

## School Plan

**PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**  
**1201 SMITHERS DRIVE, BENTON, AR 72015**

**Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan**  
**2013-2014**

The mission of Howard Perrin Elementary School is to enable all students to become proficient in literacy and math.

Pursuing  
 Excellence  
 Respect and  
 Responsibility in a positive and safe environment through the  
 Involvement of students, teachers, and community in order to  
 Nurture a love of learning.

Grade Span: K-5

Title I: Not Applicable

School Improvement: MS

---

### Table of Contents

#### Priority 1: Literacy

**Goal:** LITERACY GOAL: All students will improve in the areas of Writing - Multiple Choice Reading - Open response: literary Writing - Open response: content and style

#### Priority 2: Mathematics

**Goal:** Students will focus on Multiple Choice in the following areas; Measurement (Grade 3, 4), Data analysis & Probability (Grade 5). In Open Response, students will focus on Measurement (Grade 4), in the area of Numbers & Operations (grade 3), Geometry (Grade 4, 5)

#### Priority 3: Wellness

**Goal:** To improve the physical health and wellness of all Howard Perrin students.

#### Priority 4: Parental Involvement

**Goal:** Our school will work hand in hand with parents to provide the best academic environment for our students.

---

#### Priority 1: Literacy

##### Supporting Data:

- ACSIP CRT Data Source for PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Benchmark 3rd Grade Literacy 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
    - 87 Students: 81% of Combined Students
    - 5 Students: 63% of African American Students
    - 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students
    - 77 Students: 84% of Caucasian Students
    - 16 Students: 64% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
    - 1 Students: 50% of LEP Students
    - 3 Students: 30% of Students with Disabilities
  - 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
    - 97 Students: 81% of Combined Students
    - 0 Students: 0 % of African American Students
    - 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students
    - 73 Students: 82% of Caucasian Students
    - 20 Students: 63% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students
    - 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students
    - 5 Students: 45% of Students with Disabilities
  - 2012-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:
    - 89 Students: 91% of Combined Students
    - 1 Students: 50% of African American
    - 3 Students: 75% of Hispanic
    - 81 Students: 94% of Caucasian
    - 32 Students: 87% Econ. Disadvantaged Students
    - 10 Students: 83% of Students with Disabilities
    - 0 Students: NA LEP
- The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multi-Choice writing and Open Response: reading- literary passage and writing-content and style. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Multi-Choice writing and Open Response: reading- literary passage and writing-content and style. The

- lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multi-Choice writing and Open Response: reading- literary passage and writing-content and style. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A
2. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
 Benchmark-4th Grade Literacy Exam 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 91 Students: 84% of Combined Students  
 6 Students: 86% of African American Students  
 3 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students  
 79 Students: 83% of Caucasian Students  
 27 Students: 78% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 5 Students: 56% of Students with Disabilities  
 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 100 Students: 94% of Combined Students  
 4 Students: 58% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 85 Students: 97% of Caucasian Students  
 24 Students: 86% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 0 Student: 0% of LEP Students  
 5 Students: 50% of Students with Disabilities  
 2012-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 87 Students: 89% of Combined Students  
 1 Students: 50% of African American Students  
 3 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 81 students: 92% of Caucasian Students 22 Students: 73% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 3 Students: 38% of Students with Disabilities  
 The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response: reading practical passage and writing content and style. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response: reading practical passage and writing content and style. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response: reading practical passage and writing content and style The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A
3. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
 Benchmark-5th Grade Literacy Exam 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 96 Students: 88% of Combined Students  
 2 Students: 34% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 92 Students: 92% of Caucasian Students  
 24 Students: 80% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 4 Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
 4 Students: 40.0% of Students with Disabilities  
 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 98 Students: 92% of Combined Students  
 3 Students: 75% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 82 Students: 94% of Caucasian Students  
 20 Students: 77% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 2 Students: 29% of Students with Disabilities  
 2012-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 93 Students: 97% of Combined Students  
 5 Students: 100% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 84 Students: 96% of Caucasian Students  
 26 Students: 93% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 0 Students: 0% of LEP Students  
 5 Students: 71% of Students with Disabilities  
 The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Multiple choice: Writing and open response: Reading literary and content. Writing: content and style. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Multiple choice: Writing and open response: Reading literary and content. Writing: content and style. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Multiple choice: Writing and open response: Reading literary and content. Writing: content and style. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A

