



[District Menu Page](#) | [Work On Your ACSIP](#) | [Reports](#) | [Federal/State Budgets](#) | [School Completion Status](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Feedback](#) | [Logout](#)

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

GENTRY INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2009-2010

The mission of the Gentry Intermediate School is to work in partnership with students, parents, and the community to establish a strong foundation for life-long learning in literacy and math by providing a safe, nurturing, child-centered environment. As we foster intellectual growth, we will contribute to the character and physical development of each student.

"A Strong Foundation for Lifelong Learning"

"Whatever it takes, our kids are worth it!"

Grade Span: 3-5

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will improve by 5% or better over and above last year's benchmark score in reading comprehension and written expression.

Priority 2: Math

Goal: All students will improve by 4% or better in mathematics skills and answering open-response math and multiple-choice questions. The 3rd grade class of 2007-2008 (101 students total tested) combined population scored 85% proficient or advanced on the 2008 Augmented Benchmark Exam in math. This same class in 2008-2009 (107 total students tested) combined population scored 84% proficient or advanced in math on the 2009 4th Grade Augmented Benchmark. GIS is pleased that this class of students continues to score well but is aware that they must continue to make gains in order to reach 100% proficient or advanced in the 2013-2014 school year. This is our 5th grade class of 2009-2010 and the first class of students to go through 3 years of several of the actions we have in place to help them be high achievers: Target Assessments, RTI, and Classroom Walk-Throughs.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: Gentry Intermediate Wellness activities will create a healthy school environment that supports consistent health, nutrition and physical activity messages to students and community.

Goal: Gentry Intermediate Students will improve the percentage of students who are at a healthy weight by 2%.

Priority 4: Parental Involvement

Goal: Parent Involvement Plan: Gentry Intermediate will take every opportunity to involve parents in the process of school review and improvement including the following interventions.

Priority 5: Special Education Trigger

Goal: To reduce the percentage of white students in special education programs in relation to the proportion of the percent of white students in the general education programs.

Students in the Gentry Intermediate School will perform at grade level in the curriculum area of literacy. Needs Assessment: Teachers worked in grade level teams to examine the past three years 2007 - 2009 test data in literacy to determine trends. From this data disaggregation the 5th grade team found that students in 5th grade have struggled primarily in answering open response questions on the content and practical passages. Those two areas remain the weakest for our 5th

Priority 1:

graders. The 4th grade team of teachers found that their students over the past 3 years have had difficulty mostly with open response content and literary passages. Their students' lowest areas seem to be inference, understanding context clues, prior knowledge, and content reading. While the 3rd grade team determined that their students weakest areas are also in answering open response questions over practical, content, and literary passages. They found their students struggle with summarizing non-fiction and text-to-world connections. Understanding the author's purpose is particularly difficult at this level also. Students at all three grade levels, over all three years, perform lowest in writing in the domain of content and style.

1. Benchmark Exam: Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam 2007 GRADE 5 BENCHMARK EXAMINATION COMBINED POPULATION LITERACY 105 STUDENTS TESTED, 64 STUDENTS: 61% PROF/ADV. FEMALE - 34 STUDENTS: 70% PRO/ADV. MALE - 30 STUDENTS: 54% PRO/ADV. ASIAN - . STUDENTS:n/a PRO/ADV. AFRICAN AMERICAN - N/A 0 STUDENTS HISPANIC - . STUDENTS: n/a PRO/ADV. CAUCASIAN - 52 STUDENTS: 66% PRO/ADV. STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES - . STUDENT: n/a PRO LEP - 7 STUDENTS: 44% PRO/ADV. FREE AND/OR REDUCED - 26 STUDENTS: 51% PRO/ADV. The weakest areas in literacy in the 5th grade were writing open-response and content passage open-response.

_____ 2008 Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam 119 students tested of which 71 students: 60.2% were Pro/Adv.. Of Female Students: 35 students or 68% Pro/Adv.. Of Male Students: 33 Students or 52% Pro/Adv.. 0 students: .% African American Students Pro/Adv.. 17 Students: 64.7% Hispanic Students Pro/Adv.. 74 Students 56.8% Caucasian students Pro/Adv.. 68 Students:55.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Pro/Adv.. 18 Students: 55.6% of LEP students Pro/Adv.. 12 Students:8.3% Students w/Disabilities Pro/Adv.. The lowest two identified area across all subpops were Content Passage Open Response and Literary O.R..

- _____ 2009 GRADE 5 AUGMENTED BENCHMARK 125 STUDENTS TESTED. COMBINED POPULATION NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT/ADVANCED: 102 STUDENTS: 81% PRO/ADV..FEMALE: 53 STUDENTS:86% PRO/ADV.. MALE: 49 STUDENTS: 76% PRO/ADV..STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES: 0 STUDENTS: 0% PRO/ADV.. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT 14 STUDENTS:78% PRO/ADV.. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED 63 STUDENTS: 80% PRO/ADV..ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER: 7 STUDENTS: 88% PRO/ADV.. AFRICAN AMERICAN: NA.. HISPANIC 11 STUDENTS: 78% PRO/ADV.. CAUCASIAN: 77 STUDENTS: 83% PRO/ADV. THE LOWEST AREAS OF PERFORMANCE FOR 5TH GRADERS IN READING WAS IN THE PRACTICAL PASSAGES FOR BOTH M/C AND OPEN RESPONSE. IN WRITING WAS BOTH CONTENT AND STYLE WERE THE LOWEST PERFORMANCE AREAS.

2. Benchmark Exam: Benchmark-4th Grade Literacy Exam 2007 GRADE 4 BENCHMARK EXAM COMBINED POPULATION - 115 STUDENTS TESTED, 72 STUDENTS: 63% PRO/ADV. FEMALE - 28 STUDENTS: 52% PRO/ADV. MALE - 44 STUDENTS: 72% PRO/ADV. ASIAN - . STUDENTS: n/a PRO/ADV. AFRICAN AMERICAN - N/A 0 STUDENTS TESTED HISPANIC - 10 STUDENTS: 62% PRO/ADV. NATIVE AMERICAN - 10 STUDENTS: 84% PRO/ADV. CAUCASIAN - 49 STUDENTS: 62% PRO/ADV. STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES - 2 STUDENTS: 17% PRO. LEP - . STUDENTS: n/a PRO/ADV. FREE AND/OR REDUCED - 33 STUDENTS: 57% PRO/ADV. The weakest area for 4th grade literacy was literary and content reading passage particularly open-response.

_____ 2008 Benchmark - 4th Grade Literacy Exam 127 Students tested of which 94 students or 74.6% were Pro/Adv. of the combined population!!!! 0 students: .% of African American scored Pro/Adv. 17 Students:58.8% of Hispanic scored Pro/Adv.. 91 Students: 79.1% Caucasian scored Pro/Adv.. 76 Students:71.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Pro/Adv.. 21 Students: 52.4% of LEP scored Pro/Adv.. 11 Students: 27.3% of Students w/Disabilities scored Pro/Adv.. The lowest identified area across all subpopulations in the 4th grade was Content Passage Open Response.

- _____ 2009 4TH GRADE AUGMENTED BENCHMARK LITERACY COMBINED POPULATION: 107 STUDENTS TESTED. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENT SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED: 83 STUDENTS: 78% PRO/ADV.. FEMALES 46 STUDENTS: 83% PRO/ADV.. MALES: 37 STUDENTS: 73% PRO/ADV.. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: 0 STUDENTS:0% PRO/ADV.. LEP:0 STUDENTS: 0% PRO/ADV.. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED: 49 STUDENTS: 75% PRO/ADV.. ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER:3 STUDENTS: 50% PRO/ADV.. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 2 STUDENTS: 100% PRO/ADV.. HISPANIC: 6 STUDENTS: 66% PRO/ADV.. NATIVE AMERICAN: 3 STUDENTS:38% PRO/ADV..CAUCASIAN: 69 STUDENTS: 84% PRO/ADV.. THE LOWEST AREAS FOR 4TH GRADE STUDENTS IN READING WAS IN M/C PRACTICAL PASSAGE AND OPEN RESPONSE LITERARY PASSAGE. WRITING CONTENT AND STYLE REMAIN THE LOWEST AREAS.

3. Benchmark Exam: Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam 2007 GRADE 3 BENCHMARK EXAM COMBINED POPULATION 125 STUDENTS TESTED, 93 STUDENTS: 74% SCORED PRO/ADV. FEMALE - 46 STUDENTS: 73% PRO/ADV MALE - 47 STUDENTS: 75% PRO/ADV. ASIAN - . STUDENTS: n/a PRO/ADV. AFRICAN AMERICAN - N/A 0 STUDENTS HISPANIC - 12

STUDENTS: 63% PRO/ADV. NATIVE AMERICAN - . STUDENTS: n/a PRO/ADV. CAUCASIAN - 74 STUDENTS: 81% PRO/ADV. STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES - 2 STUDENTS: 17% PRO/ADV. LEP - 13 STUDENTS: 56% PRO/ADV. FREE AND/OR REDUCED - 47 STUDENTS: 68% PRO/ADV. The weakest areas is 3rd grade literacy on the 2007 Benchmark exam were literary and content passage open response.

2008 Benchmark - 3rd Grade Literacy Exam Combined Population 97 students tested: 72.2% scored Pro/Adv.. . Students: n/a African American scored Pro/Adv.. 8 Students: 50% Hispanic students Pro/Adv.. 74 Students: 78.4% of Caucasians students scored Pro/Adv.. 58 Students: 65.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged students scored Pro/Adv.. 11 Students: 36.4% of LEP students Pro/Adv.. 10 Students: 30% of Students w/ Disabilities scored Pro/Adv. The lowest identified areas for the 3rd Grade combined population for reading was Content Passage Open Response. For writing the lowest area was Style.

