



# 2010-2011 ARCHIVE

## School Plan

[Print Version](#)

### LEVERETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

### Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

### 2010-2011

Leverett School promotes excellence by educating its diverse student population in a nurturing, challenging and disciplined environment. We are committed to helping all students gain the necessary skills to become responsible citizens and life-long learners.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement: MS

### Table of Contents

#### Priority 1: Math

**Goal:** All students will improve in mathematic skills with additional attention to, Measurement, Number Sense/Properties & Operations, Geometry, and Algebra mathematic strands.

#### Priority 2: Literacy

**Goal:** 100% of students will realize or exceed their expected growth in Literacy for MAP testing.

**Goal:** All students will improve on Literacy skills across the curriculum. Emphasis will be placed on comprehension and fluency.

#### Priority 3: Wellness Priority

**Goal:** Students participating in the BMI activity show a need to improve and maintain their physical activity and nutritional practices.

#### Priority 4: Priority 4: Title III/ELL

**Goal:** Provide interventions for all ELL students working below grade level in literacy.

#### 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: All students will improve in mathematic skills and responding to constructed response questions with additional attention to Data Analysis/Statistics & Probability, Measurement and Number Sense/Properties & Operations math strands.

1. Grade K-2 SAT 10 2010: Data not available yet. Grade 3-SAT 10 2010: The Combined Population and each Subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 70% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 77.5% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. Combined Population: 49 Students were tested and 96% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the math strands revealed weaknesses Geometry, Data Analysis and Probability. SAT 10: Grade 3 Economically Disadvantaged: In 2010, 26 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 92% were proficient or advanced. Caucasian (Total) Population:

Grade 3: In 2010, 33 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 100% were proficient or advanced. Grade 4- SAT10 2010: Combined Population: 51 Students were tested and 90% were proficient or advanced. The analysis of the math strands revealed Algebra and Geometry as weaknesses. SAT 10: Grade 4: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2010, 30 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 93% scored proficient or advanced. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2010, 39 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 90% scored proficient or advanced. Hispanic (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2010, 8 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 88% scored proficient or advanced. Grade 5- SAT 10 2010: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the math strands revealed weaknesses in Problems Solving & Data Interpretation. Grade 5- SAT 10 2010: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the math strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. SAT 10: Grade 5: Caucasian (Total) Population: In 2010, 28 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 75% scored proficient or advanced. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2010, 30 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 63% scored proficient or advanced.

2. Grade K-2 SAT 10 2009: Data not available yet. Grade 3-SAT 10 2009: The Combined Population and each Subpop MET the 2009 AYP target of 62.5% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2010 AYP Target of 70% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. Combined Population: 47 Students were tested and 81% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problems Solving & Data Interpretation. SAT 10: Grade 3 Economically Disadvantaged: In 2009, 30 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 74% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2009, 30 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 77% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Grade 4- SAT10 2009: Combined Population: 45 Students were tested and 59% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problems Solving & Data Interpretation. SAT 10: Grade 4: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 59% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 56% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Hispanic (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 60% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Grade 5- SAT 10 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problems Solving & Data Interpretation. SAT 10: Grade 4: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 59% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 56% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Hispanic (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 60% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Grade 5- SAT 10 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problems Solving & Data Interpretation. SAT 10: Grade 4: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 59% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 56% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Hispanic (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 10 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 60% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Grade 5- SAT 10 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 71% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the Concepts and Estimation subtest, Problem Solving and Data Interpretation subtests revealed weaknesses in Problems Solving & Data Interpretation. SAT 10: Grade 5: Caucasian (Total) Population: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 78% had an NPR score of 50% or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 28 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 68% had an NPR score of 50% or above.
3. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Grade K: 2008, Not reporting due to incomplete data. SAT 10: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 1: In 2008, 60 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 48.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 1: In 2008, 40 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 50% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 1: In 2008, 37 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 32.4% had an NPR score of 50, or above. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 48 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 58.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 33 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 54.5% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total)

Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 31 students were tested on the ITBS and 58.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2008, 47 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 59.6% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2008, 29 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 69% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2008, 37 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 51.4% had an NPR score of 50, or above. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2008, 41 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 73.2% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 27 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 77.8% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2008, 27 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 70.4% had an NPR score of 50, or above. NRT: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2008, 42 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 66.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2008, 24 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 62.5% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2008, 26 students were tested on the SAT 10 and 57.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

4. Benchmark-3rd Grade Mathematics Exam 1. Combined Population Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 47 students were tested and 91% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 47 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 41 students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Measurement, Data Analysis and Probability. 2. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. 3. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than ten students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 4. Economically Disadvantaged (SES): Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 30 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 37 students were tested and 75% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 26 students were tested and 73% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number Operations and Measurement. 5. African American: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than ten students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 6. Caucasian: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 30 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 18 students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 28 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Algebra and Number Operations. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Number Operations. 7. Hispanic: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested.
5. Benchmark-4th Grade Mathematics Exam 1. Combined Population Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 45 students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 40 students were tested and 80% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 43 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement, Geometry, and Data Analysis. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Measurement. 2. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. 3. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 4. Economically Disadvantaged (SES): Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 32 students were tested and 72% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 73% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 33 students were tested and 54% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the

Supporting  
Data:

trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability, and Measurement. 5. African American: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 11 students were tested and 54% scored proficient or advanced. 6. Caucasian: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 27 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 27 students were tested and 89% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 18 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra, Geometry and Measurement. 7. Hispanic: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 10 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 12 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced.

6. Benchmark-5th Grade Mathematics Exam 1. Combined Population Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 43 students were tested and 77% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 42 students were tested and 74% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 46 students were tested and 54 % scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis, Algebra, and Measurement. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis/Probability and Measurement. 2. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 10 students were tested and 30% scored proficient or advanced. 3. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 4. Economically Disadvantaged (SES): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 28 students were tested and 68% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 69% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 28 students were tested and 36% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Algebra. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Algebra and Measurement. 5. African American: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 10 students were tested and 60% scored proficient or advanced. 6. Caucasian: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 27 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 24 students were tested and 67% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 28 students were tested and 54% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) (based on the trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Geometry. The lowest identified area (s) (based on the trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra, Geometry and Measurement. 7. Hispanic: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 student were tested.
7. Attendance Rate: In 2009, the attendance rate for the building was 95.25%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 94.38%. In 2007, the attendance rate for the building was 95.6%.

