shoulder flexibility and 87% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 35 ten-year old boys were tested in shoulder flexibility and 86% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 63 eleven-year old students were tested in aerobic capacity. 27 eleven-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 36 eleven-year old boys were tested in aerobic capacity and 92% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 eleven-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 36 eleven-year old boys

were tested in abdominal strength and 97% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 eleven-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 74% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 36 eleven-year old boys were tested in upper body strength and 89% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 eleven-year old girls were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 36 eleven-year old boys were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 eleven-year old girls were tested in hamstring flexibility and 96% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 36 eleven-year old boys were tested in hamstring flexibility and 89% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 eleven-year old girls were tested in shoulder flexibility and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 36 eleven-year old boys were tested in shoulder flexibility and 86% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 2 twelve-year old students were tested in aerobic capacity. 1 twelve-year old girl was tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in aerobic capacity and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old girl was tested in abdominal strength and 100.00 scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in abdominal strength and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old girl was tested in upper body strength and 100% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in upper body strength and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 1 twelve-year old girl was tested trunk on extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested on trunk on extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old girl was tested in hamstring flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in hamstring flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old girl was tested in shoulder flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in shoulder flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ).

5. Prudential Fitnessgram Test Results Spring 2009: 26 nine-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 80.7% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 nine-year old boys were tested in aerobic capacity and 88.5% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ). 26 nine-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 96.1% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 nine-year old boys were tested in abdominal strength and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 26 nine-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 65.3% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 nine-year old boys were tested in upper body strength and 85.7% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 26 nine-year old girls were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 nine-year old boys were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 26 nine-year old girls were tested in flexibility and 86.5% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 35 nine-year old boys were tested in flexibility and 88.5% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 60 ten-year old students were tested in aerobic capacity. 27 ten-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 70.3% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 33 ten-year old boys were tested in aerobic capacity and 90.9% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 ten-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 92.5% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 33 ten-year old boys were tested in abdominal strength and 96.9% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 ten-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 44.4% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 33 ten-year old boys were tested in upper body strength and 84.8% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 ten-year old girls were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 33 ten-year old boys were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 27 ten-year old girls were tested in flexibility and 90.5% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 33 ten-year old boys were tested in flexibility and 92.3% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 55 eleven-year old students were tested in aerobic capacity. 32 eleven-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 75.6% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 23 eleven-year old boys were tested in aerobic capacity and 86.9% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 32 eleven-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 93.7% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 23 eleven-year old boys were tested in abdominal strength and 95.6% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 32 eleven-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 56.2% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 23 eleven-year old boys were tested in upper body strength and 78.2% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 32 eleven-year old girls were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ).

Supporting
Data:

23 eleven-year old boys were tested on trunk extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 32 eleven-year old girls were tested in flexibility and 90.5% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 23 eleven-year old boys were tested in flexibility and 84.7% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 3 twelve-year old students were tested in aerobic capacity. 2 twelve-year old girls were tested in aerobic capacity and 50.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in aerobic capacity and 86.9% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 2 twelve-year old girls were tested in abdominal strength and 100.00 scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in abdominal strength and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 2 twelve-year old girls were tested in upper body strength and 50.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in upper body strength and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 2 twelve-year old girls were tested trunk on extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested on trunk on extensor strength and flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 2 twelve-year old girls were tested in flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ). 1 twelve-year old boy was tested in flexibility and 100.0% scored at or above Healthy Fitness Zone(HFZ).

6. pre> National Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS):2005 The percentage of 9-12 grade students that did not participate in any vigorous or moderate physical activity has not significantly changed since 1999. The number of students who attended physical education classes on one or more days in an average week when they were in school has not significantly changed since 1995. The number of students who watched television on an average school day for three or more hours per day has significantly decreased (5.6%) since 1999.
7. Free/Reduced Rate: In 2010 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 45.6%. In 2009 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 49.9%. In 2008 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 42%.