4. Kindergarten ITBS/MAT10 In 2007 84.6 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: word analysis. MAT 8 In 2009 66 percent of our students scored at/above the 50th percentile in reading. The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information. MAT 8 In 2010 68 percent of our students scored at/above the 50th percentile in reading 2010-# percent of our students scored at/above the 50th percentile in reading  
 104 Students: 68% of Combined Students  
 7 Students: 20% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 50% of Hispanic Students  
 88 Students: 72% of Caucasian Students  
 44 Students: 55% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 . Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
 9 Students: 43% of Students with Disabilities  
 The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information.
5. First Grade NRT In 2010 58 percent of our students scored at/above the 50th percentile in reading(SAT 10). The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information. 2011-1st Grade Reading ITBS Combined population-69th percentile African American Students-19th percentile Hispanic Students-79th percentile Caucasian Students-72nd percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 64th percentile LEP Students-N/A Students w/ Disabilities-31st percentile The areas of weakness in reading are sentence comprehension(factual understanding) and story comprehension(inference and interpretation). 2012-1st Grade Reading ITBS (% rank of average SS: National Student Norms Combined population- 71 African American Students - 42 Hispanic Students-63 Caucasian Students-76 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 51 LEP Students- 73 Students with Disabilities-(SLD 46 and SI 38)
6. Second Grade NRT In 2010 65 percent of our students scored at/above the 50th percentile in reading(SAT 10). The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information. 2011-2nd Grade Reading ITBS Combined population-78th percentile African American Students-20th percentile Hispanic Students-55th percentile Caucasian Students-81st percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 66th percentile LEP Students-56th Percentile Students with Disabilities-69th percentile The areas of weakness in reading are sentence comprehension(factual understanding) and story comprehension(inferencing and interpretation). 2012-2nd Grade Reading ITBS (% rank of average SS: National Student Norms Combined population- 77 African American Students - 59 Hispanic Students-75 Caucasian Students-78 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 64 LEP Students- NA Students with Disabilities-(OHI 28, SLD 20, and SI 68)
7. Third Grade NRT In 2010 59 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information. 2011-3rd Grade Reading NRT Combined population-61st percentile African American Students-26th percentile Hispanic Students-41 percentile Caucasian Students-62nd percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 46th percentile LEP Students-39th Percentile Students with Disabilities-40th percentile 2012 3rd Grade Reading ITBS (Natl. % rank of mean standard score) Combined population- 65 African American Students - 47 Hispanic Students-59 Caucasian Students-68 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 58 LEP Students- NA Students with Disabilities- 50
8. Fourth Grade NRT In 2010 75 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information. 2011 4th Grade Reading ITBS Combined population-66th percentile African American Students-44th percentile Hispanic Students-26th percentile Caucasian Students-69th percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 50th percentile LEP Students-0 Percentile Students with Disabilities-33rd percentile  
 The areas of weakness N/A 2012 4th Grade Reading ITBS (Natl. % rank of mean standard score) Combined population- 68 African American Students - 21 Hispanic Students-77 Caucasian Students-69 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- LEP Students- 61 Students with Disabilities- 59
9. Fifth Grade NRT In 2010 71 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in reading. The area of weakness could not be determined due to lack of sub-skill information. 2011-5th Grade Reading ITBS Students wit Combined population-61st percentile African American Students-39th percentile Hispanic Students-69th percentile Caucasian Students-63rd percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 45th percentile LEP Students-31st Percentile Disabilities-19th percentile 2012 5th Grade Reading ITBS (Natl. % rank of mean standard score) Combined population- 63 African American Students - 8 Hispanic Students-62 Caucasian Students-66 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 51 LEP Students- 43 Students with Disabilities- 22
10. Attendance Grades K-5 2010-2011 The attendance rate was 94.4 percent. 2011-2013 The attendance rate was 95.2 percent. 2012-2013 The attendance rate was 94.0 percent.

- 11. In 2011-2012 performance for all students is 93.80% and for our TAGG students 85.42%. In 2011-2012 growth for all students is 92.09% and for our TAGG students 80%. In 2012-2013 performance for all students is 92.17% and for our TAGG students 86.82%. In 2012-2013 growth for all students is 90.34% and for our TAGG students 84.93%.

**Goal** LITERACY GOAL: All students will improve in the areas of Writing - Multiple Choice Reading - Open response: literary Writing - Open response: content and style

**Benchmark** BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for all students in the performance category, we are 91.76% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 92.58% which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.

**Benchmark** BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for TAGG students in the performance category, we are 78.22% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 80.40% proficient which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.

**Benchmark** BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for all students in the growth category, we are 90.34% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 95.25% proficient which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.

**Benchmark** BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for TAGG students in the growth category, we are 84.93% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 93.30% which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.