Goal All students will improve in mathematic skills with additional attention to, Measurement, Number Sense/Properties & Operations, Geometry, and Algebra mathematic strands.  
 Benchmark All sub populations met the AYP target of 70% Proficient or Advanced for Mathematics. It is expected that all sub populations will meet the 2011 target of 77.5% proficient or advanced for Mathematics.

Intervention: Act 83 of 2003. An act 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; Professional Development Design: Loucks-Horsley, S., Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics, 1998, National Institute for Science Education.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: In compliance with ACT 83, 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 formative and summative 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.</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>HIGHLY QUALIFIED: The school will continue to hire and maintain "highly qualified" teachers and support staff. All instruction will be given by "highly qualified" staff. Teachers will work closely with Title I staff to implement school wide reform strategies. Data will be used to continue to monitor progress and point-in- time remediation.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT: NRT, CRT, local achievement assessments and other relevant indicators will be analyzed by the faculty at each grade level with consideration to the combined population as well as each subpopulation in order to determine student learning needs and achievement gaps within subpopulations. NRT &amp; CRT data will be analyzed annually. Formative evaluations will be analyzed quarterly.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Parent Engagement: An annual meeting will be held to inform parents of the right of parents to be involved in planning, review, and</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION</p>

<p>improvement of parent programs and a description and explanation 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 be evaluate the parent involvement activities. A parent training will be provided for parents to learn about specific things they can do to promote learning within the home and school. Booklets will be purchased for parents summarizing this information and to keep at home as a parental reference guide. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>		06/30/2011		BUDGET: \$
<p>Program Evaluation:At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: Professional development focus plans, Professional development records and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The following EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrate that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning that are part of this program: Student test scores indicate more than 50% of students scored proficient or advanced in mathematics. 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: 100% of teachers will be trained in one of the following areas: Brain Research, Service Learning, Collaborative Strategies, Relationships, Writing to Learn. We will use student data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report the results, in our 2011-2012 ACSIP Plan, and use those evaluation results in making decisions that impact our future instructional program. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Technology integration professional development will be added to ensure our students are receiving the most current information furthering their math and literacy learning. Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Parent Involvement Plan				
<p>Scientific Based Research: "A new wave of evidence. The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement." Henderson, A., &amp; Mapp, K., 2002: National Center for Family &amp; Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, (<a href="http://www.sedl.org/connections/">http://www.sedl.org/connections/</a>)</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

Administrators, teachers and parents will develop a VOLUNTEER RESOURCE BOOK including: a parent interest survey, an option for parents to designate how frequently they would participate in the program, and include opportunities for parents to assist from home. These are accessible on the web. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• School Library</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT 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 a difference in his or her child's education. Literature, brochures, and printed materials will be provided to provide information to parents in responsible parenting. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Administrators, teachers, and parents will develop a parental involvement plan addressing the diverse needs of the students and their parents to increase the school's ability to provide for the educational success of their children. The plan will be reviewed and updated annually. An alumni advisory committee will be formed. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
The district will designate two PARENT/TEACHER CONFERENCES each school year. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
INFORMATIONAL PACKETS: The school will develop an information sheet that includes: the school's commitment to parental involvement, the PROCESS FOR RESOLVING PARENTAL CONCERNS, and tips for how parents can foster their child's success. These will be made available online. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Administrators will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parent involvement strategies and the importance of setting expectations and creating a climate conducive to parental participation. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
PARENT ENGAGEMENT: "Informational Packets" for each family are developed and distributed. They include: *Parental Involvement Meetings *School Calendar *A School-Parent Compact *A system encouraging the home, school, and community connection. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers and parents will receive training to enhance understanding of effective parental involvement strategies. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Professional Development				
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 purchased for parents to borrow for review in each building. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carol Raybon	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ 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. We will have two curriculum nights that will incorporate training parents on how to create developmentally appropriate learning activities to assist in their child's learning. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/20/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Literacy and Math materials will be provided to parents as homework in partnering with the learning process. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Amanda Winn	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
A computer program will help document the amount of parental participation within the school, and identification of barriers that exist that hinder greater participation by parents. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
In order to take advantage of community resources our school will ENABLE THE FORMATION OF A PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATION, or ORGINAZATION, that will foster parental and community involvement within the school. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/01/2009 End: 07/30/2010		_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated this Intervention/Program through: Parent participation by using sign in sheets and surveys and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. The following EVALUATION RESULTS demonstrate that this Intervention is valid in support of the teaching and learning that are part of this program: Parent Surveys and Parent sign in sheets. 80% of parents attended Annual report night, parent/teacher conferences, and curriculum nights. 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: 85% of parents will attend Annual report night, parent/teacher	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

conferences, and curriculum nights. We will use this data/information to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention/Program were achieved and whether it has been successful in attaining the anticipated participant outcome objectives. We will report 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:				\$0
---------------	--	--	--	-----

Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (McGraw-Hill); A Research-Based Curriculum: The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell; Mathematics Evaluation Report, Mathematics Evaluation Committee of Hopewell Valley Regional School District; The Impact of Two Standards-Based Mathematics Curricula on Student Achievement in Massachusetts, Journal for Research in Mathematics Education (2001, Vol. 32, No. 4, 368-398); Student Achievement Studies, Everyday Learning

Scientific Based Research: The Research Foundations of the UCSMP Everyday Mathematics Curriculum, Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll and Max Bell; Mathematics Evaluation Report, Mathematics Evaluation Committee of Hopewell Valley Regional School District; The Impact of Two Standards-Based Mathematics Curricula on Student Achievement in Massachusetts, Journal for Research in Mathematics Education 2001, Vol. 32, No. 4, 368-398; Student Achievement Studies, Everyday Learning