2009 AUGMENTED BENCHMARK 3RD GRADE LITERACY EXAM, 105 STUDENTS WERE TESTED. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED, COMBINED POPULATION 68 STUDENTS: 64% PRO/ADV.. FEMALE: 33 STUDENTS: 68% PRO/ADV.. MALE: 35 STUDENTS: 63% PRO/ADV..STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES: 0 STUDENTS:0% PRO/ADV.. LEP: 6 STUDENTS: 35% PRO/ADV.. ECON. DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS: 36 STUDENTS: 55% PRO/ADV.. ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER 6 STUDENTS: 60 % PRO/ADV.. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 1 STUDENT: 100% PRO/ADV.. HISPANIC: 8 STUDENTS: 51% PRO/ADV.. NATIVE AMERICAN: 5 STUDENTS: 63% PRO/ADV.. CAUCASIAN: 48 STUDENTS: 69% PRO/ADV.. FOR 3RD GRADE STUDENTS IN 2009 THE LOWEST AREAS OF PERFORMANCE WERE IN READING M/C PRACTICAL PASSAGES AND IN OPEN RESPONSE CONTENT PASSAGES. IN THE AREA OF WRITING OUR 3RD GRADE STUDENTS PERFORMED LOWEST IN CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS.

4. 2009 ACSIP NRT Data: 125 students tested in 5th grade. % at/above 50th NPR in: Combined Population: Reading Comprehension 65.6%. Hispanic: Reading Comprehension 57.1%. Caucasian: Rdg Comp 69.9%. Economically Disadvantaged Number tested: 83, Rding Comp:60.2. LEP # tested: 19. Rding Comp 57.9%. Student w/disabilities # tested 12. Rding 25%. _____ 2008 SAT 10 Norm

Supporting
Data:

Referenced Test for Grade 5 Reading Comprehension 119 Students tested, 55.5% of combined population scored At/Above 50th NPR. African American students N/A%. Hispanic students 19 tested:57.9% At/Above. Caucasian students 77 tested: 55.8% At/Above. Economically Disadvantaged students 71 tested: 47.9% At/Above. Limited English Proficient students 19 tested:47.4% At/Above. Students w/Disabilities 14 tested 14.3% At/Above. The Lowest subpopulation is LEP students in Reading Comprehension.

5. _____ Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007 Grade: 5, 106 students tested. Vocabulary 55 students: 51.9%. Reading Comprehension 56 students:52.8%. Reading Total 61 students: 57.6%. Spelling 54 students:50.9%. Capitalization 66 students:62.3%. Punctuation 75 students: 70.8%. Usage and Expression 65 students:61.4%. Language Total 67 students: 63.2% The weakest area for combined population is spelling and vocabulary. AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION N/A 0 students. HISPANIC POPULATION Grade 5 - 19 students tested. Vocabulary . students: n/a. Comprehension 11 students:57.9%. Reading Total 9 students: 47.4. Spelling . students: n/a. Capitalization 10 students: 52.6%. Punctuation 13 students: 68.5 %. Usage and Expression 13: 68.4%. Language Total 11 students: 57.9% The weakest area for Hispanic students is spelling and vocabulary. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade 5 - 93 students tested. vocabulary 69 students: 74.2%. Comprehension 69: 74.2%. Total Reading 73 students:78.5%. Spelling 66 students: 71%. Capitalization 69 students:74.2%. Punctuation 73 students: 78.5%. Usage and Expression 73 students:78.5%. Total Language 73 students: 78.5%. The weakest area for 5th grade caucasian students was Spelling. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED 52 students tested in 5th grade. Vocabulary 21 students: 40.4%. Comprehension 24 students: 46.1%. Total Reading 26 students: 50%. Spelling 24 students: 46.1%. Capitalization 27 students: 52%. Punctuation 32 students: 61.5%. Usage and Expression 29 students: 55.7%. Total Language 27 students: 51.9%. The weakest areas for economically disadvantaged students are vocabulary and comprehension and spelling. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT 16 students tested in the 5th grade. Vocabulary . students:n/a. Comprehension . students: n/a. Total Reading 5 students: 31.3 %. Spelling 7 students: 43.8%. Capitalization 10 students: 62.6%. Punctuation 11 students: 68.8%. Usage and Expression . students: n/a. Total Language . students:n/a. The weakest areas for LEP students in the 5th grade is vocabulary and Total Reading. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES 12 students tested in the 5th grade. Vocabulary . student: n/a. Comprehension . student: n/a. Total Reading . student:n/a. Spelling . student:n/a. Capitalization . student: n/a. Punctuation . students:n/a. Usage and Expression . students: n/a. Total Language . student: n/a. Weakest areas are vocabulary, comprehension, total reading, spelling, and total language.
6. NRT ACSIP DATA SOURCE - 4TH GRADE 2009 Number tested and Percent of students scoring

at/above 50th percentile: Combined Population 108 tested reading comprehension 63.9% Pro/Adv. Hispanic 10 tested. Reading Comp. 50% Pro/Adv Caucasian 82 tested. Reading Comp. 72% Pro/Adv Economically Disadvantaged 68 tested. Reading Comp. 57.4% Pro/Adv. Limited English Proficient 12 tested. Rding Comp: 41.7% Pro/Adv. Students w/Disabilities 8.3% Pro/Adv. _____ 2008 SAT 4th Grade Norm Referenced Test. Combined population tested 127 students, 73.2% of those scored At/Above the 50th NPR. African American N/A%. Hispanic students 18 tested: 66.7% At/Above. Economically Disadvantaged Students 80 tested: 68.8% AT/Above. Limited English Proficient Students 22 tested: 50% At/Above. Student w/Disabilities 10 tested: 20% At/Above. The subpopulation with the greatest need in 4th grade are students w/disabilities first and LEP students second.

7. Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007 Grade: 4. 117 students tested. Vocabulary 69 students: 58.9%. Comprehension 68 students: 58.1%. Total Reading 65 students: 55.5%. Spelling 70 students: 59.8%. Capitalization 72 students: 60.5%. Punctuation 76 students: 65%. Usage & Expression 75 students: 64.2%. Total Language 75 students: 64.1%. The weakest area for combined population is Vocabulary. Total Reading - Economically Disadvantaged 28 students: 43.8%. Limited English Proficient . student: n/a. Female 28 students: 49.1%. Male 37 students: 61.7%. Asian N/A, Caucasian 50 students: 61%. Hispanic 6 students: 40%. Native American . students: n/a.
8. 2009 SAT 10 NRT ACSIP Data Source 3rd Grade Number tested and Percent of Students Scoring at/Above 50th Percentile: Combined Population 106 tested. Reading Comprehension 32.1% Pro/Adv. Hispanic 17 tested. Reading Comp. 23.5% Pro/Adv. Caucasian 70 tested. Reading Comp. 38.6% Pro/Adv. Economically Disadvantaged 68 tested. Reading Comp. 17.6% Pro/Adv. Limited English Proficient 18 tested. Reading Comp. 0% Pro/Adv. Students w/Disabilities 12 tested. Reading Comp. 0% Pro/Adv.

_____ 2008 SAT 10 3rd Grade Norm Referenced Test. 101 Students tested, of those 50.5% scored At/Above the 50th NPR. African American . students tested: n/a scored At/Above. Caucasian 78 students tested: 57.7% At/Above. Economically Disadvantaged 61 students tested: 49.2% At/Above. Limited English Proficient 10 students tested: n/a At/Above. Students w/Disabilities tested: n/a At/Above. Interesting that 72.2% of the 3rd grade students scored Pro/Adv on the CRT in Literacy but only 50% scored At/Above on the NRT in Reading Comprehension. We need to work on comprehension.

9. Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 2007 Grade: 3. 126 students tested. Vocabulary 81 students: 63.8%. Comprehension 87 students: 68.5%. Total Reading 89 students: 70.1%. Spelling 83 students: 65.4%. Capitalization 89 students: 70%. Punctuation 95 students: 74.8%. Usage & Expression 92 students: 72.4%. Language Total 96 students: 74.6%. The weakest area for combined population is Vocabulary. Total Reading - Economically Disadvantaged 44 students: 61.1%. Limited English Proficient . students: n/a. Female 42 students: 66.7%. Male 47 students: 73.5%. Asian . students: n/a. Caucasian 73 students: 78.5%. Hispanic students: n/a. Native American students: n/a.
10. Student Attendance for Gentry Intermediate: during the 2008 - 2009 school year attendance was 95.34%. In the 2007 - 2008 school year, 95.23% of students were in attendance. During the 2006 -2007 school year Average Daily Attendance was 95.20%. Gentry Intermediate School has exceeded our attendance goal of 91.13% every year for the past 3 years with a slight increase each year.

Goal All students will improve by 5% or better over and above last year's benchmark score in reading comprehension and written expression.

Benchmark Each grade level will meet or exceed the AYP standard developed by the Arkansas Department of Education.