Intervention: Implement a balanced comprehensive literacy program to improve student achievement in the areas of open response - literary and open response - content and style.				
Scientific Based Research: Smart Start Initiative/ADE Copes, Stephanie. (2002). A Three year Study of the Writing Progression of Students in Writing Workshop Classrooms. University of Arkansas at Little Rock. www.relearn.com Samuels, S.J., and Yi Chen Wu. (2002). Two Experimental Tests show cause and effect: Accelerated Reader vs. Non Accelerated Reader and the effect of more vs. less time spent reading. Reading Achievement. Technical Report. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. Smart Start Initiative/ADE Copes, Stephanie. (2002). A Three Year Study of the Writing progression of studentw in writing workshop classrooms. University of Arkansas at Little Rock. Smart Step Initiative / ADE Knuth, R.A. and B.F. Jones. (1991). What does research say about reading? North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Oak Brook, IL. Durkin, D. (1978, October). What classroom observartions reveal about reading comprehension instruction. Center for the study of reading. Technical report Number 106. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. A Study of Read 180 Stages A and B in Upper Elementary and Middle Schools in Iredell-Statesville Schools, North Carolina. Data analysis conducted by Noga Admon, November 2003. Saxon's instructional approach to teaching phonics is supported by Gagne's cumulative-learning theory (1965, 1962) and Anderson's ACT* theory (1983).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
ELLA (K - 2), ELF ( 3- 4), and Literacy Lab (5) strategies and basic concepts will be used for classroom instruction by all teachers including special education. These strategies are phonetic awareness, fluency development, phonics, work study, vocabulary, writing development. These strategies have been aligned with the CCSS. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>School Library</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Accelerated Reader Program will be implemented to improve student achievement in comprehension in grades 1 - 5 for all students including special education students. Accelerated reader will follow guidelines set by the program. Accelerated Reader supports many of CCSS and is used to supplement the reading instruction for comprehension. Parents are utilized in the AR program by labeling books, reading books, and assisting students with taking quizzes.	Sherry Kelley	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>School Library</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Special Education                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>All teachers including special education teachers will implement the strategies of Six Traits of Writing in K - 5. These will be implemented during the balanced literacy block to enhance our instruction for open response, writing, content, and style. These strategies have been aligned with the Arkansas frameworks/Common Core and the SLE's and is used supplement Writer's Workshop.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Kim Russell</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>All teachers including special teachers will be provided staff development necessary to implement the following programs; ELLA, ELF, LITERACY LAB, AR, AND SIX TRAITS. This training provided at the district and state level. We also use our Dawson CO-OP during the summer and school year. The six hours embedded technology development. Administrative staff will also attend these trainings.                  Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Gina Holstead</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>District/school funds will be used to purchase the necessary books used in the AR program. These books will be leveled and will be consumable. These books will provide supplemental instruction to all students 1 - 5 aligned with the State Frameworks/Common Core/SLE's.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Sherry Kelley</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Office</li> <li>• School Library</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by; FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS: teacher observations, writing samples, lesson plans, DRA, running records, READ 180/System 44, and Dibels. SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS: Benchmarks, NRT, and TLI (Module). Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will continue to be implemented. At the end of the school year evidence of the READ 180/System 44 programs impact on student achievement resulted in the following: Growth Summary Report: (Average Growth in Lexile) Grade 3 - 330, Grade 4 - 228, and Grade 5 - 161                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Gina Holstead</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>READ 180/System 44, an intensive reading program designed to meet the needs of students whose reading achievement is below the proficient level, will be implemented. It combines research-based reading practices with the effective use of technology, offering students an opportunity to achieve reading success through a combination of instructional, modeled, and independent reading components. Effectiveness will be determined by increased reading lexile levels. Students are placed based on SPR/SRI and teacher input. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Kim Russell, Lori Peden, Kristen Bowling</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Saxon Phonics Intervention Program will be implemented in all K-2 classrooms including Special Education. This program focuses on intensive systematic phonics, spelling, vocabulary development, letter recognition, reading, comprehension, and writing connections. Teachers will be trained and effectiveness will be determined through DIBELS and standardized tests.</p>	<p>Grace Smith</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Using NSLA funds, laptops will be purchased to improve student achievement. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Sherri Fite</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>NSLA (State-281) - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$53677.50 ACTION BUDGET: \$53677.5</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$53677.5</p>

Intervention: To implement curriculum alignment and mapping activities  
 Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs (1997). Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment K-12. ASCD.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>All teachers, including special education teachers, annually review and modify our curriculum; pacing guides, Common Core and maps to the Arkansas frameworks. The assistant superintendent of curriculum supervises these activities. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Karla Neatherly</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by teacher observations, lesson plans, pacing guides, and curriculum documents. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will continue to be implemented. Evidence of curriculum alignment- 100% of teachers in grades K-5 documented standards in</p>	<p>Gina Holstead</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Lesson plans. Action Type: Program Evaluation				
The school will use the services of the literacy specialist at Dawson Co-op to assist with implementing strategies for a comprehensive based literacy program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Karla Neathery/Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement intensive reading intervention (IRI) and academic improvement plan (AIP)