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Trainings will be available to K-5 grade new teachers in the Everyday Math methodology. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Katie Austin	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
<b>SCHOOLWIDE REFORM STRATEGIES:</b> We will evaluate the effectiveness of Everyday Math strategies using unit tests and/or grade level developed tests (formative assessments). In addition, we will use the summative data from standardized testing and the Benchmark exam in Grades 3-5. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Melissa Armendariz	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate with classroom teachers, special education teachers and other support staff to implement differentiated strategies for all students with Academic Improvement Plans or special education needs to improve information skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Sharon Michaels	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Inform parents of Everyday Math curriculum and strategies through the use of unit parent letters and home/study links. The school social worker will collaborate with area Head Start organizations to inform and educate future Leverett parents who may be parents of migrant, English Language Learner, free and	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

reduced lunch, highly mobile and homeless students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement				
Classroom, ESL, and Special Education teachers will work together with principal to support Everyday Math strategies. Art, PE, and music teachers will collaborate when applicable to curriculum. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	John Andrews	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaborate 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	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF PROGRAMS: Grades 1-5 will be evaluated using MAPS testing to measure computation fluency and growth. Spring Summative NRT and CRT Testing to determine learning gains for all students. Math Materials will be purchased and implemented to support student achievement. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Pam Dunn	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Certified Instructional interventionist totaling 1 FTE will be hired to provide tutorial assistance for students performing below grade level in math. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 01/07/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	Title I - Employee \$37868.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$9846.00 Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$47714
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM Regular 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: 1. 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. 2. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. 3. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. 4.Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. Summary notes and sign-in sheet will be kept and made available upon request. Our ACSIP Plan will be revised in order to keep it timely and valid in our efforts to improve teaching and learning. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated Everyday Math through: CBM, quarterly targeted assessments and Arkansas Benchmark exam data and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. With a combination of Grades 3-5, 80% scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark Exam. Therefore, we believe this 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 MAPS testing, and Benchmark assessment data in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within Everyday Math. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$47714
<p>Intervention: A Handbook for Classroom Instruction that Works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (Includes specific lesson designs using the nine research-based strategies.) Marzano, Robert J.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Pollock, Jane E. (2001). Classroom Instructions that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (Based on meta-analysis of hundreds of studies. Includes chapters on the nine most effective teaching strategies, plus chapters on implementation</p>				
<p>Scientific Based Research: Marzano, Robert J.; Norford, Jennifer S.; Paynter, Diane E.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). A Handbook for Classroom Instruction that Works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Marzano, Robert J.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Pollock, Jane E. (2001). Classroom Instructions that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>A. Collaborative team planning time B. Training/continuing education/professional development will be provided to improve math and literacy. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Laura Goodwin	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Writing strategies will be utilized to improve open-ended math responses. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Olivia Murphy	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Collaboration of classroom teachers, special education teachers and other support staff to implement differentiated strategies for all students with Academic Improvement Plans and or special needs to improve information skills. Formative and summative assessment data will be examined. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Sharon Michaels	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Classroom, ESL and Special Education teachers will work together with principal to support appropriate writing strategies for answering open response math problems. The media specialist will collaborate when applicable to add materials to enhance the curriculum. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Adrienne Johnson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated math constructed response in the building, and assessed targeted assessment writing prompts using the Arkansas State Writing Rubric to 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 because more than 50% of 3-5 graders scored proficient or advanced in math constructed response on the benchmark exam. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to assess math constructed response in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: The curriculum will be mapped and aligned. Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K-12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, 1997.

Scientific Based Research: Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K-12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD (1997).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the school's curriculum. Action Type: Collaboration	Melissa Armendariz	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$
There will be an annual review of data from summative norm referenced tests, MAPS, and Benchmark scores to analyze areas of weakness in order to address sub skills, content clusters, subtests and subgroups that may need to be addressed in the curriculum mapping process. An annual review and adjustment to the curriculum maps will be made according to gaps and/or duplications	Olivia Murphy	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	_____ ACTION BUDGET: \$

noted from the data analysis. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Teachers will participate in ongoing development of curriculum mapping, including horizontal and vertical alignment. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Lyndsey Runyan	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Ongoing learning teams will provide continual assessment to vertical and horizontal alignment of the math curriculum. The team will share effective teaching and assessment strategies and training for teachers. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Pam Dunn	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will plan and coordinate Math, Science, Reading/Language Arts and/or Social Studies correlations for specific instructional units and times. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Stephanie Harter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will identify grade level correlations between Math, Science, Reading/Language Arts and/or Social Studies. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Shirley Gorman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Parents will be aware of and have access to the Fayetteville Schools Curriculum Map via the district web page. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will implement the correlated curriculum at grade levels for all students. Formative and summative assessment data will be examined. Action Type: Collaboration	Melissa Armendariz	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Curriculum maps are an on going process of development as new frameworks are revised. As part of this process grade level teams, special areas, special education and cross-grade level meetings will be held to correct gaps and duplications. This will include horizontal and vertical alignment and alignment to the Arkansas State Frameworks. Lesson plans are submitted to the principal through Curriculum Recorder. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers are provided with weekly instructional meeting time in order to plan for the implementation of best practices chosen to help improve student achievement at each student's readiness level. This planning time will be provided during the course of the day. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year we evaluated our	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	—————

<p>grade level competencies and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe that it did meet our expectations. We believe the evidence shows that it is a valuable tool in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-2011 school year we plan to continue the use of core competencies to guide student achievement.  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>End: 07/01/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>			<p>\$0</p>

Priority 2: Improving Literacy

- Grade K - 2 SAT 10: Data unavailable. Grade 3 SAT 10 2010 - Combined Population: 49 Students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Practical and Content passages. Grade 3: Caucasian (Total) Population: In 2010, 30 students were tested on the SAT10 and 91% scored proficient or advanced. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2010, 26 students were tested on the SAT10 73% scored proficient or advanced. Grade 4-SAT10 2010: Combined Population: 51 Students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced. Grade 4-SAT10 2010: Combined Population: 45 Students were tested and 62% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Spelling. SAT10: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the ITBS and 67% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT10 and 50% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT10 and 59% had an NPR score of 59%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 28 students were tested on the SAT10 and 53% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Grade 4-SAT10 2009: Combined Population: 45 Students were tested and 62% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Spelling. SAT10: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the ITBS and 67% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT10 and 50% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT10 and 59% had an NPR score of 59%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 28 students were tested on the SAT10 and 53% had an NPR score of 50%, or above.. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Spelling. SAT10: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the ITBS and 67% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT10 and 50% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT10 and 59% had an NPR score of 59%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 28 students were tested on the SAT10 and 53% had an NPR score of 50%, or above.
- Grade K - 2 SAT 10: Data unavailable. Grade 3 SAT 10 2009 - Combined Population: 47 Students were tested and 62% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary. Grade 3: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2009, 30 students were tested on the SAT10 and 60% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2009, 30 students were tested on the SAT10 and 50% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Grade 4-SAT10 2009: Combined Population: 45 Students were tested and 62% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Spelling. SAT10: Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the ITBS and 67% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2009, 32 students were tested on the SAT10 and 50% had an NPR score of 50%, or above.