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

Benchmark The number of students being considered overweight or at risk of overweight, according to their BMI, will decrease by .5% 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 (1994) (2005)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Students will participate in physical education classes, nationally-sponsored fitness programs, and school-sponsored physical activities. Activities will include Jump Rope for Heart, Bicycle Education Program, Prudential Fitness Testing, Track Meets, Punt, Pass and Kick, Field Day, and Spark Curriculum. Action Type: Wellness	Connie West, PE/Health teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students' BMI assessments will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Connie West, PE/Health teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Teachers 	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	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Promote reduction of time children spend engaged in sedentary activities such as watching television and playing video games by sending home informational packages from Kids For Health that include tips for parents/caregivers. Students will also participate in school-wide activities that promote physical fitness, health and character-building.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Encourage participation in family-oriented, community-based physical activity program. We will send home information from the Fayetteville Youth Center, Fayetteville Public Schools, Jump Rope for Heart, Bicycle Education Program, Arkansas Athletes Outreach, Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, UA Sweat Hawg program, and Fayetteville Parks and Recreation</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Connie West, PE/Health teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>To assess Happy Hollow Elementary School's physical education program, parents, students, and faculty members will be invited to participate in the School Health Index survey.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Connie West, PE/Health teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through the collection of data from fitness testing, BMI, School Health Index Survey and Kids For Health, Brain Pop, and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 ,school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: Throughout the school year, the PE teacher and school nurse will increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of physical activity and will collect health and wellness information from fitness testing, BMI, School Health Index Survey, Kids For Health, Spark PE, attendance in PE class, doctor's note to be excused from PE participation and make a comparison of fitness scores, BMI scores and the number of students participating/non-participating in PE classes for lifelong health and wellness. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objective (s) of this Intervention/Program was (were) achieved and whether it has been</p>	<p>Sharon Pepple, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. All students participated in physical education classes unless a doctor's note advised differently. 29 notes were collected throughout the 2009-2010 school year.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>				
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 (1994) (2005)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Kids for Health will be taught at every grade level. This program covers both health and nutrition. Health tips will be posted on a regular basis on the Happy Hollow website. Our weekly Rise and Shine celebration will be used to reinforce these tips and recognize students who exhibit healthy behavior.</p> <p>Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Connie West, PE/Health teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Student BMI assessment will be analyzed annually to determine the percentage of students decreasing in the categories of at risk or overweight. Interventions will be evaluated for their effectiveness based on this data.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Jacki Tighe, school nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: comparing the BMI results, grade level assessments, observations and discussions and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: throughout the school year, the PE teacher, classroom teachers and school nurse will increase awareness and knowledge of the benefits of sound nutritional practices for lifelong health and wellness by teaching student learning expectations for health and wellness, then comparing the BMI results, grade level assessments, observations and discussions. Using the data/information collected for the program during the 2009-2010 school year, we determined that our program was successful. We will use Brain Pop and computer lab and presentations (National Dairy Council) to enhance health lessons.</p> <p>Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Connie West, PE/Health teacher</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal Provide support for families looking for information on health and safety issues, parenting skills and programs available in our community.

Benchmark Data will be collected on the number of parents using the Parent Center by monitoring checkout and the amount of free materials taken from the Center.

Intervention: To increase parent awareness and knowledge on a variety of topics, including parenting skills, health and safety issues and the services provided by our community.				
Scientific Based Research: Parent Involvement Plan ACT 307- National PTA Standards 1998				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Improve Parent Center to include information on parenting skills and health and safety issues. This will include contacting local agencies, picking up materials, researching links for helpful websites, organizing a list of helpful websites, and making Parent Library ready for checkout. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Connie West, PE/Health teacher	Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Improve Parent Center by providing information about services provided by the community. This will include contacting community resources, picking up free or donated materials, researching helpful websites for parents and making a printed list of those websites. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Connie West, PE/Health teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: book checkouts and brochures and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: to increase parent awareness and knowledge of a variety of topics, including parenting skills, health and safety issues and the services provided by our community throughout the year. Our Health and Wellness Committee will monitor our Parent Center of parent utilization of literature through book checkouts and brochure and pamphlet replacement. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Connie West, PE/Health teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal : The new Happy Hollow playground and play area will be made accessible to persons with disabilities, including a track for school and community use.

Benchmark The number of students using their play area of choice will increase due to greater accessibility. Student, parent and community use of play areas will increase due to availability.

Intervention: To provide a safe and accessible environment on our school grounds for students, staff and the community.				
Scientific Based Research: Americans With Disabilities Act- Section 504				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The new school's main playground and play area will be made accessible to persons with disabilities. Action Type: Wellness	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The new school grounds will include a track for students, parents, faculty and community to use.	Sharon Pepple,	Start: 07/01/2010		

Action Type: Wellness	Principal	End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: "At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: observation. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to use the following protocol in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities that make up the action descriptions within this intervention/program: throughout the school year, teachers , parents, school nurse and school district will provide a safe environment on our school grounds for students, staff and the community by making the new playground accessible to persons with disabilities as well as adding a track to our new school's grounds. We will continue to work with the district to implement this plan. The school's main playground was made accessible to persons with disabilities in the fall of 2008. The district installed a sidewalk with rails that led to the main playground. In the spring of 2009, a retaining wall was built on our main playground to help control erosion. With a new school projected for completion in 2011-2012, all other issues should be resolved. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Sharon Pepple, Principal	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 the BMI and Prudential Fitness Test. We conducted data analysis to determine our main areas of weakness. In addition, we studied the three most recent years of BMI and Prudential Fitness Tests across grade levels within our building. 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. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that the following area reflects our greatest need within the Wellness Priority: upper body strength. We will select Interventions and address this area. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4: Improving mathematics and literacy achievement, specifically in the area of Open Response.