Intervention: Total Instructional Alignment will be used as a guide by all teachers to to align the curriculum.				
Scientific Based Research: Marzano, Robert, What Works in Schools, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2003), Carter, Lisa, Total Instructional Alignment. Solution Tree Publishers (2007). Center for Mental Health in Schools (2008). Frameworks for Systemic Transformation of Student Learning Supports. Los Angeles, CA.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers worked in both vertical and horizontal teams developing formative and summative assessments in literacy. The Northwest	Denise Waters, Principal	Start: 07/01/2009 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	ACTION

<p>Arkansas Educational Service Cooperative (NWAESC) coordinated the implementation of this instructional and curriculum alignment model in all 16 districts in the NWAESC beginning in January 2007. Each school district, with support of the school superintendent, sent the administrator from each school and the school's best instructional practitioners to the week long training under the direction of Lisa Carter. The resulting work (in constant progress and improvement) was a vertically and horizontally aligned curriculum and instructional document aligned with state Standards and Benchmark assessments. Teachers were trained at the building level on how to implement TIA on a quarterly basis over the course of the school year. Teachers will work in collaborative grade level teams (PLC)to develop lessons that are aligned using their specific TIA document as a guide for grade level and content area . Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>		06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	BUDGET: \$
<p>The building level administrator was trained in the Classroom Walk Through Model (CWT) of instructional evaluation in relation to TIA during the 2007-2008 school year. The ADE provides access to the Teachscope CWT platform where CWT data is electronically warehoused. Administrators can use wireless devices (PDAs) that are compatible with the TeachScape platform to collect data regarding implementation of TIA in all classrooms. Data can be retrieved as reports that can be analyzed in conjunction with student achievement/lesson objectives in order to make ongoing decisions about classroom instruction and professional development. The CWT process involves the building administrator conducting multiple classroom visits over the course of the year. Parents and students will be informed as to the nature of these multiple visits and how it differs from the traditional 2-3 formal/informal teacher evaluations they may be accustomed to. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Denise Waters, Principal	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP BASELINE DATA: Pre/post and quarterly (PLC developed)Targeted Assessments will be administered in each grade 3 - 5 in conjunction with grade level team (PLC) developed curriculum. Results will be used to determine how better to serve students through reteaching and other interventions as</p>	Denise Waters, Principal	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Central Office ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>determined necessary by the building teams. The Targeted Assessment data, will be used to determine the success of implementation and instructional and curriculum needs and adjustments for each student on an ongoing basis. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>ATTRACTING HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF - Gentry Intermediate School has and will continue to hire highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals. The school will continue to implement strategies to recruit and hire highly qualified faculty and staff by advertising on our web-site and ensuring that all qualifications have been met or approved plans are in place for the applicant to become highly qualified prior to making a recommendation for a position within the school. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Denise Waters, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION - Federal, state, and local funds are used to coordinate and integrate services to improve instruction and increase student achievement. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Denise Waters, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • School Library • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT. Selected faculty/staff will attend professional development opportunities that support ACSIP at the local state, regional and national levels. PD opportunities may include but not be limited to AAEA, ASCD, BER, NCTM, IRA, AP, PLC, RTI Institutes, Instructional Conferences, ARRR/Literacy Conference, CurrMapSoftware, Technology Conference, Literacy Lab, ESL/TESOL, PLC/book Studies, Portfolio training and other local, state, regional and national conference/trainings. Monies will be used to fund all reasonable cost associated with the professional development including fees, meals, travel, etc. Funds may be used for membership dues/fees for organizations/publications which contribute to the field of education as well as paying for substitutes while teachers are attending professional development training. Information gleaned from professional development opportunities will be shared with faculty upon return to the district. \$ \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
EVALUATION OF 08-09 RESULTS FROM TIA. Pre/Post and quarterly targeted assessments provided to the district from the Northwest Arkansas Educational Services Cooperative (NWAESC) were determined by grade level PLC teams and vertical PLC teams to be neither well-written nor reflective of what and how the teachers are teaching frameworks. Grade level PLC teams voted unanimously to design their own pre/post and quarterly target assessments using released items and other available resources in alignment with Arkansas State Curriculum Frameworks while still using the TIA curriculum document as a guide. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Denise Waters	Start: 07/30/2009 End: 06/28/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Response to Intervention (RTI) will be used by all teachers to help students learn in areas where the student is achieving below grade level.				
Scientific Based Research: Friend, M. (2008). Co-teaching creating successful and sustainable programs. National Assoc. of State Directors of Special Education. Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P.L., & Young, C.L. (2003) Responsiveness -to-Intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disabilities construct. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18(3), 157-171. Kovalski, J.F/ (2003, December). The three tier model of identifying learning disabilities: Critical program features and system issues. Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO. Wright, J. (2005, Summer). Five interventions that work. NAESP leadership Compass, 2(4) pp.1,6.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
POINT IN TIME REMEDIATION: Intervention resources will be organized into 3 tiers using both the "problem solving" and "standard protocol" methods: Tier 1 will include universal strategies for all children provided in the regular classroom (i.e. reteaching using one-on-one or small group instruction). Tier 2 - interventions individualized to the needs of students at-risk for learning or behavioral issues will be provide instruction in small groups using scientifically valid strategies with frequent progress monitoring facilitated in a team-teaching model. Tier 3 - Intensive student support with possible referral for Special Education Services complete with Parent conference and consent. Materials and supplies will be purchased for instruction and implementation of tiers. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM STRATEGIES -Flexible Response to Struggling Learners. As soon as a student demonstrates that they require more assistance, the classroom teacher puts Tier 1 (universal) interventions into place and monitors the student's performance. Tier 1 is a scheduled 30 minute period daily in which the teacher works individually or in small group with the student(s) who need additional help. If the student fails to make adequate progress with Tier 1, the teacher refers that student to the multidisciplinary School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT) for Tier 2 interventions. Tier 2 is another 45 minute scheduled time 4 days a week in which those students requiring individualized instruction are sent to small groups (no more than 6 students to a teacher) for specific instruction in a Team-teaching classroom. Teachers are working together, two classroom teachers, a interventionist, and/or the ESL teacher, and/or a special education teacher. All teachers are working with the students on the same specific S.L.E. for that period. Tier 2 is documented daily and monitored frequently using curriculum based measures. Progress-monitoring data is repeatedly compared to the student's outcome goal to determine whether the intervention is successful. If the student fails to make adequate progress over a reasonable period of time (9 weeks) the student is referred back to the SBIT for referral to Tier 3 and possible evaluation for special education. Parents are kept informed of their child's progress through the RTI tiers. Title 1 funds will be used to pay salary/benefits/supplies/materials for two full-time teachers (2.0 FTE) to provide interventions for struggling students. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Denise Waters	Start: 08/25/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$1000.00 Title I - Employee Salaries: \$92380.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$21932.26 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$115312.26
PARENT ENGAGEMENT. Parents will be informed about RTI at Open House prior to the beginning of school and during the Report to the	Jo Derwin	Start: 09/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Public. A written explanation of RTI will be provided to parents of students participating in RTI at Parent/Teacher Conferences. If a student demonstrates a need for RTI, the parent will be kept informed of their child's involvement in the prescriptive tiers by a letter from the multidisciplinary School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT) Parents may also access information concerning Response to Intervention (RTI) on the Intermediate School Website. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COLLABORATION AND TEACHER DECISION. Teachers will further develop formative performance assessments for the Response to Intervention model during both professional development and an on-going process through out the school year in grade level/vertical PLC team study. Grade Level Teams (PLC) will meet weekly to plan and develop assessments for RTI. Vertical teams (PLC) will meet monthly to review instructional progress. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>COLLABORATION AND TEACHER DECISION. Faculty will meet intermittently to review, evaluate, and/or revise the school's ACSIP plan in order to keep the plan pertinent and valid. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Plan evaluation. District Targeted Assessments and (CRT)(NRT) Benchmark assessment will be used to help determine student placement in Tiers of Interventions. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Jo Derwin	Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 2010-2011 ACSIP BASELINE DATA: The School-Based Intervention Team consisting of multidisciplinary members of the faculty will meet once a week to review student data and refer students to RTI tiers as needed. The SBIT will keep parents informed of their decisions by mail. Meeting sign-in sheet and minutes will document and determine the level of implementation. Documentation of student involvement in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will indicate success. Teacher notes from PLCs will be used to prompt adjustment of the SBIT team and RTI intervention. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Jo Derwin</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS FROM 2008-2009 RTI INTERVENTION: The School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT)met every Wednesday morning with only a few exceptions through-out the 08-09 school year. Minutes from each meeting document decisions that were made on behalf of students placed in the various Tiers of Intervention all the way to evaluating for Special Education Services. Data collected indicates that the SBIT team was successful in having students identified as learning disabled 80% of the time they were referred for SpEd testing. Said referral required that each student receive academic intervention through at least 9 weeks of Tier 2 and 9 weeks of Tier 3. A Teacher Survey conducted at the end of the school year asked teachers to rate the effectiveness of the RTI intervention on a Likert Scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being excellent. The average response was a 4 or 80% positive from all staff members. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 07/28/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$115312.26</p>
<p>Intervention: GIS will utilize a comprehensive literacy approach to Literacy instruction: Effective Literacy Training, provided by Literacy Specialist from the Northwest Arkansas Educational Cooperative to include Writing Workshop, Guided Reading, Reading Workshop, and Strategies That Work.</p>				
<p>Scientific Based Research: Allington, Ricard (2000). What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research-Based Programs. New York: NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. CIERA (2001). Put Reading First: The Research Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Literacy, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and U.S. Department of Education. National Reading Panel (2000). Teaching Children to Read. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and</p>				