Grade 5-Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2009: Combined Population: 43 Students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile. The analysis of the reading subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 27 students were tested on the SAT10 and 59% had an NPR score of 50%, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2009, 28 students were tested on the SAT10 and 53% had an NPR score of 50%, or above.

3. Iowa Test of Basic Skills: Combined (Total) Population: Grade K: 2008, Not reporting due to incomplete data Iowa Test of Basic Skills: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 1: In 2008, 60 students were tested on the ITBS and 43.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 1: In 2008, 40 students were tested on the ITBS and 47.5% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 1: In 2008, 37 students were tested on the ITBS and 24.3% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Iowa Test of Basic Skills: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 48 students were tested on the ITBS and 45.8% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 33 students were tested on the ITBS and 48.5% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 2: In 2008, 31 students were tested on the ITBS and 38.7% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Iowa Test of Basic Skills: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2008, 47 students were tested on the ITBS and 34% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2008, 29 students were tested on the ITBS and 37.9% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 3: In 2008, 37 students were tested on the ITBS and 27% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Iowa Test of Basic Skills: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2008, 41 students were tested on the ITBS and 65.9% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2008, 27 students were tested on the ITBS and 74.1% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 4: In 2008, 27 students were tested on the ITBS and 63% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Iowa Test of Basic Skills: Combined (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2008, 42 students were tested on the ITBS and 69% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Caucasian (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2008, 24 students were tested on the ITBS and 79.2% had an NPR score of 50, or above. Economically Disadvantage (Total) Population: Grade 5: In 2008, 26 students were tested on the ITBS and 50% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
4. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam 1. Combined Population Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 47 students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 47 students were tested and 68% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 41 students were tested and 66% 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 and Literary. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 2. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. In 2008, Less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. 3. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, Less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 4. Economically Disadvantaged (SES): Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 30 students were tested and 73% were proficient and advanced. In 2008, 37 students were tested and 62% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 26 students were tested and 65% 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 is: Content. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 5. African American: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 6. Caucasian: Grade 3 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 30 students were tested and 77% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 18 students were tested and 78% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 28 students were tested and 68% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and literary. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 7. Hispanic: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 student were tested.
5. Benchmark-4th Grade Literacy Exam 1. Combined Population Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 45 students were tested and 64% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 40 students were tested and 63% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 43 students were tested and 49% 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

Supporting  
Data:

area (s) are: Content and Literary. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Syle. 2. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. In 2008, Less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. 3. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 13 students were tested and 53% 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 and Literary. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Syle. 4. Economically Disadvantaged (SES): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 32 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 58% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 33 students were tested and 36% 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 is: Content. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 5. African American: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 11 students were tested and 45% 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 is: Content. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style 6. Caucasian: Grade 4 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 27 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 27 students were tested and 74% were proficient and advanced. In 2007, 18 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and literary. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 7. Hispanic: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009 10 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, 12 students were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced.

6. Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam 1. Combined Population Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 43 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 46 students were tested and 41 % scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 39 students were tested and 51.1% 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 and Practical. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Syle. 2. Students with Disabilities (IEP): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 20% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, less than 10 students with IEPs were tested. 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 Passages. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 3. Limited English Proficient (LEP): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 students were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 4. Economically Disadvantaged (SES): Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 28 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 28 students were tested and 18% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 26 students were tested and 61.2% 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 and Style. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 5. African American: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, 10 students were tested and 40% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested. 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. The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style 6. Caucasian: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, 27 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 28 students were tested and 43% scored proficient or advanced. In 2007, 33 students were tested and 78.7% 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...

The trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area (s) are: Content and Style. 7. Hispanic: Grade 5 Benchmark Exam: In 2009, less than 10 students were tested. In 2008, less than 10 student were tested. In 2007, less than 10 students were tested.

- Attendance Rate: In 2009, the attendance rate for the building was 92.25%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 94.38%. In 2007, the attendance rate for the building was 95.6%.

**Goal** 100% of students will realize or exceed their expected growth in Literacy for MAP testing.  
**Benchmark** The Combined Population and each Sub population MET the 2009 AYP target of 71.2% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed the 2011 AYP Target of 78.4% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. 100% of students will meet or exceed their expected growth for MAP assessments for the year.

Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy Model; Adams, M. (1996), Beginning to Read; Allington, R.(1994), Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write; Calkins, L. (1991), The Art of Teaching; Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First; Clay, M. (1993), Becoming Literate; Clay, M. (1993), An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement; Clay, M.(1993), Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T. (1998), Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions in Reading and Writing; Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S. (1996), Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children				
Scientific Based Research: Adams, M. (1996), Beginning to Read; Allington, R.(1994), Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write; Calkins, L. (1991), The Art of Teaching; Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First; Clay, M. (1993), Becoming Literate; Clay, M. (1993), An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement; Clay, M.(1993), Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T. (1998), Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions in Reading and Writing; Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S. (1996), Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Social work program will work with families of educationally disadvantaged students to address family and student issues relevant to improving academic achievement. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
K-5 teachers will be trained in Comprehensive Literacy Model. Professional Development for staff members will be ongoing and provided by the literacy coach. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will participate in data analysis using comparative data from beginning of year and end of year measures. Action Type: Collaboration	Gayle Bowman, 3rd Grade Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Kindergarten through 5th grade will have a weekly newsletter sent home. Parent nights will be implemented throughout the school year. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marianne Baxter	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Kindergarten-5, ESL, resource, and instructional aides will work together with principal to support Comprehensive Literacy strategies.	Penny Ezell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Materials will be purchased to support these strategies. Action Type: Collaboration				
ESL instructional assistant will provide interventions for ESL students and other students with similar needs toward improvement in reading achievement. Action Type: Collaboration	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Ongoing tracking of staff training in literacy learning recorded by district reading specialist. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Shannon Carlton, 4th Grade Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
K-5 students will be given a pre and post writing prompt. The DSA (Developmental Spelling Assessment) will be given as a pre test in grades 2-5 for placement. DRA will be given to all new students without previous data for reading level placement and small group instruction. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Jackie Curington, 1st Grade Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The resource teacher will use Comprehensive Literacy strategies with grades K - 5. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Stephanie Wood, Kindergarten teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
TRANSITION: Action: (Pre-K) Kindergarten teachers will collaborate to incorporate research/best practices related to early childhood development so that there will be a seamless transition for students between preschool and kindergarten environments. The kindergarten curriculum includes instructional strategies, teaching methodologies, and assessment techniques based upon the theories of early childhood growth and development. Each kindergarten classroom will have an instructional assistant to support this process, depending on needs of students and state requirements. Entrance conferences 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: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Stephanie Wood	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	