Scientific Based Research: DuFour, Richard, Whatever It Takes, National Education Service, 2004. Educational Leadership, May 2004, Vol. 61, Number 8. Schools as Learning Communities.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Using the test results from the NRT, Benchmarks, Qualls (K) and DIBELS, an IRI / AIP will be developed for each student scoring below proficient. This plan will outline areas of specific needs and will guide remediation instruction to reduce the achievement disparity among subpopulations. Parents will partner with the classroom teacher to support the child's achievement of success according to the IRI/AIP. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All students will receive remediation through Success Maker and Reflex Math (Computer Lab), individual/small group instruction, practice Open-Response, Reading intervention program, Adult volunteer tutoring, Barton Reading Method, Study Skills and BENCHMARK CAMP. Special education students are exempted from IRIs and AIP's. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students who are on an IRI/AIP will be determined proficient using DIBELS (K-2), Learning Institute Assessments (2-5) and progress monitoring. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Stacye Shelnut/Grace Smith	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by; FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS / teacher observations, writing samples, lesson plans, DRA, running records, Benchmark Camp 3-5 and Dibels. SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS. Benchmarks, NRT, and Module Tests. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will continue to be implemented. Evidence of the AIP's impact on student achievement resulted in the following 12-13 school year	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

9 students on AIP's in Grades 4 &5 and for the 13-14 only 3 students on AIP's. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 2: Mathematics

Supporting Data:

1. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
 Benchmark-3rd Grade Mathematics Exam. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 94 Students: 88% of Combined Students  
 6 Students: 75.0% of African American Students  
 3 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 83 Students: 91% of Caucasian Students  
 19 Students: 76% of Econ.Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 50% of LEP Students  
 6 Students: 60% of Students with Disabilities  
 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 97 Students: 93% of Combined Students  
 0 Students: 0% of African American Students  
 1 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 85 Students: 96% of Caucasian Students  
 26 Students: 81% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 10 Students: 91% of Students with Disabilities  
 2012-# Tested Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 91 Students: 92% of Combined Students  
 0 Students: 0% of African American Students  
 4 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 81 Students: 94% of Caucasian Students  
 33 Students: 89% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 11 Students: 91% of Students with Disabilities  
 The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open response in number and operations. Multiple Choice; measurement. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open response in number and operations. Multiple Choice; measurement. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open response in number and operations. Multiple Choice; measurement. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A
2. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
 Benchmark-4th Grade Mathematics Exam 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 101 Students: 93% of Combined Students  
 7 Students: 100% of African American Students  
 3 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students  
 87 Students: 92% of Caucasian Students  
 32 Students: 91% of Econ Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 8 Students: 89% of Students with Disabilities  
 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 100 Students: 97% of Combined Students  
 7 Students: 100% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 85 Students: 97% of Caucasian Students  
 25 Students: 89% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 0 Students: 0% of LEP Students  
 9 Students: 90% of Students with Disabilities  
 2012-# Tested Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 87 Students: 90% of Combined Students  
 2 Students: 100% of African American Students  
 3 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 80 Students: 91% of Caucasian Students  
 23 Students: 77% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students



- 3 Students: 38% of Students with Disabilities  
 The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: measurement (open response and multiple Choice) Open response; geometry. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: measurement (open response and multiple Choice) Open response; geometry. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: measurement (open response and multiple Choice) Open response; geometry. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A
3. ACSIP CRT Data Source for PERRIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
 Benchmark-5th Grade Mathematics Exam 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 91 Students: 83% of Combined Students  
 2 Students: 34% of African American Students  
 1 Students: 50% of Hispanic Students  
 87 Students: 88% of Caucasian Students  
 22 Students: 73% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 . Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
 6 Students: 60.0% of Students with Disabilities  
 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 98 Students: 95% of Combined Students  
 3 Students: 75% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 83 Students: 96% of Caucasian Students  
 23 Students: 88% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 1 Students: 100% of LEP Students  
 6 Students: 85% of Students with Disabilities  
 2012-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced:  
 84 Students: 87% of Combined Students  
 3 Students: 60% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students  
 79 Students: 91% of Caucasian Students  
 21 Students: 75% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
 2 Students: 29% of Students with Disabilities  
 The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Geometry (open response) Multiple choice data analysis and probability. . The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Geometry (open response) Multiple choice data analysis and probability. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Geometry (open response) Multiple choice data analysis and probability. . The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A
4. Kindergarten ITBS/MAT In 2007 86.3 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math computation. Analysis of content subskill and skill cluster performance showed the following areas of weakness: Math Computation. MAT 8 In 2009 66 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math. The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information. In 2010 64 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math. 2010-# of students at / above the national 50th PR: 104 Students: 64% of Combined Students  
 7 Students: 0% of African American Students  
 2 Students: 0% of Hispanic Students  
 88 Students: 71% of Caucasian Students  
 44 Students: 52% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students  
 . Students: N/A% of LEP Students  
 9 Students: 57% of Students with Disabilities  
 The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information.
5. First Grade NRT In 2010-11 68 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math. The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information. 2011-12 1st Grade Math ITBS Combined population-66th percentile African American Students-22nd percentile Hispanic Students-49th percentile Caucasian Students-68th percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 62nd percentile LEP Students-N/A Percentile Students with Disabilities-48th percentile The areas of weakness are Numbers, Properties and Operations, measurement, problem solving (single step, approaches and procedures, and relationships & trends. 2012-13 1st Grade Math ITBS (% rank of average SS: National Student Norms) Combined population- 66 African American Students - 30 Hispanic Students-61 Caucasian Students-70 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 48 LEP Students- 93 Students with Disabilities-(SLD 72 and SI 27)
6. Second Grade NRT In 2010-11 81 percent of our students scored above the 50th percent. The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information.