Human Development, National Institute for Literacy and U.S. Department of Education. "Teaching Writing" Gail Tompkins (2000); "Guiding Readers and Writers Grades 3-6" Fountas and Pinnell (2001).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS - In addition to the classroom teachers, the district will provide supplementary highly qualified certified teachers (Interventionist) to work on reducing the gap for lowest achievers in grade 3-5 by serving students in small groups. Classroom Teachers will instruct writing in whole groups. Provide students with writing opportunities daily. Purchase any needed materials and supplies to carry out responsibilities and activities. Establish a uniform, school-wide program of pre-writing strategies. Curriculum development and alignment by grade levels. All teachers will be trained in Effective Literacy. Teachers will instruct using ELT strategies. All teachers will continue to be trained in the use of ELT strategies. NSLA funds will be used to pay salary/benefits/supplies/materials for one certified teacher (1.0 FTE) to provide supplemental services.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Teachers will participate collaboratively in follow-up activities to support use of Effective Literacy strategies and evaluate effectiveness of process by reviewing the students' performance on frequent writing assignments including the use of writing rubrics. The children will be taught how to use the rubric to write and evaluate their own work.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Shannon Holland, Carmen Tromp, Jennifer Hinterthuer	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT - Update student data and reports annually. All students are pre-tested with the use of the DRA, DIBELS, and a writing CBA for placement. Each student is then post-tested in May to establish individual growth using the aforementioned assessments and Grade Level Team (PLC) developed Target Testing. Rights to JEDI usage will be purchased. Students are tested at the end of each unit in the JEDI lab in order to progress to the next level. Teachers also have the ability to give students a specific unit to work on in the JEDI lab.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Naomi Wilson, Rhonda Lyles	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM STRATEGIES - All students will participate in explicit writing instruction in the regular classrooms. Intervention teachers will provide supplemental instructions to those students showing a need in RTI. This includes teacher explanation and modeling of all writing skills, followed by guided practice and independent practice. Progress in grades 3-5 will be monitored periodically with Curriculum Based Measures and Classroom Based Assessments. Parents will be informed of student progress in writing at 5 weeks and 9 weeks. Parents will be provided a list of suggested activities for writing in routine newsletters and at Parent Night. GIS expects all students to be proficient in writing. NSLA funds will be used to purchase materials, supplies, and technology to implement instruction. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Carmen Tromp, Shannon Holland, Jennifer Hinterthuer</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM STRATEGIES - All students will participate in explicit and systematic word study/spelling and vocabulary instruction. This includes teacher explanation and modeling of all word study/spelling and vocabulary skills, followed by guided practice and independent practice. Additional practice may be integrated in RTI tiers, ENCORE higher level thinking skills, literacy centers or as homework. Teachers will also teach the "essential vocabulary" provided for each Curriculum Frameworks Student Learner Expectation. Student progress will be evaluated based on Arkansas Gr. 3, Gr. 4, and Gr. 5 Benchmark Exams, JEDI, DRA, and Targeted Assessments. Parents will be provided activities to assist in word study/spelling and vocabulary in routine information letters and at Parent Night. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Melinda Ramsey, Liz Newlun, Tracey McCartney</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION - All students 3-5 will participate in fluency instruction. This includes teacher explanation and modeling of fluency skills, followed by guided practice and independent practice. Students identified as not meeting the expectation for success will receive additional fluency instruction in RTI small groups by highly qualified certified teachers. Parents will be informed of student progress in fluency. Parents will be provided suggested fluency activities in newsletters and at Parent Night. Students will meet fluency benchmarks for grades 3-5. The program will be evaluated by student growth on the DIBELS. \$ [Modify] [Delete]</p>	<p>Naomi Wilson</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>Provide a link for parents to Accelerated Reader list on school website. Provide the Gentry Public Library with the Accelerated Reader list. Increase student opportunities for reading by encouraging their reading whenever they have free time in the classroom. Increase number of informational books for Accelerated Reader program. Provide staff development for Technology use with Accelerated Reader. Monies will be used to maintain the Accelerated Reader Program during the school year. \$ [Modify] [Delete] * Add Action Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Del Duncan</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Public Library ● School Library ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT. Each teacher in grades 3-5 will utilize the Effective Literacy teaching procedures for comprehension instruction in literacy and core curriculum classes. An emphasis will be placed on monitoring comprehension, using graphic organizers and semantic organizers, answering questions, generating questions, recognizing story structure, summarizing, making use of prior knowledge and connections, and using mental imagery. Whole group instruction and small group instruction will be utilized as noted in the instructional protocol. All students will participate in comprehension strategy instruction. This includes teacher explanation and modeling of all comprehension strategies, followed by guided practice and independent practice. Additional practice may be integrated into literacy centers, literacy circles, or homework. DRA will be utilized as a placement tool for leveling reading instruction to meet the needs of the students in grades 3-5. Each student will receive a pre-test to determine their current ability level. All students will be post-tested each May to measure growth and determine placement for the next year. Teachers will continue training in Effective Literacy to learn about best practices in comprehension instruction. Parents will be informed of student progress in comprehension. Parents will be provided a list of comprehension activities in newsletters and at Parent Night. Students identified as not meeting the expectation for success will receive additional comprehension strategy instruction in RTI tiers. Progress will be monitored weekly until the expectation is met. NSLA monies will be used to purchase materials and supplies as well as classroom sets of books for Guided Reading and Literature Circles. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Rhonda Lyles, Naomi Wilson, Megan Oaks</p>	<p>Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Performance Assessments ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
TEACHER DECISIONS - Periodically review and evaluate plan in ACSIP meetings and vertical team meetings. Update student data and reports quarterly. Students that score below proficient on the (CRT)(NRT)Benchmark Exam will be placed in RTI Tier 2 and on AIPs by their current teacher to improve their areas of weakness. \$ Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Denise Waters	Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP BASELINE DATA: Classroom teachers will specify Student Learner Expectations and Effective Literacy strategies in their lesson plans which are turned into the principal weekly. The principal will conduct Classroom Walk-Throughs to document implementation of Effective Literacy. Information gathered from Teacher surveys at the end of the school year will be used to make adjustments to the intervention. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Denise Waters	Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
TECHNOLOGY. Document readers of the ELMO type, projectors, and laptop computers will be used in classrooms to provide comprehensive literacy instruction. ARRA/Stimulus monies will be used to fund the necessary technology equipment as well as much needed new magnetic white boards. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Denise Waters	Start: 08/19/2009 End: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● School Library ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS FOR THE 2008-2009 SCHOOL YEAR. Classroom teachers were considerent in specifying Effective Literacy Strategies in their lesson plans on a weekly basis. Classroom Walk-Throughs and teacher observations documented implementation of Effective Literacy strategies use in the classroom. Teacher surveys at the end of the 08-09 school year rated the Effective Literacy Professional Development on a 1 - 5 Likert Scale with 1 being awful and 5 being excellent. The average score of surveys from everyone who participated in Effective Literacy rated it at 3.78 or 75% effective. Gentry Intermediate will continue with Year 2 of Effective Literacy Strategies Professional Development for the 2009-2010 school year. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Denise Waters	Start: 08/01/2009 End: 07/28/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: ELL funds will be used to pay salary/benefits/supplies/materials for one certified teacher (1.0				

FTE) to serve ESL students. Faculty will have the opportunity to attend professional development trainings to reinforce/enrich their knowledge/skills in order to better serve our ELL students. \$

Scientific Based Research: LeSaux, N. & Ragan, A.(2006). Federal, state, and district level english language learner program entry and exit requirements: effects on the education of language minority learners. Cappellini, M. (2005). Balancing reading and language learning: A resource for teaching english language learners, K-5. York, ME: Stenhouse. Morrow, L.M. (2003). Motivating lifelong voluntary readers. In J Flood, D. Lapp, J. Squire, & J. Jensen (Eds.), Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts (2nd ed., pp857-867). Mahwah, NJ:Erlbaum. Fay, K. & Whaley, S. (2004). Becoming One Community: Reading and Writing with English Language Learners. Protland, ME: Stenhouse. LeSaux, N., Rupp, A., & Siegel, L. (2007). Growth in reading skills of children from diverse linguistic backgrounds: Findings from a 5-year longitudinal student. Journal of Educational Psychology, v99 n4 p821-834. Ragan, A., & Lesaux, N. (2006). Federal, state, and district level English language learner program entry and exit requirements: Effects on the education of language minority learners. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 14(20).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: ELL students who are not proficient on the Benchmark exam will be included in Tier 2 small group instruction with 2 regular classroom teachers, an intervention teacher, and the ESL teacher using a team-teaching model. Teachers will use research-based strategies in instruction for Tier 2.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Hannah Frazier</p>	<p>Start: 08/18/2009 End: 07/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT and EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP BASELINE DATA: All students enrolling in Gentry Intermediate will complete a Home Language Survey to identify students whose primary language is other than English. All students whose primary language is other than English will be administered an English language proficiency assessment approved by the ADE to identify ELL students. All ELLs identified will have an education plan conducted annually by a language placement and assessment committee (LPAC) to decide on appropriate placement and assessment. All ELLS students with Education Plans will receive modifications in the classroom. Classroom teachers will keep documentation of the modifications they are making for the ELL student. In the spring ELL students will be assessed using the English Language Development Assessment in Listening/Reading/Writing and Speaking to aid in instructional decisions. Documentation for all of the above will be used to determine the level of implementation. (CRT)(NRT)Benchmark scores will be used to determine ELL student growth and the success of the program. Adjustments for the intervention will be determined by LPAC Committee Member survey.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Hannah Frazier</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teachers will receive professional development training in understanding the results of the ELDA scores and planning instruction for their students to alleviate the gap in achievement of our ELL students. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Hannah Frazier	Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
PARENT INVOLVEMENT: Parents of ELL students are invited to participate in LPAC (Language Placement Assessment Committee) meetings with regard to their child's placement in ESL services. Interpreters are provided if needed. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Hannah Frazier	Start: 07/30/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
COLLABORATION: The ESL teacher, classroom teachers, and intervention teachers all work together to meet the needs of the ELL student in RTI. ELL students who are at-risk are reviewed by the School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT) and their progress is monitored as long as is necessary to close any gaps in achievement. Parents are informed by letter when their child is placed in RTI by the SBIT. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Jo Derwin	Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 2: Students in the Gentry Intermediate School will improve their performance by 5% in the curriculum area of math.

- Benchmark Exam: Benchmark-3rd Grade Mathematics Exam Benchmark Exam: 3rd Grade 2007 Grade 3 Benchmark Examination 125 students tested Combined Population. proficient or advanced 108 students: 86%, female 51 Students: 61%, male 57 Students: 92% ASIAN: . Students: n/a AFRICAN AMERICAN: 0 Students, 0%, HISPANIC: 14 Students: 73%, NATIVE AMERICAN: . Students: n/a, CAUCASIAN: 82 Students: 90%, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: 12 Tested, students: 41% LEP: 23 students tested, 17 students: 74%, FREE AND REDUCED: 58 Students: 84%, The weakest areas were measurement and geometry.

2008 Benchmark (ACSIP CRT Data Source) 3rd Grade Mathematics Exam # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced - 97 Students: 85.6% of Combined Students. Students: n/a of African American Students. . Students: n/a of Hispanic Students. 74 Students: 89.2% of Caucasian Students. 58 Students: 84.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students. 11 Students: 72.7% of LEP Students. 10 Students: 60% of Students with Disabilities. The lowest area across all subpopulations in 3rd Grade for 2008 was in the Geometry Strand particularly Open Response with the Measurement Strand Open Response coming in second lowest.