<p>year we evaluated the Comprehensive Literacy Model through formative assessments: DIBELS assessments, DSA and DRA levels and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development (combined population grades 3-5, more than 70% scored proficient or advanced in Literacy). In addition, summative CRT data was used. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement. During the 2010-11 school year we plan to use DIBELS, DRA, and MAPS in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within Comprehensive Literacy Model.  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>		<p>End: 07/01/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>A .25 FTE certified licensed, highly qualified reading teacher will be hired to remediate students below grade level.  Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam</p>	<p>Start: 01/08/2008  End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$9551.00  Title I - Employee Benefits: \$2483.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$12034</p>
<p>One (.50 FTE) para pro will be hired to work under the direct supervision of a licensed, highly qualified teacher to help students reading below grade level.  Action Type: Title I Target Assistance</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam</p>	<p>Start: 06/30/2010  End: 07/01/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$10133.00  Title I - Employee Benefits: \$2634.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$12767</p>
<p>One .75 FTE classified teacher will be hired to remediate students reading below grade level.  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Equity  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$8365.00  Title I - Employee Benefits: \$2174.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$10539</p>
<p>Three .1 FTE classified teachers will be hired to remediate students reading below grade level.  Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$2605.00  Title I - Employee Benefits: \$675.00</p>

				ACTION BUDGET: \$3280
One .5 FTE classified teacher will be hired to remediate students reading below grade level Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		Title I - Employee Salaries: \$2278.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$800.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$3078
Total Budget:				\$41698

Intervention: Step Up to Writing: Marzano, Robert J.; Norford, Jennifer S.; Paynter, Diane E.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). A Handbook for Classroom Instruction that Works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD (Includes specific lesson designs using the nine research-based strategies.) Marzano, Robert J.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Pollack, Jane E. (2001). Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (Based on a meta-analysis of hundreds of studies. Includes chapters on the nine most effective teaching strategies, plus chapters on implementation

Scientific Based Research: Marzano, Robert J.; Norford, Jennifer S.; Paynter, Diane E.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). A Handbook for Classroom Instruction that Works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD (Includes specific lesson designs using the nine research-based strategies.) Marzano, Robert J.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Pollack, Jane E. (2001). Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (Based on a meta-analysis of hundreds of studies. Includes chapters on the nine most effective teaching strategies, plus chapters on implementation

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COLLABORATION: Resource, GT, ESL, K-5 teachers and media specialist will work together to implement and integrate Step Up to Writing strategies taught in the classroom. The school social worker will work with local Head Start organizations to educate and inform future Leverett parents who may be parents of homeless, English Language Learner, migrant, free and reduced lunch and highly mobile students. The school social worker will also collaborate with local organizations to assist homeless families. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
District writing prompts, classroom writing prompts, district K-1 writing continuum, and Arkansas writing rubrics will be used to assess student progress in writing. Formative and summative data will be examined. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lacey Bingaman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will share writing prompts within grade levels and/or across grade levels on a quarterly basis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Penny Ezell	Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated writing	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	

<p>prompts in the building, assessed district writing prompts using the Arkansas State Writing Rubric, and used Arkansas Benchmark writing prompts to determine 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 (combined population grades 3-5, more than 70% scored proficient or advanced in Literacy). During the 2010-11 school year we plan to use these assessments in evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program. Our goal in grades 3-5 is to meet AYP target of 78.4% proficient or advanced in Literacy. 100% of students will meet or exceed their expected growth for MAP assessments for the year.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>		<p>End: 07/01/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
---	--	----------------------------	--	--------------------------

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

Intervention: The curriculum will be mapped and aligned. Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K-12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, (1997).

Scientific Based Research: Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K-12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, (1997).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Teachers will receive training on curriculum mapping, including horizontal and vertical alignment. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Cheryl Putnam	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Teachers will plan and coordinate math, science, reading/language arts and/or social studies correlations for specific instructional units. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration</p>	John Andrews, Music Teacher	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Teachers will identify grade level correlations between Math, Science, Reading/Language Arts and/or Social Studies. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Jackie Curington	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Parents will be aware of and have access to the Fayetteville Schools Curriculum Bank via the district web page. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Cheryl Putnam	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Teachers will implement the correlated curriculum at grade levels for all students. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Lacey Bingaman	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Curriculum maps are on going process of development as new frameworks are revised. As part of this process grade level teams, special areas, special education and cross-grade level meetings will be held to correct gaps and duplications. This will include horizontal and vertical alignment and</p>	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

alignment to the Arkansas State Frameworks. Lesson plans are submitted to the building share drive on a weekly basis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation				
All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the school's curriculum. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated our curriculum alignment using competencies we developed to guide student achievement. We believe these competencies were effective in meeting the state standards as well as the individual needs of students. During the 2010-11 school year we plan to continue the use of competencies developed to guide student achievement and growth. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal

All students will improve on Literacy skills across the curriculum. Emphasis will be placed on comprehension and fluency.

The combined population and each subgroup MET the 2010 AYP target of 71.2%. It is expected that Benchmark each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 78.4%. 100% of students will meet or exceed their expected growth for MAP assessments for the year.

Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy Model; Adams, M. (1996), Beginning to Read; Allington, R.(1994), Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write; Calkins, L. (1991), The Art of Teaching; Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First; Clay, M. (1993), Becoming Literate; Clay, M. (1993), An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement; Clay, M.(1993), Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T. (1998), Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions in Reading and Writing; Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S. (1996), Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children				
Scientific Based Research: Adams, M. (1996), Beginning to Read; Allington, R.(1994), Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write; Calkins, L. (1991), The Art of Teaching; Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, Put Reading First; Clay, M. (1993), Becoming Literate; Clay, M. (1993), An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement; Clay, M.(1993), Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training; Dorn, L., French, C. and Jones, T. (1998), Apprenticeship in Literacy: Transitions in Reading and Writing; Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G.S. (1996), Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The resource teacher will use Comprehensive Literacy strategies with grades 2-5. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Sharon Michaels	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Kindergarten through 5th grade will have a weekly newsletter sent home. Parent nights will be implemented throughout the school year. Materials will be sent home for parents to work with students to further their learning. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Gayle Bowman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
K-5 grade students will be given a pre and post writing prompt. The DSA	Jackie Curington,	Start: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	

(Developmental Spelling Assessment) will be given as a pretest for placement. Formative and summative assessment data will be examined. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	1st Grade Teacher	End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Kindergarten through 5th grade, ESL, resource, instructional aides and certified reading interventionist will work together with principal to support Comprehensive Literacy strategies. Action Type: Collaboration	Penny Ezell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The media specialist will continue to build book resources in a variety of languages within the library as well as a number of technology resources used for grades K-5. Library resources will be communicated to parents via beginning of school newsletter to support the learning of all families. Action Type: Professional Development	Beth Lewis	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials \$23374.00 & Supplies:  ACTION BUDGET: \$23374
K-5 teachers will be trained in Comprehensive Literacy Model. This includes new teachers to the building. Action Type: Professional Development	Jackie Curington	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Ongoing tracking of staff training in literacy learning recorded by district reading specialist. Action Type: Professional Development	Shannon Carlton	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
K-5 teachers will develop and maintain reading libraries, provide explicit instruction in reading strategies and develop meaningful writing curriculum. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Lacey Bingaman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Kindergarten students, who score delayed in both written and oral communication, on the Qualls Early Learning Inventory (QELI), and first and second grade students who score "below basic", in reading, will be considered to have a substantial reading deficiency. These children will be provided Intensive Reading Instruction utilizing Phonetics Connection, TPRI, "I've DIBELed Now What?", Florida Center for Reading Research Interventions, and Quick Reads - scientifically based reading programs. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) will be administered to all students who are shown to have a substantial	Marianne Baxter and Penny Ezell	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>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, and within 30 days after receiving the QELI report, for applicable kindergarten students. Intensive reading interventions will be comprehensive in nature and will be targeted to remediate the area of deficiency. For those affected students, school personnel will develop an Intensive Reading Improvement Plan (IRI) that will describe our intervention program. Intervention will be provided in the form of small group instruction and tutorial services. These intervention strategies and methods will continue until each student has reached grade level proficiency in all essential areas of reading. Student achievement in each of the essential elements shall be monitored bi-weekly until proficiency occurs. Students who are not meeting current expectations shall be provided additional interventions. Each parent, or guardian, will be notified in writing when their child has been identified with a substantial reading deficiency.  Action Type: AIP/IRI  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration</p>				
<p>POINT IN TIME REMEDIATION: Progress will be monitored using classroom running records, quarterly assessment and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, SAT-10 and Benchmark Exams to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance for children scoring below proficiency.  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Central Office</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated the Comprehensive Literacy Model through: DIBELS assessments, Guided Reading levels and student progress on the Phonics continuum, and determined that it was effective in support of our Curriculum Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is</p>	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement(combined population grades 3-5, more than 70% scored proficient or advanced in Literacy). During the 2010-11 school year we plan to use DIBELS, Guided Reading levels, student progress on Phonics continuum, and MAP assessments in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within Comprehensive Literacy Model. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation				
One 1 FTE certified teacher will be hired to remediate students reading below grade level. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		Title I - Employee \$37868.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$9847.00 Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$47715
Total Budget:				\$71089

Intervention: Step Up to Writing; Marzano, Robert J.; Norford, Jennifer S.; Paynter, Diane E.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). A Handbook for Classroom Instruction that Works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD (Includes specific lesson designs using the nine research-based strategies.) Marzano, Robert J.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Pollack, Jane E. (2001). Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (Based on a meta-analysis of hundreds of studies. Includes chapters on the nine most effective teaching strategies, plus chapters on implementation

Scientific Based Research: Marzano, Robert J.; Norford, Jennifer S.; Paynter, Diane E.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). Alexandria, VA: ASCD (Includes specific lesson designs using the nine research-based strategies.) Marzano, Robert J.; Pickering, Debra J.; and Pollack, Jane E. (2001). Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (Based on a meta-analysis of hundreds of studies. Includes chapters on the nine most effective teaching strategies, plus chapters on implementation

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Resource, GT, ESL, K-5 teachers and media specialist will work together to implement and integrate strategies taught in the classroom. Action Type: Collaboration	Stephaine Sawyer	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
District writing prompts, classroom writing prompts and Arkansas writing rubrics will be used to assess student progress in writing. formative and summative assessment data will be examined. Action Type: Collaboration	Karie Sutton	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Benchmark writing scores will be examined annually and scores compared. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated writing prompts in the building, assessed district writing prompts using the Arkansas State Writing Rubric, and Arkansas Benchmark writing prompts to determine that it was effective in support of our Curriculum	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. We believe the evidence shows that it is valuable in terms of supporting our efforts to increase student achievement (combined population grades 3-5, more than 70% scored proficient or advanced in Literacy). During the 2010-11 school year we plan to use these assessments in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: The curriculum will be mapped and aligned. Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K-12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, (1997).