- 2011-12 2nd Grade Math ITBS Combined population-73rd percentile African American Students-8th percentile Hispanic Students-51st percentile Caucasian Students-78th percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 57th percentile LEP Students-70th Percentile Students with Disabilities-88th percentile The areas of weakness are Numbers, Properties and Operations and problem solving(multi- step, and relationships & trends. 2012-13 2nd Grade Math ITBS (% rank of average SS: National Student Norms Combined population- 78 African American Students - 62 Hispanic Students- 81 Caucasian Students-79 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 67 LEP Students- NA Students with Disabilities-(OHI 42, SLD 37, and SI 76)
7. Third Grade NRT In 2010-11 66 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math. The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information. 2011-12-3rd Grade Math ITBS Combined population-66th percentile African American Students-11 percentile Hispanic Students-58th percentile Caucasian Students-68th percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 55th percentile LEP Students-58th Percentile Students with Disabilities-48th percentile The areas of weakness N/A 2012-13 3rd Grade Math ITBS (Natl. % rank of mean standard score) Combined population- 70 African American Students - 42 Hispanic Students-57 Caucasian Students-74 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 66 LEP Students- NA Students with Disabilities- 41
  8. Fourth Grade NRT In 2010-11 75 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math. The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information. 2011-12 -4th Grade Math ITBS Combined population-75th percentile African American Students-65th percentile Hispanic Students-40th percentile Caucasian Students-76th percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 60th percentile LEP Students-0 Percentile Students with Disabilities-59th percentile The areas of weakness N/A 2012-13 4th Grade Math ITBS (Natl. % rank of mean standard score) Combined population- 71 African American Students - 29 Hispanic Students-84 Caucasian Students-71 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 57 LEP Students- 81 Students with Disabilities- 57
  9. Fifth Grade NRT In 2010-11 72 percent of our students scored above the 50th percentile in math. The weakness areas could not be determined due to a lack of sub-skill information. 2011-12 5th Grade Math ITBS Combined population-71st percentile African American Students-37th percentile Hispanic Students-92nd percentile Caucasian Students-72nd percentile Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 61st percentile LEP Students-74th Percentile Students with Disabilities-41st percentile The areas of weakness N/A 2012-13 5th Grade Math ITBS (Natl. % rank of mean standard score) Combined population- 67 African American Students - 36 Hispanic Students-44 Caucasian Students-69 Econ. Disadvantaged Students- 56 LEP Students- 36 Students with Disabilities- 20
  10. In 2011-2012 performance for all students is 90.51% and for our TAGG students 80.21%. In 2011-2012 growth for all students is 73.45% and for our TAGG students 54.55%. In 2011-2012 performance for white students was 92.28%, growth for economically disadvantaged was 81.71%, and students with disabilities was 60.71%. In 2011-2012 growth for white students was 75.16% and growth for economically disadvantaged was 57.14%.

Goal	Students will focus on Multiple Choice in the following areas; Measurement (Grade 3, 4), Data analysis & Probability (Grade 5). In Open Response, students will focus on Measurement (Grade 4), in the area of Numbers & Operations (grade 3), Geometry (Grade 4, 5)
Benchmark	BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for all students in the performance category, we are 90.39% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 96.82% which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.
Benchmark	BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for TAGG students in the performance category, we are 85.16% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 92.33% which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.
Benchmark	BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for all students in the growth category, we are 59.09% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 90.08% which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.
Benchmark	BENCHMARK: In 2012-2013 for TAGG students in the growth category, we are 54.79% proficient. In 2013-2014 we will be at least 85.27% which will meet the annual measurable objectives set by the Department of Education.

**Intervention: Implement a standard's based math model.**

Scientific Based Research: Mokros, J., Berle-Carman, M., Rubin, A., & O'Neal, K. (1996, April). Learning operations: Invented Strategies that work. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. Mokros, J., Berle-Carman, M., Rubin, A., & Wright T. (1994, December). Full year pilot grades 3 and 4: Investigations in number, data, and space. Cambridge, MA : TERC Coton, K., (200). Classroom Questioning. Retrieved January 25, 2004 from NW Regional Educational Laboratory Website: <http://www.nwrel.org> Garlikov, R., (2003). The Socratic Method: Teaching by Asking Instead of