2009 AUGMENTED BENCHMARK - 105 STUDENTS TESTED IN 3RD GRADE MATHEMATICS (CRT DATA SOURCE) # TESTED & PERCENT OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT/ADVANCED - 81 STUDENTS: 77% OF COMBINED POPULATION. 0 STUDENTS: 0% OF STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES. 11 STUDENTS: 65% OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT. 46 STUDENTS: 70% OF ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED. 43 STUDENTS: 77% OF MALE. 38 STUDENTS: 78% OF FEMALE. 8 STUDENTS: 80% OF ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER. 1 STUDENT: 100% OF AFRICAN AMERICAN. 11 STUDENTS: 69% OF HISPANIC. 6 STUDENTS: 75% OF NATIVE AMERICAN. 55 STUDENTS: 79% OF CAUCASIAN. THE LOWEST AREAS OF PERFORMANCE FOR 3RD GRADERS ON M/C QUESTIONS WAS DATA ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY AND MEASUREMENT. ON OPEN RESPONSE QUESTIONS THE 3RD GRADE STUDENTS WEAKEST AREA OF PERFORMANCE WAS IN GEOMETRY AND NUMBER AND OPERATIONS.

2. Benchmark Exam: Benchmark-4th Grade Mathematics Exam Benchmark 4th Grade 2007 Grade 4 Benchmark Examination Combined Population - 115 students tested in all. 80 Students: 69% scored proficient or advanced. Female - 32 students: 59% Male - 48 students: 79% ASIAN - . students:n/a AFRICAN AMERICAN - N/A 0 students: 0% HISPANIC - . Students: n/a NATIVE AMERICAN - 11 Students:92% CAUCASIAN - 57 Students: 72% STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES - Students: n/a LEP - 16 students tested, Students: 26% FREE AND REDUCED - 33 Students: 57% The weakest areas were algebra and data analysis and probability. _____ 2008 Benchmark (ACSIP Data Source) 4th Grade Mathematics Exam. # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 122 Students: 86.9% of Combined Students!!!! 0 Students: .% of African American Students. 17 Students: 88.2% of Hispanic Students. 91 Students: 89% of Caucasian Students. 76 Students: 82.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students. 21 Students: 85.7% of LEP Students. 11 Students: 45.5% of Students with Disabilities. The lowest areas for the Hispanic population were Measurement Open Response 50.0 and Data Analysis & Probability Open Response 57.4. The lowest area for Caucasian Students was Geometry Open Response 46.4 with Measurement Open Response 56.2 coming in second. _____ 2009 AUGMENTED BENCHMARK EXAM 4TH GRADE MATHEMATICS 107 STUDENTS TESTED.(CRT DATA SOURCE) NUMBER OF STUDENTS - PERCENT PROFICIENT/ADVANCED: 90 STUDENTS -84% COMBINED POPULATION. 0 STUDENTS - 0% STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. 7 STUDENTS - 63% LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT. 53 STUDENTS - 82% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED. 41 STUDENTS - 80% MALES. 49 STUDENTS - 87% FEMALES. 4 STUDENTS - 67% ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER. 2 STUDENTS - 100% AFRICAN AMERICAN. 6 STUDENTS - 66% HISPANIC. 5 STUDENTS - 63% NATIVE AMERICAN. 73 STUDENTS - 89% CAUCASIAN. THE LOWEST AREA OF PERFORMANCE FOR OUR 4TH GRADE STUDENTS ON M/C QUESTIONS WAS DATA ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY WITH MEASUREMENT BEING SECOND LOWEST. ON OPEN RESPONSE QUESTIONS THE LOWEST PERFORMANCE WAS IS THE MEASUREMENT STRAND WITH NUMBER AND OPERATIONS NEXT LOWEST.
3. Benchmark Exam: Benchmark-5th Grade Mathematics Exam 2007 Grade 5 Benchmark Exam Combined Population 105 students tested - 62 students: 59% prof/adv. female - 32 students: 66% male - 30 students: 53% ASIAN - 4 Students: 67% AFRICAN AMERICAN - N/A 0 students HISPANIC - . Students: n/a NATIVE AMERICAN - . Students: n/a CAUCASIAN - 49 Students: 62% Students w/disabilities - . students: n/a prof/adv. LEP - . students: n/a prof/adv. Free and/or Reduced - 24 students: 47% prof/adv. The weakest areas were measurement and geometry. _____ 2008 Benchmark (ASCIP CRT Data Source)5th Grade Mathematics Exam. # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 113 Students: 62.8% of Combined Population. 0 Students: .% of African American. 17 Students: 58.8% of Hispanic Students. 74 Students: 63.5% of Caucasian Students. 68 Students: 61.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students. 18 Students: 55.6% of LEP Students. 12 Students: 16.7% of Students with Disabilities. The Lowest identified areas for 5th grade in Mathematics for Hispanic students were equally divided by Algebra Strand Open Response and Measurement Strand Open Response both with 50.8 percent of points earned. The lowest identified areas for Caucasian students in 5th grade were Data Analysis & Probability Open Response with 37.6 percent of point earned and Algebra Open Response with 45.8 percent of points earned. _____ 2009 AUGMENTED BENCHMARK 5TH GRADE MATHEMATICS 125 STUDENTS TESTED. NUMBER - PERCENT PROFICIENT/ADVANCED POPULATION: 98 STUDENTS - 78% COMBINED POPULATION. NA - STUDENTS W/DISABILITIES ONLY 1 TESTED. 13 STUDENTS - 72% LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT. 61 STUDENTS - 77% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED. 52 STUDENTS - 81% MALE. 46 STUDENTS - 76% FEMALES. 7 STUDENTS - 88% ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER (8 TESTED). NA - AFRICAN AMERICAN (0 TESTED). 10 STUDENTS -72% HISPANIC (14 TESTED). 4 STUDENTS- 50% NATIVE AMERICAN (10 TESTED).76 STUDENTS - 82% CAUCASIAN. THE LOWEST AREA OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE COMBINED POPULATION OF 5TH GRADERS IN 2009 ON M/C QUESTIONS WAS MEASUREMENT BUT ON OPEN RESPONSE QUESTIONS IT WAS THE DATA ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY STRAND FOLLOWED BY MEASUREMENT.
4. 2009 SAT 10 NRT ACSIP Data Source for 5th Grade: number tested and percent of students scoring at/above 50th percentile for Math Problem Solving: Combined 125 tested - 59.2%. Hispanic 14 tested - 50%. Caucasian 93 tested - 61.3%. Economically Disadvantaged 83 tested - 54.2%. Limited English Proficient 19 tested - 52.6%. Students w/disabilities 12 tested - 8.3%. _____ 2008 NRT SAT10 5th Grade Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile for Math Problem Solving: Combined Population 119 students tested, 49.6% scored At/Above. African American . tested: n/a At/Above. Hispanic 19 tested: 47.4% At/Above. Caucasian 77 tested: 51.9% At/Above. Economically Disadvantaged 71 tested: 45.1%

Supporting
Data:

At/Above. Limited English Proficient: 19 tested: 36.8% At/Above. Students with Disabilities 14 tested: 14.3% At/Above. The lowest identified area was problem solving.

2007 (ITBS) IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS Fifth Grade Report Completed: March 2007 Number of students tested 106 Number and Percent of Students Scoring At or Above 50th Percentile: COMBINED POPULATION Math Concepts/Estimation: 61 students: 57.2%, Problems & Data: 61 Students: 58.1%, Computation: 46 Students: 43.8%, Math Total: 58 Students: 55.2%, The weakest area was math computation. AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION Grade 5: 0 students tested ASIAN Grade 5: Students tested. Concepts/Estimation: Students: , Problems/Data: . Students: n/a, Computation: . Students: n/a, Math Total: . Students: n/a. The weakest area was Problems/Data. CAUCASIAN Grade 5: 80 Students tested Concepts/Estimation: 48 Students: 60.7%, Problems/Data: 49 Students: 62%, Computation: 34 Students: 43%, Math Total: 47 Students: 59.5%. HISPANIC LATINO Grade 5: Students Tested. Concepts/Estimation: Students: n/a, Problems/Data: . Students: n/a, Computation: . Students: n/a, Math Total: . Students: n/a. The weakest area was Computation. NATIVE AMERICAN Grade 5: . Students tested. Concepts/Estimation: Students: n/a, Problems/Data: Students: n/a, Computation: Students: n/a%. Math Total: Students: n/a. The weakest area was all of the above. The weakest area was Computation. Concepts/Estimation:

5. 2009 SAT 10 NRT ACSIP Data Source for 4th Grade. Number tested and percent of students scoring At/Above 50th Percentile in Math Problem Solving: Combined Population 108 tested - 75.9%. Hispanic 10 tested - 50%. Caucasian 82 tested - 82.9%. Economically Disadvantaged 68 tested - 72.1%. Limited English Proficient 12 tested - 41.7% Students with disabilities 12 tested - 41.7%_

2008 Norm Referenced Test SAT10 4th Grade Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile. Math Problem Solving. Combined Population 127 Tested: 74.8% At/Above. African American 0 tested: N/A% Hispanic 18 tested: 72.2% At/Above. Caucasian 94 tested: 77.7% At/Above. Economically Disadvantaged 80 tested: 68.8% At/Above. Limited English Proficient 22 tested: 68.2% At/Above. Students with Disabilities 10 tested: 30% At/Above. The lowest identified area was problem solving.

2007 (ITBS) Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) Grade 4: 117 students tested. Concepts & Estimation 88 students: 75.2%. Probability/Data 76 students: 65%. Computation 74 students: 63.2%. Total Math 80 students: 68.4%. The weakest area for the combined population was computation. Students with Disabilities . student: n/a. Economically Disadvantaged 39 students: 61%. Limited English Proficient . students: n/a. Females 33 students: 57.9%. Males 47 students: 78.3%. Asian . students: n/a. Caucasian 56 students: 68.3%. Hispanic 10 students: 66.7%. Native American . students: n/a.