- Grade 5 ELDA: In 2010, 11 students were tested and 10 scored Level 4 and 1 scored Level 5. Grade 4 ELDA: In 2010, 3 students were tested and 2 scored Level 2 and 1 scored Level 4. Grade 3 ELDA: In 2010, 5 students were tested and 3 scored Level 1 and 2 scored Level 2. Grade 2 ELDA: In 2010, 8 students were tested and 2 scored Level 2, 3 scored Level 3, and 3 scored Level 4. Grade 1 ELDA: In 2010, 6 students were tested and 1 scored Level 2, 2 scored Level 3, 2 scored Level 4, and 1 scored Level 5. Grade K ELDA: In 2010, 5 students were tested and 2 scored Level 2 and 3 scored Level 3. Grade 5 ELDA: In 2009, 3 students were tested and 2 scored Level 3 and 1 scored Level 4. Grade 4 ELDA: In 2009, 11 students were tested and 1 scored Level 2, 2 scored Level 3 and 8 scored Level 4. Grade 3 ELDA: In 2009, 3 students were tested and 1 scored Level 1, 1 scored Level 2, and 1 scored Level 3. Grade 2 ELDA: In 2009, 9 students were tested and 4 scored Level 2, 4 scored Level 4, and 1 scored Level 5. Grade 1 ELDA: In 2009, 9 students were tested and 3 scored Level 2, 2 scored Level 3, 2 scored Level 4, and 2 scored Level 5. Grade K ELDA: In 2009, 8 students were tested and 1 scored Level 1, 2 scored Level 2, 4 scored Level 3 and 1 scored Level 4. Grade 5 ELDA: In 2008, 3 students were tested and 1 scored Level 3 and 2 scored Level 4. Grade 4 ELDA: In 2008, 5 students were tested and 1 scored Level 3 and 4 scored Level 4. Grade 3 ELDA: In 2008, 10 students were tested and 1 scored Level 1, 3 scored Level 2, 5

- scored Level 3 and 1 scored Level 4. Grade 2 ELDA: In 2008, 4 students were tested and 1 scored Level 2 and 3 scored Level 3. Grade 1 ELDA: In 2008, 7 students were tested and 3 scored Level 2, 3 scored Level 3, and 1 scored Level 4. Grade K ELDA: In 2008, 6 students were tested and 1 scored Level 1, 1 scored Level 2, 1 scored Level 3 and 3 scored Level 4.
2. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam(Literacy): In 2010, 6 students were tested and 0.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 60.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam(Literacy): In 2010, 3 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 78.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,4 students were tested and 50.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam(Literacy): In 2010, 11 students were tested and 64.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,2 students were tested and 100.0 % scored proficient or advanced.
 3. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam(Math): In 2010, 6 students were tested and 17.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 80.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam(Math): In 2010, 3 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 89.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,4 students were tested and 75.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam(Math): In 2010, 11 students were tested and 82.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students were tested and 100.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 2 students were tested and 0 % scored proficient or advanced.
 4. Grade 2 SAT 10(Literacy): Grade 2 SAT 10(Literacy): In 2009, 9 students were tested and 11.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,4 students were tested and 0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 1 SAT 10(Literacy): In 2009, 10 students were tested and 10.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 8 students were tested and 13.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade K MAT 8(Literacy): In 2009, 9 students were tested and 22.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, no students were tested. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 11.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,4 students were tested and 0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 1 SAT 10(Literacy): In 2009, 10 students were tested and 10.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 8 students were tested and 13.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade K MAT 8(Literacy): In 2009, 9 students were tested and 22.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, no students were tested.
 5. Grade 2 SAT 10(Literacy): In 2010, 9 students were tested and 22.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 11.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,4 students were tested and 0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade 1 SAT 10 (Literacy): In 2010, 6 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 10 students were tested and 10.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 8 students were tested and 13.0 % scored proficient or advanced. Grade K MAT 8(Literacy): In 2010, 5 students were tested and 20.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 22.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, no students were tested.
 6. Grade 2 SAT 10(Math): In 2010, 9 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 33.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 4 students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. Grade 1 SAT 10 (Math): In 2009, 6 students were tested and 17.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 10 students were tested and 10.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 8 students were tested and 26.0% scored proficient or advanced. Grade K MAT 8(Math): In 2010, 5 students were tested and 0.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 9 students were tested and 11.0 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, no students were tested.
 - 7.