Telling. Retrieved January 25, 2004 website: <http://www.garlikov.comBrownV.> (01, March1). Tony Thrall and Barbara Tingey. (April 15, 2003. Success Maker Motion: A research Summary. Pearson Education. Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J. and Bradford Findell. (2001) Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics. Center for Education National Research Council. Washington, D.C. National Academy Press. CGI:Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, Vol. 27, No. 4. (Jul., 1996), pp. 403-434. and NCRMSE Research Review: The Teaching and Learning of Mathematics: vl n2 p 5-9 Spring 1992.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>K-5 teachers including special education teachers will use Math Investigations activities(Terc, INC) to supplement adopted math curriculum. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Linnie McCook</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>P.E.T.S. Thinking Strategies will be used with Kindergarten and First Grade students to promote convergent, divergent, visual and evaluative thinking which are aligned to local and state frameworks. The effectiveness will be evaluated through teacher observation. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Kristi Chumley</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>All students will use the technology lab(Successmaker and Reflex Math) for remediation, reinforcement of skills, and increased levels of learning. Our TAGG students will receive additional time on Reflex Math. A building level technology coordinator will attend professional development to receive training and updates used in the lab. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Shannon Ridgley</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>3-5 teachers will use TI-108, TI-10 and TI-15 calculators in the classroom and on tests from the learning institute as a tool for math concepts and problem solving. Additional math manipulatives have been purchased to support CCSS for all students. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Adrienne Roe</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>K-5 teachers including, special education teachers, will use CGI strategies for math instruction. The implementation of this program includes no less than 60 minutes of math instruction each day including such strategies as: algebra, problem solving skills,</p>	<p>Gina Holstead</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>estimation, rounding, hands-on activities, and math vocabulary.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Special Education                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by: FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS: teacher observations, math open response problems, lesson plans. SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS: Benchmarks and NRT. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will continue to be implemented. In 2013, 90.39% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the benchmark exam.                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Gina Holstead</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013                  End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The Math instructional coach will assist all classroom teachers and all students in math activities. The Math instructional coach will participate in professional development at the state and national level. The Math instructional coach will in turn provide K-5 teachers professional development twice a year for upcoming math modules and best practices. Effectiveness of the Math coach will be evaluated through test scores and their professional development log.                  Action Type: AIP/IRI                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Cheryl Hentschel</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013                  End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>K-5 teachers will use cognitively guided instruction during math instruction. CGI is about problem types, solution strategies, and how children develop cognitively in the area of mathematics. Using CGI, we will target all students (white, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities).                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Cheryl Hentschel</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013                  End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The District Curriculum Math Specialist will provide supplemental activities to all teachers using "Teaching Student-Centered Mathematics"</p>	<p>Cheryl Hentschel</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2013                  End: 06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

by Van de Walle. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education				
A computer assisted instruction lab aide will be employed (1.0 FTE - Shannon Ridgely) and substitutes will be paid using NSLA funds. Additional computer supplies and software will be purchased. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$18070.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$6099.00 NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$180.00 NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$822.20 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$25171.2
Additional funds will be provided to assist students in the improvement of academics. These activities will include the purchase of technology to enhance math instruction. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$10000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$10000
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$35171.2</b>

Intervention: Implement curriculum alignment and mapping.

Scientific Based Research:

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by formative assessments : Benchmark, Successmaker and Math Reflex Data and Norm Reference Test. Summative Assessments : teacher observations, lesson plans, pacing guides, and curriculum documents. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will continue to be implemented. Evidence of curriculum alignment is documented in planned math meetings and professional development log.	Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Curriculum Coordinators will provide training at the beginning of the school year to all teachers concerning any changes or modifications to the curriculum. The Curriculum Coordinators will attend monthly district curriculum meetings.	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development				
All teachers, including special education teachers, annually review CCSS, modify our curriculum and pacing guides. The curriculum coordinator guides the activities. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Cheryl Hentschel/Karla Neathery	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Implement academic improvement plan (AIP).  
 Scientific Based Research: DuFour, Richard, Whatever It Takes, National Education Service, 2004. Educational Leadership, May 2004, Vol. 61, Number 8. Schools as Learning Communities.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Using the test results from the NRT scores, Benchmarks, Qualls(K), an AIP will be developed for each student scoring below proficient. This plan will outline areas of specific needs and will guide remediation instruction to reduce the achievement disparity among subpopulations. Parents will partner with the classroom teacher to support the child's achievement of success according to the AIP. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All students, including special education students, will receive remediation through Success Maker (Computer Lab), Reflex Math, individual/small group instruction (Grades 3-5 will concentrate on math during a planned in intervention time each day), practice Open-Response, Adult volunteer tutoring. Special education students are exempted from AIP's. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students who are on an AIP will be determined proficient using the next year's Benchmark and NRT scores. These students are progress monitored throughout the year. Action Type: AIP/IRI	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by; FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS; teacher observations and lesson plans, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS; Benchmarks and NRT. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will continue to be implemented. Evidence of the AIP's impact on student achievement resulted in the following: 12-13 school year 8 students in 4 & 5 grade on AIP's and for the 13-14 year only 5 students on AIP's. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