6. 2009 SAT 10 NRT ACSIP Data Source for 3rd Grade. Number tested and Percent of Students Scoring At or Above 50th Percentile: Combined Population: 106 students tested - 37.7% At/Above in Math Problem Solving. Hispanic population: 17 students tested - 29.4% At/Above in Math Problem Solving. Caucasian Population: 70 students tested - 40% At/Above in Math Problem Solving. Economically Disadvantaged: 68 students tested - 25% At/Above in Math Problem Solving. Limited English Proficient: 18 Students tested - 5.6% At/Above in Math Problem Solving. Students w/Disabilities: 12 students tested - 8.3% At/Above in Math Problem Solving.

2008 Norm Referenced Test SAT10 3rd Grade Mathematics Problem Solving Number Tested and Percent of Students Scoring At/Above 50th Percentile: Combined Population 101 tested: 60.4% At/Above. African American .tested: n/a At/Above. Hispanic Population . tested: n/a At/Above. Caucasian 78 tested: 65.4% At/Above. Economically Disadvantaged 61 tested: 52.5% At/Above. Limited English Proficient 10 tested: 50% At/Above Students With Disabilities . tested: n/a At/Above. Students with Disabilities scored the lowest on Math Problem Solving.

2007 (ITBS) Iowa Test of Basic Skills Grade 3: 127 students tested for the combined population. Concepts & estimation 98 students: 77.2%. Probs/Data 90 students: 70.9%. Computation 65 students: 51.2%. Total Math 85 students: 66.9%. Economically Disadvantaged 43 students: 59.7%. Limited English Proficient 11 students: 50%. Female 39 students: 61.9%. Male 46 students: 71.9%. Asian . students: n/a. Caucasian 68 students: 73.1%. Hispanic 11 students: 57.9%. Native American . students: n/a. The weakest area for combined population was computation.

7. Student Attendance for GIS: In 2009, 95.34% of students were in attendance. In 2008, 95.23% of students were in attendance. In 2007, 95.20% of students were in attendance. We have exceeded our goal of 91.13% every year for the past 3 years with a slight increase each year.

All students will improve by 4% or better in mathematics skills and answering open-response math and multiple-choice questions. The 3rd grade class of 2007-2008 (101 students total tested)

Goal combined population scored 85% proficient or advanced on the 2008 Augmented Benchmark Exam in math. This same class in 2008-2009 (107 total students tested) combined population scored 84% proficient or advanced in math on the 2009 4th Grade Augmented Benchmark. GIS is pleased that this class of students continues to score well but is aware that they must continue to make gains in order to reach 100% proficient or advanced in the 2013-2014 school year. This is our 5th grade class of 2009-2010 and the first class of students to go through 3 years of several of the actions we have in place to help them be high achievers: Target Assessments, RTI, and Classroom Walk-Throughs.

Benchmark Students will meet or exceed the AYP math standard developed by the Arkansas Department of Education. Needs Assessment Statement: Grade level teams of teachers examined the Benchmark Data from the past three years. Open Response items continue to be a weak area across all three grade levels. 3rd grade students tend to have the most difficulty with Measurement, Geometry, Data Analysis & Probability and Number & Operation Strands. 4th Grade students over the 2007-2009 period have had the most trouble also with Measurement, Geometry, Data Analysis & Probability and Number & Operation Strands. 5th grade students weakest performance is also in the Measurement and Data Analysis & Probability Strands but they appear to be making gains in Geometry and Number & Operations strands.

Intervention: Arkansas Frameworks will be used by all teachers in planning and designing lessons. Total Instructional Alignment will be used as a guide by all teachers to align the curriculum both vertically and horizontally.				
Scientific Based Research: Marzano, Robert, "What Works in Schools" Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2003), Carter, Lisa. "Total Instructional Alignment", Solution Tree Publishers (2007).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers worked in both vertical and horizontal teams developing formative and summative assessment in math. The Northwest Educational Service Cooperative (NWAESC) coordinated the implementation of this instructional and curriculum alignment model in 16 districts in the NWAESC beginning in January 2007. Each school district, with support of the school superintendent, sent the administrator from each school and the school's best instructional practitioners to the week long training under the direction of Lisa Carter. The resulting work (in constant progress and improvement) was a vertically and horizontally aligned curriculum and instructional document aligned with state Standards and Benchmark assessments. Teachers will work in collaborative groups to develop lessons that are aligned to their specific grade level frameworks while using the TIA document as a guide. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Denise Waters, Principal	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
The building level administrator was trained in the Classroom Walk Through Model (CWT) of instructional evaluation in relation to TIA. The ADE provides access to the TeachScape CWT platform where CWT data is electronically warehoused. Administrators can use wireless devices (PDAs) that are compatible with the TeachScape platform to collect data regarding implementation of TIA in all classrooms. Data can be retrieved as reports that can be analyzed in conjunction with student achievement/lesson objectives in order to make ongoing decisions about classroom instruction and professional development. The	Denise Waters, Principal	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Outside Consultants ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>CWT process involves the building administrator conducting multiple classroom visits over the course of the year. Parents and students will be informed as to the nature of these multiple visits and how it differs from the traditional 2-3 formal/informal teacher evaluations they may be accustomed to. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP BASELINE DATA. Pre/post and quarterly Grade Level Team (PLC) designed Targeted Assessments will be administered each in each grade 3-5. Target Assessment results will be used to determine how better to serve students through reteaching and other interventions (RTI) as determined necessary by the building teams. The Grade Level Team (PLC) Targeted Assessments will be used to determine instructional and curriculum needs and adjustments for each student on an ongoing yearly basis. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Terrie Metz, Joan Myers, Carmen Tromp</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS FOR THE 2008-2009 SCHOOL YEAR: Teachers working in both vertical and grade-level teams implemented and simultaneously evaluated the TIA document and the Targeted Assessments provided by the Northwest Arkansas Educational Services Cooperative during the 2008-2009 school year. At the end of the school year, teachers reached consensus that they could create a better "targeted assessment" pre/post and quarterly assessment using released items and other available resources in alignment with the AR Curriculum Frameworks. For this reason, they chose to do away with targeted assessments from NWAESC and design their own in PLC teams for the 2009-2010 school year. The TIA curriculum guide is still used as a resource/guide but is not being fully implemented in 09-10. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carmen Tromp, Shannon Holland, Jennifer Hinterthuer</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 07/28/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>
<p>Intervention: Response to Intervention (RTI) will be used by all teachers to help students learn in areas where the student is not achieving on grade level.</p>				
<p>Scientific Based Research: Scientific Based Research: Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P.L., & Young, C.L. (2003) Responsiveness -to-Interventio: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disabilities construct. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18(3), 157-171. Kovaleski, J.F/ (2003, December). The three tier</p>				

<p>model of identifying learning disabilities: Critical program features and system issues. Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO. Wright, J. (2005, Summer). Five interventions that work. NAESP leadership Compass, 2(4) pp.1,6.</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Professional Development and Teacher Decision. Teachers will continue to develop the Response to Intervention model as well as progress-monitoring assessments during both professional development and an on-going process through out the school year in grade-level and vertical team professional learning communities (PLC). Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Action 2: SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM STRATEGIES -Flexible Response to Struggling Learners. As soon as a student demonstrates that they require more assistance, the classroom teacher puts Tier 1 (universal) interventions into place and monitors the student's performance. Tier 1 is a scheduled 30 minute period daily in which the teacher may work individually or in small group with the student(s) who need additional help. If the student fails to make adequate progress with Tier 1, the teacher refers that student to the multidisciplinary School Based Intervention Team (SBIT)for Tier 2 interventions. Tier 2 is another 30-45 minute scheduled time 4 days a week in which those students requiring individualized instruction are sent to a Team-teaching classroom in which two classroom teachers, and an intervention teacher work in small groups (no more than 6 students) for specific instruction on a pre-determined S.L.E. that is documented daily and monitored frequently using curriculum based measures. Progress-monitoring data is repeatedly compared to the student's outcome goal to determine whether the intervention is successful. If the student fails to make adequate progress over a reasonable period of time (9 weeks) the student is referred back to the SBIT for referral to Tier 3, and possible evaluation with Parental permission for special education services. Parents are kept informed of their child's progress through the RTI tiers. Students receive specific instruction in mathematics from an intervention teacher in a small group setting during Tier 3. NSLA monies and Professional Development monies will be used to purchase materials, supplies, and technology for instruction and implementation of instruction. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Naomi Wilson	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● Computers ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Teaching Aids ● Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 BASELINE DATA: School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT). Grade Level Team (PLC) developed Targeted Assessments and (CRT) (NRT)Benchmark assessment as well as curriculum based measures will be used to help determine student placement in Tiers of Interventions by the School-Based Intervention Team. Minutes from the SBIT and documentation from teachers with regard to Tiers 2 and 3 will document and determine the level of implementation and the success of the intervention. Teacher survey will be used to make necessary adjustments to the process. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jo Derwin	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Action 5: PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT. Parents will be informed about RTI at Open House prior to the beginning of school and at the Report to the Public in September. If a student demonstrates a need for RTI, the parent will be kept informed of their child's involvement in the prescriptive tiers by a letter from the multidisciplinary School-Based Intervention Team. A written explanation is also provided to parents at Parent Teacher Conferences.\$0.00 [Modify] Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jo Derwin	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR THE 2008-2009 SCHOOL YEAR RTI INTERVENTION. The School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT) met every Wednesday morning with few exceptions throughout the 2008-2009 school year. Minutes were kept as documentation of the level of implementation and success of RTI. Teachers kept progress monitoring documentation records also. The end of the year Teacher Survey indicated staff had an 80% satisfaction rate for the effectiveness of RTI. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Denise Waters	Start: 08/19/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Teachers will research and implement best practice to help students with Problem Solving and Open Response with Existing Curriculum.				
Scientific Based Research: Gersten,R. (2006). Effective strategies for teaching students with difficulties in mathematics. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Reston, VA. Hiebert,J.& Grouws, D. (2007). Effective teaching for the development of skill and conceptual understanding of number: what is most effective? The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Reston, VA. Tarr,J., Reys,R., Reys,B.,Chavez,O., Shih,J., Osterlind,S. (2008). The impact of middle-grades mathematics curricula and the classroom learning environment on student achievement. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education 39, 36-41. "Making Standards Work", Doug Reeves, (1999); "Classroom Instruction That Works," Marzano, Pickerling, Pollock (2001): "Mapping the Big Picture." Heidi Hayes Jacobs (1997); "Writing in Math Class: A Resource for grade 2 - 8", Burns, Marilyn (1995).				