Scientific Based Research: Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment, K-12. Heidi Hayes Jacobs. ASCD, (1997).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the school's curriculum. Action Type: Collaboration	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
There will be an annual review of data from norm referenced tests and Benchmark scores to analyze areas of weakness in order to address sub skills, content clusters, subtests and subgroups that may need to be addressed in the curriculum mapping process. An annual review and adjustment to the curriculum maps will be made according to gaps and/or duplications noted from the data analysis. Action Type: Alignment	Karie Sutton	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will receive training on curriculum mapping, including horizontal and vertical alignment. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Beth Lewis	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Ongoing learning team work will provide continual assessment to vertical and horizontal alignment of the reading curriculum. The team will share effective teaching and assessment strategies and training for teachers. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Stephanie Wood, Kindergarten Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will plan and coordinate Math, Science, Reading/Language Arts and/or Social Studies correlations for specific instructional units and times. Literacy materials that correlate with the curriculum will be purchased. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	John Andrews	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will meet quarterly to identify grade level correlations between Math, Science, Reading/Language Arts and/or Social Studies. Teachers will review formative and	Jackie Curington, 1st Grade Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>summative data from norm referenced tests and Benchmark scores to analyze areas of weakness in order to address sub skills, content clusters, subtests and subgroups that may need to be addressed in the curriculum mapping process. A review and adjustment to the curriculum maps will be made according to gaps and/or duplications noted from the data analysis. Substitutes will be used to provide this time.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>Parents will be aware of and have access to the Fayetteville Schools Curriculum Bank via the district web page.</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Teachers will implement the correlated curriculum at grade levels for all students.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Jackie Curington, 1st Grade Teacher	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>After curriculum maps are completed, grade level teams, special areas, special education and cross-grade level meetings will be held to correct gaps and duplications. This will include horizontal and vertical alignment and alignment to the Arkansas State Frameworks. Lesson plans will be submitted to the principal on Curriculum Recorder.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Cheryl Putnam, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated writing prompts in the building, assessed district writing prompts using the Arkansas State Writing Rubric, and Arkansas Benchmark writing prompts to determine 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 (combined population grades 3-5, more than 70% scored proficient or advanced in Literacy). During the 2010-11 school year we plan to use these assessments in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Comprehensive Literacy initiative is implemented to support a comprehensive reading program utilizing the essential elements: comprehension, fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary.				
Scientific Based Research: Report of the National Reading Panel (2000): Teaching Children to Read, Put Reading First; National Institute for Literacy, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; The U.S. Department of Education, Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children; National Research Council, Beginning to Read, Marily J. Adams.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

<p>A certified 1.0 Literacy Coach will be hired to support comprehensive literacy program.  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee \$34009.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$8640.00 Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$42649</p>
<p>Teachers, administrators and Literacy Coach will attend professional development and training with the district to promote the learning of teachers within grade levels.  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Mindy Lawson</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Central Office</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Comprehensive Literacy Model implementation will be supported through the purchase of necessary learning materials and supplies.  Action Type: Alignment  Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>DIBELs Assessment will be examined to monitor growth and progress. Formative and summative assessment data will be examined.  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010</p>		<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>HIGHLY QUALIFIED: Strategies will be developed in conjunction with the central office staff for attracting highly qualified teachers to the Fayetteville school district.  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM Closing the Achievement Gap (Literacy): Regular quarterly 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: 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. The ongoing monitoring of student progress in order to influence classroom instruction. The utilization of Formative and Summative Assessment Data to make decisions that impact: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Professional Development. Coordination of resources in order to better meet the needs of all students. A sign-in sheet will be kept and made available upon</p>	<p>Cheryl Putnam</p>	<p>Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

request. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Program Evaluation: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated Comprehensive Literacy Model through: DIBELS assessments, DRA levels, Guided Reading Levels, and placement on the Phonics continuum 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(combined population grades 3-5, more than 70% scored proficient or advanced in Literacy). During the 2010-11 school year we plan to use DIBELS, DRA, Guided Reading level, and Phonics continuum in evaluating, and adjusting, the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program. 100% of students will meet or exceed their expected growth for MAP assessments for the year. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 06/30/2010 End: 07/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Hire a 1.0 FTE for CSR for 3rd grade to better support students below grade level.	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		Title II-A - Employee \$5106.00 Salaries: Title II-A - Employee \$1794.00 Benefits: Title I SIP04 - Employee \$34652.00 Salaries: Title I SIP04 - Employee \$9311.00 Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$50863
Total Budget:				\$93512

Priority 3: Students will improve and maintain their wellness through physical activity and nutrition.

1. Body Mass Index Data 2008-2009: of the 338 student population, 144 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at

risk of being overweight or are overweight: Grade K: Males N/a, N/A Females Grade 2: Males 22.7%, N/A Females Grade 4: Males 30%, 47.6% Females Approximately 11% of all children measured were overweight, and 10% of all children measured were identified as obese.

2. Body Mass Index Data 2007-2008: of the 328 student population, 141 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or are overweight: Grade K: Males 25%, N/A Females Grade 2: Males 40.9%, 23.8% Females Grade 4: Males 36.8%, 23.8% Females Approximately 12.8% of all children measured were at risk of being overweight, and 14.2% of all children measured were identified as overweight.
3. Free/Reduced Rate: In 2008 the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 65 %. In 2007, the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 66%. In 2006, the percentage of free and reduced lunch was 64%.
4. The School Health Index Survey for 2008 indicates a need in the areas of Module 2: Health Education.

Supporting Data:

Goal

Students participating in the BMI activity show a need to improve and maintain their physical activity and nutritional practices.

Benchmark

Healthier BMI results will be evident by June 30, 2011. There will be a 1/2% difference in the 2010-11 BMI results indicating healthier lifestyles are being practiced.

Intervention: Leverett Elementary School will implement strategies and activities to promote increased physical activity.				
Scientific Based Research: Let's Get Physical-Promotion and Education Strategies by Dr. Hal Wechsler <a href="http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/menu/NNEC/Files/2003/LetsGetPhysical.pdf">http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/menu/NNEC/Files/2003/LetsGetPhysical.pdf</a>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Inform students and parents of extracurricular programs that support physical activity, i.e. walking, softball, baseball, soccer Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kevin Thomas	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Through implementation of "Kids For Health Program", teaching and learning will occur regarding reduction of time children spend engaged in sedentary activities such as watching television and playing video games. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kevin Thomas	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Implementation throughout the physical education schedule of state standards and frameworks that address physical activity. Certified personnel will assure implementation. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Kevin Thomas	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
BMI Assessments will be examined for growth. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Kevin Thomas	Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010		<hr/> 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	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Encourage participation in family oriented, community-based physical activity program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

To assess Leverett Elementary School's physical education program, parents, students, and faculty members will be invited to participate in a survey. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated BMI, School Health Index, and Farm to School 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 2010-11 school year we plan to continue to use these measures in evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program. Farm to School program was not granted so that was discontinued. Healthy cooking classes were provided through partnership with the school district and Apple Seeds nonprofit. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Leverett Elementary School will implement strategies and activities to promote improved nutritional practices.