To target our TAGG group we will purchase a mobile laptop lab for students in grades 3-5. We will use problem solving strategies and Math Reflex to address areas in need. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Priority 3:

1. In 2010-2011, 74.4% of Kindergarten males and 72.1% of Kindergarten females were healthy or underweight according to the Body Mass Index. 62.2% of 2nd grade males, 67.4% of 2nd grade females, 68% of 4th grade males, 66.7% of 4th grade females were healthy or underweight according to the Body Mass Index. In 2011-12, 60.5% of Kindergarten males and 76.7% of Kindergarten females were healthy or underweight and 39.5% of males and 23.3% of females were overweight or obese according to the Body Mass Index. 70.5% of 2nd grade males and 76.5% of 2nd grade females were healthy or underweight and 29.5% of males and 23.5% of females were healthy or underweight according to the Body Mass Index. 61.9% of 4th grade males and 61.9% of 4th grade females were healthy or underweight and 38.1% of males and 38.1% of females are overweight or obese according to the Body Mass Index. In 2012-2013, 67.3% of Kindergarten males and 75.5% of Kindergarten females were healthy or underweight and 32.7% of males and 24.5% of females were overweight or obese according to the Body Mass Index. 78.9% of 2nd grade males and 71.1% of 2nd grade females were healthy or underweight and 21.1% of males and 28.9% of females were healthy or underweight according to the Body Mass Index. 63.8% of 4th grade males and 69.8% of 4th grade females were healthy or underweight and 36.2% of males and 30.2% of females are overweight or obese according to the Body Mass Index.

Supporting Data:

2. In 2010-2011, the School Health Index for Module 1, School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, was 98%. The area of greatest concern is outside access to physical facilities. The School Health Index for Module 2, Health Education, was 95%. An area of concern was professional development in delivering curriculum. The School Health Index for Module 3, Physical Education and Other Physical Education, was 89%. An area of concern is 150 min. of physical education per week. The School Health Index for Module 4, Nutrition Services was 97%. An area of concern is collaboration between food service staff and teachers. The School Health Index for Module 8 was 100%. In 2011-12, the School Health Index for Module 1, School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, was 100%. The School Health Index for Module 2, Health Education, was 95%. An area of concern was professional development in health education. The School Health Index for Module 3, Physical Education and Other Physical Education, was 97%. The School Health Index for Module 4, Nutrition Services was 100%. The School Health Index for Module 8 was 100%. In 2012-13, the School Health Index for Module 1, School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, was 87%. The School Health Index for Module 2, Health Education, was 81%. An area of concern was professional development in delivering curriculum. The School Health Index for Module 3, Physical Education and Other Physical Education, was 95%. An area of concern is 150 minutes of physical education. The School Health Index for Module 4, Nutrition Services was 86%. An area of concern - collaboration between food service staff and teachers. The School Health Index for Module 8 was 100%. An area of concern is - none

Goal To improve the physical health and wellness of all Howard Perrin students.

Benchmark Using the elementary school health index, we will meet 95% on all modules.

Intervention: Implement a comprehensive school health program.				
Scientific Based Research: Act 1220; Physical Activity and Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996, www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/sgr/htrn.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
In accordance with the Arkansas Health and Physical Education standards, all students will receive health and physical education instruction weekly, as directed by the Physical Education and classroom teachers.	Susan Covington	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Wellness				
In accordance with Act 1220, all students will be provided 150 minutes of physical activity weekly, during which all students will be active. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Wellness	Susan Covington	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The nutrition guidelines outlined in Act 1220 will be adhered to at Howard Perrin. Snacks of non-nutritive value will not be provided for students, snacks will not be given to students within 30 minutes after the last lunch period, and no more than nine snack days will be given (example: Christmas Party) Parents will be given suggestions for healthy snacks in the teachers' class newsletter. Food served in the school cafeteria will be in compliance with all district and state regulations. The food service director will collaborate with teachers by providing nutritional information. Action Type: Wellness	Martha Nehus	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school playground is available for community use after school hours. Neighborhood children play on the playground after school and on weekends and city league football and baseball teams use the playground for team practice. The UPTO hosts a Field Day of physical activities every spring. Annually the Benton Fire Department conducts a fire safety program for Kindergarten and third grade. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Susan Covington	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Howard Perrin Wellness Committee will meet regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of the School Wellness Plan. The committee will review state regulations and ensure compliance among all stakeholders and will plan staff development as needed. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Susan Covington	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Central Office</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Supplies for preschool playground will be purchased. Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness	Gina Holstead	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$500
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$500</b>



Priority 4:

Supporting Data: 1. Evidence of this intervention is documented with attendance at parent/ teacher conferences. Fall 2010 - 95%, Spring 2011 - 83% Fall 2011 - 93%, Spring 2012 - 81% Fall 2012 - 91% ,Spring 2013 - 83%

Goal Our school will work hand in hand with parents to provide the best academic environment for our students.