Supporting Data:

Goal

ELL students will improve in reading comprehension, fluency, written expression and mathematical skills. Improvement will be shown through increased scores in DIBELS, MAPS, ELDA, Benchmark and MAT-8.

Benchmark

The non-reported subpopulation of ELL did not meet the 2009 AYP target of 51% in literacy and 51% in math scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that this subpopulation will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP target of 51% in literacy and 51% in math scoring proficient/advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum
Scientific Based Research: Barton, M.L. and Heidema, C., Teaching Reading in Mathematics (2002); Beers, K. and Samuels, B.G. (eds.), Teaching Reading in the Content Areas; Krashen, S.(2002), The Power of Reading; McLaughlin, M. and Vogt, M.E. (eds.)(1993), Harvey, Stephanie and Goudvis, Anne, Strategies that Work (1999)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Provide ESL parents information to inform them of curriculum expectations and procedures, and to facilitate parent/student partnership for academic success. Provide for printing costs for handouts and brochures. Parent meetings held at a minimum of one per semester. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Alicia Whitaker, ESL teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2009 administration of the K-5 grade Augmented Benchmark and 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, Disciplinary, 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. Our 2009 Supporting Data Statements show the discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. 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, Math, Title III, and Wellness. 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: Title I Schoolwide	Sharon Pepple, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Teachers	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
We will employ a highly qualified ELL teacher (1.0 FTE) to provide instruction and intervention for those students identified by ELDA for service.	Alicia Whitaker	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 5: Reduce the relative proportion of African American students to students of other ethnicity identified as Mentally Retarded.

- Supporting Data:
- 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.
 - 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%
- 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.

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, SCHOOL-BASED INTERVENTION TEAMS and EARLY LITERACY STRATEGIES. These strategies include LEAP AHEAD, summer instruction, early intervention literacy strategy training for core teachers, Middle School/Early Intervention Literacy Coaches, intervention materials (Read 180/System44), ICLE Lin Kuzmich training for core teachers and lunchtime tutoring at FHS.				
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 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: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	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 linguistic backgrounds. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The AYP targets for the 2010-2011 year in Literacy in Mathematics will be met by all Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010		

<p>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: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>		<p>End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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 IDEA title VI-B CEIS funds. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Debra Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Debra Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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: Special Education</p>	<p>Deborah Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Deborah Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>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: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Debra Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Funding from Title VI-B, Coordinated Early Intervening Services will be used to fund the following initiatives at Happy Hollow Elementary: EnglishK/Primary Curriculum Oral Language Good Habits/Great Readers Blends/ABC Charts Word/Vocabulary Skills MAP Testing Licenses Happy Hollow Total: \$19,287.35 Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Debra Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: The program evaluation for</p>	<p>Debra</p>	<p>Start:</p>		

CEIS, Coordinated Early Intervening Services will be done using data from MAP testing, Benchmark testing, and Special Education referral data and placement data. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Wilson	07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

- Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Ben Crozier		ELL/Title 3
Classroom Teacher	Cheryl Sewell		Math
Classroom Teacher	Connie West	Chairman	Health and Wellness/ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Dana Troutt	Chairman	Literacy/ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Debra Fox		Math
Classroom Teacher	Denise Romero		Health and Wellness/Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Dixie Smith		ELL/Title 3
Classroom Teacher	Evelyn Kane		Math
Classroom Teacher	Gail Willits		Health and Wellness/Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Kathy Snodgrass		Math
Classroom Teacher	Krishna Crawford		Math
Classroom Teacher	Krissy Faulk		Math
Classroom Teacher	Laura Combs		Math
Classroom Teacher	Linda Fritz		ELL/Title 3
Classroom Teacher	Meredith Richard		Math
Classroom Teacher	Nancy Christy		Health and Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Pam Skelton		Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Randy VanVranken		Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Sara Alderson		Math, ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Sarah Molyneux		
Classroom Teacher	Sarah Wyatt		Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Susan Henderson		Health and Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Susan Lane	Chairman	Parental Involvement
Classroom Teacher	Tammy Scribner		Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Tonya Lopez		Literacy
District-Level Professional	Christie Jay		District Leadership
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Alicia Whitaker	Chairman	ELL/Title 3
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Angela Evans		Health and Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Dorothea Justice		Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jacki Tighe		Health and Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jennifer Jackson		
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Lora Nanak	Behavioral Interventionist	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mark Hitt		Math
Non-Classroom Professional	Mary Margaret		ELL/Title 3

Staff

Fox

Non-Classroom Professional
Staff

Nicole Geopfert

ELL/Title 3

Principal

Sharon Pepple

Chairman

ACSIP Leadership/Literacy/Math/Parental
Involvement