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP BASELINE DATA: Teachers will work in grade level teams to select and develop open response questions for weekly implementation in their classrooms. Teachers will keep dated documentation of the weekly open-response questions and a record of each student's scores on open response questions. This chart will be used to determine the success of the instruction. Grade level teams will adjust instruction as needed to help every child be successful. Classroom Walk-Throughs will be used to monitor the open-response instruction and implementation on the intervention.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Denise Waters, Joan Myers, Betsy Raiford, Jennifer Hinterthuer</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT. Parent Involvement through notification: a. teacher information and newsletters b. monthly GIS newsletter c. Grade level Parent Nights, d. Recognitions for students/parents participation solving "Problem of the Week". Parents will be offered a "Parent Technology Night" in which staff will train those in attendance in our school computer lab how to access JEDI from home using personal computers with internet access.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Melinda Ramsey, Bobbie Wiand</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Student progress will be evaluated based on Grade Level Team (PLC) developed Targeted Assessments, Arkansas Benchmark Criterion Referenced Test (CRT), Stanford 10 (SAT10) Norm-Referenced Test (NRT), JEDI, and classroom based assessments.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Heather Fox, Joan Myers, Dee Vaughan</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>All students' needs will be addressed through the application of the Arkansas Frameworks /building curriculum and the Response to Intervention tiers. Modifications will be made by the classroom teacher with the assistance of the School-Based Intervention Team (SBIT) upon reviewing individual student's AIPs or IEPs.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	<p>————— ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
The computer lab manager will provide assistance for student placement and reports. All teachers will be trained in available technology programs. Students work at their level based on prescriptive information provided software: JEDI. Classroom teachers may make specific math assignments in JEDI for students. NSLA monies will be used to maintain the JEDI program in the school computer lab. Parents may also access JEDI from personal home computers. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Bobbie Wiand	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
TECHNOLOGY. Document readers, projectors and laptop computers will be used in classrooms to provide instruction in mathematics. ARRA Stimulus monies will be used to purchase the required technology as well as much needed magnetic white boards. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Denise Waters	Start: 08/19/2009 End: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • District Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS FOR THE 2008-2009 SCHOOL YEAR. Teachers collaborated to plan implementation of open-response questions. CWTs were used to monitor the open-response instruction and implementation. Benchmark Open-Response Released Items were determined to be most effective in preparing students for the end of the Benchmark Exam. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Denise Waters	Start: 08/18/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	————— ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 3: Gentry Intermediate School recognizes each child as a unique individual. Our goal is to help every child develop the skills to become healthy and responsible citizens.

- Supporting Data:
1. In 2007-2008, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 33.3% of the male student population was at risk of being overweight or were overweight. In 2006-2007, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 34.8% of the male student population was at risk of being overweight or were overweight. In 2005-2006, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 36.6% of the male student population was at risk of being overweight or were overweight. In 2004-2005, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 39.5% of the male student population was at risk of being overweight or were overweight.
 2. In 2007-2008, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 33.3% of the female student population was at risk (18.5%) or were overweight (14.8%). In 2006-2007, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 35.2% of the female student population was at risk or were overweight. In 2005-2006, BMI results for Gentry Intermediate School indicated that 28.5% of the female student population was at risk of being overweight or were overweight.
 3. The 2005-2006 School Health Index results related that each school has incorporated more physical activity time in order to meet the standard set forth by the state The 2004-2005 School Health Index results related that students are improved in more activity and make healthier eating choices. The 2003-2004 School Health Index results related that students student need to make better/healthier choices.
 4. As related by the Arkansas Governor's Initiative Healthy Arkansas, 55.3% of Arkansas failed to meet recommendations for moderate or vigorous activity. Governor Huckabee

decided that since he was too fat and needed to lose weight, everyone else needed to also. Now that he is thin and can no longer eat whatever he wants, no one else will either. No cookies and ice cream for him, no cookies and ice cream for anyone. Who in their right mind would want him for president?

- Kids for Health: Fall 2006-Spring 2007 results on a 20 point test of health knowledge given as a pre-test and then as a post-test: 3rd Grade 43% increase in correct answers. 4th Grade 33% increase in correct answers 5th Grade 20% increase in correct answers. Fall 2006-Spring 2007 Fifth Grade Survey of Health Behavior indicated an 18% increase in positive responses from the pre-test to the post-test.

Goal Gentry Intermediate Wellness activities will create a healthy school environment that supports consistent health, nutrition and physical activity messages to students and community.

Benchmark Students will gain 1/2% difference in their performance in the Presidential Fitness Test each May indicating healthier lifestyles are being practiced.

Intervention: Gentry Intermediate will encourage strategies and activities that encourage a non-sedentary lifestyle.				
Scientific Based Research: Let's Get Physical - Promotion and Education Strategies by Dr. Hal Wechsler (http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/menu/NNEC/Files/2003/LetsGetPhysical.pdf)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Health/Physical: Selected faculty will self-train in "Brain Gym" using "Hands On How to Use Brain Gym in the Classroom." incorporating physical activities during the school day. Other faculty will do book studies of "Smart Moves" and "Brain Gym." They will in turn train students and staff at Rise-n-Shine each morning. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Leah Queen-Braden	Start: 08/16/2009 End: 06/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Health/Physical: Classroom teachers will implement physical education and health curriculum frameworks during 30 minutes of physical activity time daily. Action Type: Wellness	Denise Waters	Start: 10/06/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students will take part in 10 minutes of Brain Gym physical activities every morning, (50 minutes weekly). Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	Leah Queen-Braden, Denise Waters, Dee Vaughan, Naomi Wilson	Start: 08/20/2009 End: 06/27/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP DATA. Students participating in the Presidential Fitness Tests will be evaluated to check for growth. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Leah Queen-Braden	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal Gentry Intermediate Students will improve the percentage of students who are at a healthy weight by 2%.

Benchmark Benchmark 2: Act 1220 of 2003 made Arkansas the first state in the country to promote comprehensive measures to address the epidemic of childhood obesity. Act 1220 requires public schools to screen all students for obesity by annually assessing body mass index (BMI). Schools are then required to report these results to parents to inform them if their child has a health risk. The Arkansas Center for Health Improvement (ACHI) obtained data from schools to create individual, confidential Child Health Reports for parents. GIS participates in BMI testing at the 4th grade level.

Intervention: Students will receive instruction on healthy eating and lifestyle which includes leisure physical activity. Students will learn and have the opportunity to practice rules and techniques for various sports as well as noncompetitive physical activity.
Scientific Based Research: Arkansas Center for Health Improvement 2006-2007 Assessment of Childhood & Adolescent Obesity, Fresh Fruits an Vegetable Program, Child Nutrition Unit Arkansas Department of

Education. USDA Team Nutrition.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Gentry Intermediate School will assess using the BMI all 4th grade students during the 2009-2010 school year, approximately 33% of all students in the school. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Debbie Allred, School nurse	Start: 08/20/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
GIS will take part in the Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Grant from the Child Nutrition Unit of the Arkansas Department of Education. Students will be served a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables as an afternoon snack 5 days a week. Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Grant from the Child Nutrition Unit of the AR Dept. of Education. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Wellness	Denise Waters	Start: 09/03/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 4: Parental Involvement. Parental involvement is an integral part of a child's educational achievement.

Supporting Data: 1. Parent and Family Involvement in Education, 2006-2007 School Year, From the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2007. Engaging Parents in Education: Lessons from Five Parent Information and Resource Centers, www.edpubs.org

Goal Parent Involvement Plan: Gentry Intermediate will take every opportunity to involve parents in the process of school review and improvement including the following interventions.

Benchmark As part of the Parent Involvement Plan, the principal and Parent Involvement Coordinator will conduct monthly Parent Advisory Committee meetings beginning in August.

Intervention: Establish a partnership with parents in educating their children.				
Scientific Based Research: Epstein, J.L. (2002). School, Family and Community Partnerships. Corwin Press, Inc. Henderson, A. & Mapp, K.(2002)A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family and Community Connected to Student Achievement, Austin, Texas, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Mulroy, M. and Bothell, L. (2003) Supporting Family Involvement in Children. University of Colorado. Other resources: www.pta.org National PTA www.parenting-ed.org Center for Effective Parenting http://www.arsba.org/Arkansas School Boards Assoc. www.nochildleftbehind.gov/				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Gentry Intermediate School will work with the Center for Effective Parenting www.parenting-ed.org to distribute Informational Packets to parents at Parent/Teacher Conferences. Included in the packets are "How to Help Your Child Study," "Your Child and Homework," "Increasing Your Child's Motivation to Learn." and "Creating a Home Environment for Learning." \$ [Modify] [Delete] * [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement	Melinda Ramsey	Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Community Leaders District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: All teachers will participate in at least two hours of training opportunities in the area of parent involvement. Parents will receive mid-term reports and quarterly report cards. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside Consultants 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 09-10 ACSIP BASELINE DATA - The principal and Parent	Denise Waters	Start: 08/01/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff 	<hr/>