Benchmark We will try to maintain or increase of percentage of parents that attend the Fall and Spring parent teacher conferences.

Intervention: Implement a Comprehensive Parental Involvement Plan.				
Scientific Based Research: Henderson, A.T., Mapp, K.L., and Averett, A. (2002) A new wave of evidence: The Impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. TX: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools. National PTA (2004) National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
A minimum of two parent teacher conferences will be held annually.	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school's process for resolving parental concerns is located in our handbook. Handbooks are distributed at Open House in the Family Packet. A signature page is signed and returned to the office to establish that this material has been read and understood. Annually the parent facilitator and committee will review and revise as needed this process. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Howard Perrin Elementary has an established Parent-Teacher organization (UPTO). The school supports this organization. Activities include Fall Festival, Spring Fling, Pennies for Perrin, School Directory. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Activities/Seminars will be conducted annually for the students and parents that will assist them in making academic decisions. These transition activities include Middle School Orientation Days. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Lisa Ladd	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Howard Perrin Elementary has a Parental Involvement Facilitator, Stacye Shelnut. The role is to facilitate positive home-school relationships and help parents be academically involved with their children by provide resources and information for their children. An area for parent information is set up in the school office. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of this intervention will be determined by summative assessments: Parent surveys, increase in parent volunteers / Watch Dog Dads Program, parent participation in UPTO, attendance/participation in parent/student conferences. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

All teachers, including special education, will participate in two hours of professional development concerning parental and community involvement according to the state's professional development rotation schedule; administrators will participate in three hours. The professional development will be made available through Dawson Co-op and/or at the school level. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Informational packets will be developed by the staff and distributed to all students and parents during Open House. New students enrolled after Open House will be given a packet in the office Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Parent Involvement Meetings (formerly Parents Make a Difference evenings) are held in the Fall and Spring of each school year. Topics will include, but not be limited to Book Fairs, State of the School Address (test reports), Grandparents Social, Watch Dog Dads and Kids Pizza night. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Stacye Shelnut	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• School Library</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

• Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Adrienne Roe	5th Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Amie Dougherty	K	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Ann Barnett	Third Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Cathy Dawson	4th Grade	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Debbie Burton	4th Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Dee Clary	2nd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Denise White	Music	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Devyn Cates	1st Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Donna Brown	5th Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Gloria Fitzhugh	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Jennifer Hopkins	Kindergarten	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Kate Reecer	2nd Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Kathy Tolbert	1st Grade	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Keri Coats	SPED	Math
Classroom Teacher	Kim Russell	3rd Grade	Writing/Steering
Classroom Teacher	Kristi Chumley	Gifted and Talented	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Linnie McCook	1st Grade	Math-Steering
Classroom Teacher	Lisa Ladd	Counselor	Steering
Classroom Teacher	Lori Peden	5th Grade	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Lorin Furman	K Teacher	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Maggie Grissom	1st Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Mary Ann Elkin	Art	Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Mary Crawford	3rd Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Mary Grace Kinder	1st Grade	Writing
Classroom Teacher	Megan Thomas	2nd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Melanie Sams	3rd Grade	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Nancy Lee	Resource	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Regina Neighbors	Kindergarten	Math

Classroom Teacher	Robin Elliot	4th Grade	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Sara Ward	Kindergarten	Writing-Steering
Classroom Teacher	Shelly Harmon	Kindergarten	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Sherry Kelley	Media Specialist	Chair
Classroom Teacher	Stephanie Givens	1st Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Susan Covington	P.E.	Wellness / Steering
Classroom Teacher	Trena Slaughter	Speech	Reading
Classroom Teacher	Trent Morgan	P.E. Teacher	Wellness
District-Level Professional	Cheryl Hentschel	District Math Coach	Math
District-Level Professional	LeAnn Hopper	District OT	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Alethea Simpson	Paraprofessional	Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Cheryl Watson	Nurse	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Grace Smith	Reading Aide	Reading
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	John Goodman	Custodian	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Shannon Ridgley	Technology Coordinator	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sky Redmann	Parent	Writing
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Susan Burris	Office Aide	Math
Parent	Heather Kreulen	Parent	Math
Principal	Gina Holstead	Principal	Steering
Principal	Stacye Shelnut	Assistant Principal	Steering

# Rooming List

## State Boys Basketball Tournament

### Room 1

Blake Bowlin

Tarek Beaugard

Josh Bowling

Luke Vincent

### Room 4

Jayson Gillion

Adrian Huning

Hunter Howe

Hunter Worley Jeremiah Bowling

### Room 2

Nick Sanchez

Nathan Humble

Brian Reed

Ketiran Jones

### Room 5

Coach Fishburn

### Room 6

Coach Torres Coach Morgan

### Room 3

Braden Warhurst

Cason Maertens

Clay Anderson

Jackson Oulch

### Room 7

Bus Driver

### Room 8

Austin Riddick, Trent White

Craig Griffin, Matthew Perry