Scientific Based Research: Eat Well and Keep Moving by Lilian Cheung, Sc.D., R.D., Eat Well & Keep Moving, Harvard School of Public Health, Department of Nutrition (1999).  
<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/nutritionsource/EWKM.html>. Accessed (2008).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Kids For Health Program will inform and educate students and families in regards to improvement in nutritional practices. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Kevin Thomas	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
BMI Assessments will be examined for growth. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Kevin Thomas	Start: 06/30/2009 End: 07/01/2010		ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: At the conclusion of the 2009-10 school year we evaluated BMI, School Health Index, and Farm to School 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 2010-11 school year we plan to continue to use School Health Index, BMI, and Healthy cooking classes in evaluating and adjusting the programs, processes, and activities, that make up the action descriptions within the program. Farm to school program was not accepted this year, so the program was discontinued.	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4: Goal: All LEP students will improve in reading comprehension and fluency, written expression

and constructive response.

Supporting  
Data:

Goal Provide interventions for all ELL students working below grade level in literacy.

Benchmark "The Combined Population and each Subpop MET the 2009 AYP target of 62.9% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2010 AYP Target scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Parental Involvement: The District will ensure that each school will implement an effective means of outreach to parents of ELL students to involve parents in assisting their children to learn English, achieve at high levels in core academic subjects, and meet the same challenging State academic standards as all other children are expected to meet.				
Scientific Based Research: Scientific Based Research: Echevarria, Jana; Vogt, Mary Ellen; Short, Deborah. Pearson. New Edition (2007). Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model Echevarria, Jana; Vogt, Mary Ellen. Pearson. (2007). 99 Ideas and Activities for Teaching English Learners with the SIOP Model				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Interpreters will be available, as needed, to provide translations for Parent/Teacher Conferences, registrations, and meetings to assist parents in helping their children improve their academic achievement and becoming active participants in the education of their children. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Schools will hold meetings with teachers and ELL parents at the beginning of each school year, to interpret language assessment scores and to determine the educational plan for each student. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Cheryl Putnam	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
The District will provide professional development to district staff to substantially increase the knowledge and understanding, related to the needs of ELL students, and to enhance teaching skills of classroom teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Stephanie Sawyer	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION: This is a new intervention. At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 school year parent involvement actions will be evaluated by each school, analyzing the participation rate of ELL parents by school and grade level in parent teacher conferences. We expect to see a 25% increase in participation this school year. We will report the results in our 2010/2011 Plan and use the results to determine whether the objectives of this Intervention 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: Alignment	Stephanie Sawyer	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Equity				
Action Type: Parental Engagement				
Total Budget:				\$0

- Priority 5: Reduce the relative proportion of African American students to students of other ethnicity identified as Mentally Retarded.
- 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%
  - African American Students Labeled MR: 20/50 or 40%. All other ethnicity: 30/50 or 60%.
  - 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.
  - Currently served students in early-intervention district-wide:  
11/99 = 11% African American  
53/99 = 54% Caucasian
- Supporting Data:
- 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.				
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				
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 with CIAA	Debra	Start:		

staff 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: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Wilson	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 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	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The district will implement K-2 MAP assessments in order to provide more targeted and explicit instruction in Literacy and all content areas. (Software and Hardware) These materials will be purchased using IDEA title VI-B CEIS funds. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Elementary, Middle School and Secondary teachers will receive training in core instruction to improve early-intervening Literacy strategies across the district. Elementary Literacy coaches will be involved with the training and coaching and this will be coordinated with SPED cultural diversity and learning environment awareness. Interventionists and Aides will also be involved. Kelly Brown, our specialist involved with coordinated early intervening services, will enhance and expand the problem solving teams work. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who are evaluated for Special Education within the state established time line of 60 days (CHILD FIND) will be 100% for the overall district, the early childhood ages 3-5 and school age 5-21. In the 2009-2010 school year, the school age percentage was 100% which meets the goal from 2009. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
: Fayetteville Schools will purchase early intervention materials, including Read 180 and System 44 kits, that will be proactive in meeting the needs of all learners in hopes of preventing inappropriate SPED referrals. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Deborah Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Fayetteville schools will employ a national consultant to provide training in improvement of our co-teaching model. These sessions will be aimed at both SPED and general education teachers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Funding from Title VI, Coordinated Early Intervening Services will be designated to pay for the following items at Leverett Elementary: EnglishK/Primary	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End:	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Curriculum Oral Language Good Habits/Great Readers Blends/ABC Charts Word/Vocabulary Skills MAP Testing Equipment MAP Testing Licenses Total: \$20,198.12 Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education		06/30/2011		BUDGET:
PROGRAM EVALUATION: The program evaluation for 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: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Debra Wilson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

- Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Adrienne Johnson	2nd grade teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Amanda Winn	Pre-Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Amy Hickman	2nd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Beth Lewis	Art Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Gayle Bowman	3rd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jackie Curington	1st grade teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	John Andrews	Music Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Katie Austin	1st Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lacey Bingaman	5th grade teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Laura Goodwin	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Lorenzo Robinson	Physical Education TEacher	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Lyndsey Runyan	Speech	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Mackenzie Dailey	3rd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Melissa Armendariz	5th grade teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Mindy Lawson	Second grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Pam Dunn	1st grade teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Rachelle Simpson	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Rick Sullins	4th grade teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Shannon Carlton	4th grade teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Sharon Michaels	Resource Teacher, PDSC	Math
Classroom Teacher	Shirley Gorman	Gifted and Talented Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Stephanie Harter	3rd Grade teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Stephanie Wood	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Christie Jay	Federal Programs Coordinator	Math/Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff			
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Annie Langston	Tech-Curriculum Specialist	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Carol Raybon	Library Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Karen Bley	Counselor	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Olivia Murphy	ELL Teacher	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Penny Ezell	Literacy Coach	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sara Chamberlain	Social Worker	Literacy/Math
Parent	Chris Epperson	Parent	Wellness
Parent	Terri Chaddick	Parent	Literacy/Math
Principal	Cheryl Putnam	Principal	ACSIP Leadership/Title I/Title V