<p>Involvement Coordinator shall meet with the Parent Advisory Committee monthly. The Parent Advisory Committee shall include community members, former alumni of the Gentry Public School system, as well as those members who are representative of our student population, i.e. Hmong, Hispanic, Gifted and Talented, Special Needs, etc. It shall be the principal's responsibility to keep the Parent Advisory Committee informed about all aspects of the education of the children of Gentry, (i.e. RTI, Targeted Assessments, etc.) and seek their thoughts and advice on ways GIS can improve. Meeting agenda, sign-in sheets and minutes will document and determine the level of implementation, success, and adjustment of the PAC process. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>		<p>End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PARENT INVOLVEMENT - The district will designate no less than two parent/teacher conferences each year. We will also advertise and schedule grade level Parent Nights, student programs, and Parent Teacher Organization meetings. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Julie Harrison</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: Provide Involvement through notification: A. Parents will receive mid-term reports and quarterly report cards. B. teacher information and newsletters C. monthly GIS newsletter D. monthly Parent Teacher Organization meetings E. Monthly parenting tips via "Helping Children Learn" Tips Families can use to help children do better in school, from The Parent Institute, parent-institute.com. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff ● Performance Assessments ● Teachers ● Title Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Designate a Parent Involvement Facilitator for Gentry Intermediate School. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>A volunteer resource book will be maintained in the parent center that contains parent surveys and lists the interests and availability of volunteers for school staff members' use. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Melinda Ramsey</p>	<p>Start: 08/18/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Staff ● Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PARENT INVOLVEMENT - Parent/Student/Teacher Compacts will be distributed to all students and parents via the District Parent-Student Handbook listing the student's responsibilities, the parents' responsibilities, and the teachers' responsibilities in the learning process. The compact will contain a statement that attests to the school district's commitment to parental involvement. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administrative Staff ● District Staff 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>The district and/or school will provide Annual Open House and Reports to the Public for parents. These meetings will provide a report of the state of the school, an overview of what students will be learning, how students will be assessed, what parents should expect, and how parents can make a difference. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Resolving Parental Concerns - Parents will be informed in a newsletter how they may go about resolving their concerns as they arise. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - Selected faculty and staff may plan and participate in local, regional, and state conferences, workshops, and seminars to gain knowledge about parental involvement. Knowledge gained will be shared with the entire staff. Conferences may include the Annual Arkansas Conference for Parent Education and Parental Involvement. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Denise Waters</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>TRANSITION. In order to assist the GIS 5th graders in the transition from the Intermediate School to the Middle School the Middle School counselor will meet with all fifth graders in May to brief the children on the Middle School methods and assist them in class assignments for their sixth grade year; Middle School Music and Band teachers will present program and information to fifth graders so they are informed of their fine arts choices. In order to assist in the transition from Primary to Intermediate School, second grade students will visit for a tour and orientation at the end of the school year.\$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Jo Derwin</p>	<p>Start: 01/01/2010 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • School Library • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT - The school will provide opportunities for parents to attend parenting training. The types of training will vary depending on the needs suggested by parents in the Parents' Survey, staff and the PTO. Free child care will be provided. \$ [Modify] [Delete] Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Melinda Ramsey</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT: A parent involvement survey will be distributed during the first Parent/Teacher Conferences of the school year in September. Data collected from the survey will be used to design Parent Training Nights. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Denise Waters, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
Parental Engagement. Teachers at each grade level will use flip cameras to video tape literacy and/or math lessons to demonstrate how parents can help their children at home with lessons. Grade Level Parent Nights will be the opportunity to share these videoed lessons with parents. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Denise Waters	Start: 08/19/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS FOR THE 2008-2009 SCHOOL YEAR. The principal and building parental involvement coordinator conducted monthly Parent Advisory Committee Meetings beginning on the last Friday of the month in August but moved to the first Friday of the month later in the school year. P.A.C. members were kept informed of all aspects of planning school improvement, events, education, assessments and everything else throughout the school year. Monthly agendas, sign-in sheets, and meeting minutes document each meeting. Participants recommended additional members for the 2009-2010 school year, all were invited and chose to be part of the PAC for the new school year. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Denise Waters	Start: 08/19/2008 End: 06/28/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Leaders • Teachers 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 5: To address special education trigger of Disproportionality.

1. 1. Focus Monitoring - Special Education District Data: in 2007-2008 school year the percentage of white students in special education was 81.82% compared to the percentage of white students in the district at 72.51%.
2. 2. Special Education District Data: In 2006-2007 school year the percentage of white students in special education was 81% compared to the percentage of white students in the district at 74.50%.
3. 3. Special Education District Data: In 2005-2006 school year the percentage of white students in special education was 82.2% compared to the percentage of white students in the district at 76.56%.
4. 2007-2008 Special Education Referral Tracking Data indicates that no white students were referred at the middle school or high school level. All white students referred in the 2007-2008 school year were referred in grade K - 5.

Supporting Data:

Goal To reduce the percentage of white students in special education programs in relation to the proportion of the percent of white students in the general education programs.

Benchmark Gentry School District will reduce the relative proportion of white students receiving special education services to within one standard deviation of the state average by the end of the 2009-2010 school year. The state's established benchmark of -3.004% plus one standard deviation of 6.968% will not be exceeded.

Intervention: Gentry Intermediate School will reduce the number of white students referred by using Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies and the School Based Intervention Team (SBIT).				
Scientific Based Research: Referral Rates for Intervention and Assessment, Journal of Special Education, (2003), 37, 67-81. Gerstein, R. and Dimino, J. (2005) New Directions in Research RTI (Response to Intervention): Rethinking special education for students with reading difficulties (yet again.) Ikeda, M; Rahn-Blakeslee; Niebling, B.&Allison, R. (2006). Evaluating Evidence-Based Practice in Response-to-Intervention Systems. NASP Communique, Vol. 34, 8.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Highly Qualified Teachers - In addition to the classroom teachers, the district will provide supplementary highly qualified certified	Rhonda Lyles	Start: 07/01/2009 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments 	<hr/> ACTION

<p>teachers to work with students identified as not meeting the expectation for success. Students will receive additional instruction in small groups. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>		06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers Title Teachers 	BUDGET: \$
<p>TEACHER DECISIONS & COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS - Building level intervention team will work with regular classroom teacher to ensure success for all students. This team may make recommendations for further assessments, remediation, and/or disciplinary concerns. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	Jo Derwin	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Outside Consultants Performance Assessments Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>The three-tier model: RTI, which is a prevention model aimed at catching students early, will be implemented. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	Naomi Wilson	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>Professional Development - Selected faculty and staff will plan and participate in local, regional, and national conferences, workshops, and seminars to gain knowledge and improve skills in math and literacy instruction and implementing federal program initiatives. Knowledge gained will be shared with the entire staff. Professional Development monies will be used to purchase training and cover expenses and substitutes for teachers attending training. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	Denise Waters	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT - Data on referrals and early intervention will be kept and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of plan. Progress will be monitored using teacher created weekly tests to determine individual student mastery of skills. The Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and the Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA) will be administered to all 3-5 students who are shown to have a substantial reading deficiency. The number of referral in previous years will be compared to the number of referrals after implementation of this plan. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>	Debra Still, LEA Supv.	Start: 07/01/2009 End: 06/30/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

● Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Business Representative	Charlie Wilmoth	Parent	Parent Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Angie Howie	Art Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Betsy Raiford	3rd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Carmen Tromp	3rd grade teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Carmen Tromp	3rd grade teacher	ACSIP Leadership

Classroom Teacher	Delores Vaughan	5th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Heather Fox	3rd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Hinterthuer	5th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Joan Myers	4th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Julie Harrison	4th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Leah Queen-Braden	5th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Leah Queen-Braden	P.E. Teacher	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Liz Newlun	5th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lydia How	3rd grade teacher	literacy
Classroom Teacher	Melinda Ramsey	Parent Involvement Coordinator	Parent Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Melinda Ramsey	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Portia Edwards	5th Grade Teacher	ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Rachael Thrailkill	3rd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Shannon Holland	ACSIP Chair	ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Shannon Holland	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Sherrie Curry	Music Teacher	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Terrie Metz		ACSIP Leadership
Classroom Teacher	Terrie Metz	5th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Tracey Bennett	4th Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Tracey McCartney	3rd grade teacher	literacy
Community Representative	Brad DeZurik	grandparent	Parent Advisory
Community Representative	Cathy Beach		Parent Advisory
Community Representative	Mike Walker	parent	Parent Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Debbie Allred	school nurse	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Del Duncan	Media Specialist	ACSIP Leadership
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Dr. Andrew Zambrano	ESL/Para-Professional	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Gale Carreira	Special Ed. Teacher	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Hannah Frazier	ESL Teacher	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jo Derwin	Counselor	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jo Derwin	Counselor	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kelly Page	Speech Pathologist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Mary Adams	Special Education	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Megan Oakes	Academic Interventionist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Naomi Wilson	Title I Teacher	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Naomi Wilson	Title 1	ACSIP Leadership
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Rhonda Lyles	Title I Teacher	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sherrie Curry	Music Teacher	Math
Parent	Candis Pettit		Parent Advisory
Parent	Cheryl Sykes		Parent Advisory
Parent	Dani Cypert	School Board Member	Parent Advisory
Parent	Denisha McCollum		Parent Advisory
Parent	Dorie DeZurik		Parent Advisory
Parent	Emily Hodges		Parent Advisory
Parent	Irma Austad	Hispanic Community Rep.	Parent Advisory Committee
Parent	Jennifer Xiong	Hmong Community Rep.	Parent Advisory
Parent	Jodi Bonet		Parent Advisory
Parent	Kim Faulkenberry		Parent Advisory
Parent	Kim Holt		Parent Advisory
Parent	Melissa Milam		Parent Advisory
Parent	Sandy Smith	PTO Vice President	Parent Advisory
Parent	Shane Fitzmaurice		Parent Advisory
Parent	Tina Brinkley		Parent Advisory

Principal	Denise Waters	Principal	ACSIP Leadership
Principal	Denise Waters	Principal	Wellness
Principal	Denise Waters	Principal	Literacy
Principal	Denise Waters	Facilitator	Parent Advisory
Principal	Denise Waters	Principal	Math