



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

2008-2009 ARCHIVE

School Plan

[Print Version](#)

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2008-2009

Approved:

It is the mission of the Salem Elementary School to educate all students in a safe environment. Our school will provide a challenging curriculum promoting higher-order thinking skills, technology skills, and problem-solving abilities through relevant and engaging activities. We will work with the community to provide the experiences necessary for all students to become responsible citizens, and ensure each child fairness, equality, and access.

Grade Span: K-6

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement:

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve mathematic skills in the area of Measurement, on both multiple-choice and open-response items; all students will improve skills in problem solving in all areas of mathematics.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: The district will provide educational opportunities for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing activities to aid in decreasing the average BMI on the annual student screening.

Priority 1: All students will improve literacy skills.

1. In 2006, 64% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 51% of the low socioeconomic students, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 64% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no measurable subgroups for any ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Content & Style areas of the Writing section, the Literary & Content multiple-choice and open-response questions of the Reading section. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Content & Style areas of the Writing section, the multiple-choice questions of the Literary area of the Reading section, and the open-response questions of the Content area of the Reading section. In 2007, 75% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 74% of the economically disadvantaged students, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 75% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas for the combined population were the Reading-Content passages multiple-choice and open-response items. Writing-Content and Writing-Style domains were the lowest areas in writing for the combined population. The lowest areas of the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content passages multiple-choice and open-response items. Writing-Content and Writing-Style domains were the lowest areas in writing for the students with disabilities. In 2008, 78% of the combined population of grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 67% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% of the students with disabilities, and 80% of the Caucasian

Supporting
Data:

students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Writing-Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Writing-Style domain.

2. In 2006, 83% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 81% of the low socioeconomic students, 33% of the students with disabilities, and 83% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no measurable subgroups for any ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the multiple-choice in the Writing section and the open-response of the Reading Content section. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing multiple-choice questions and the Reading Content open-response questions. In 2007, 73% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 65% of the economically disadvantaged students, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 74% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas for the combined population were the Reading-Content passages multiple-choice and open-response items. Writing-Content and Writing-Style domains were the lowest areas in writing for the combined population. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content passages multiple-choice and open-response items. The multiple-choice items in Writing and Writing-Style domain were areas of concern, also. In 2008, 68% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 68% of the economically disadvantaged students, 13% of the students with disabilities, and 67% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain.
3. In 2006, 89% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 80% of the low socioeconomic students, 33% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no measurable subgroups for any ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the multiple-choice questions on the Writing section, and the open-response questions in the Practical area of the Reading section. In 2007, 85% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 77% of the economically disadvantaged students, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 84% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas for the combined population were the Reading-Content passages multiple-choice and open-response items. Writing-Content and Writing-Style domains were equally low. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content passages multiple-choice and open-response items, plus Writing multiple-choice items. In 2008, 84% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 78% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% of the students with disabilities, and 83% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Writing multiple-choice items.
4. In 2006, 68% of the combined population of the 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 65% of the low socioeconomic students, 20% of the students with disabilities, and 74% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no measurable subgroups for any ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Writing multiple-choice and the open-response of the Literary section of the reading. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items of the Literary and Content sections of the Reading and the Writing multiple-choice. In 2007, 72% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exams. 58% of the economically disadvantaged students, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 74% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas for the combined population were the Reading-Literacy passages multiple-choice and open-response items. The Writing-content and writing-style domains were equally low. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Literary passages multiple-choice and open-response items, plus the Writing multiple-choice items. In 2008, 84% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the

Benchmarks. 79% of the economically disadvantaged students, 17% of the students with disabilities, and 85% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain.

5. In 2006, the combined population of the kindergarten students scored in the 53rd percentile on the Reading Vocabulary section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 46th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 21st percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 55th percentile. In 2007, 78% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Vocabulary. 79% of the Caucasian population, 77% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 57% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Phonological Awareness and Decoding skill within the Word Analysis section. 2008 data not available due to the mix up at the state level. The Mat 8 will be given in the fall. In 2006, the combined population of the kindergarten students scored in the 69th percentile in Total Language. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 66th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 38th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 69th percentile. In 2007, 79% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Language. 80% of the Caucasian population, 69% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 57% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Comparative and Superlative Adjectives skill within the Language section. 2008 data not available due to the mix up at the state level. The Mat 8 will be given in the fall.
6. In 2006, the combined population of the 1st grade student scored in the 77th percentile on the Total Reading section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 73rd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 51st percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 77th percentile. In 2007, 80% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading. 79% of the Caucasian students, 77% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 67% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Vocabulary skill within the Reading section. In 2008, 59% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 59% of the Caucasian students, 50% of the free/reduced students, and 38% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the 1st grade students scored in the 81st percentile on the Total Language section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 75th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 59th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 82nd percentile. In 2007, 75% of the combined population of the 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Language. 75% of the Caucasian students, 73% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 67% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Capitalization in Context skill within the Language section.
7. In 2006, the combined population of the 2nd grade students scored in the 72nd percentile on the Total Reading section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 68th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 36th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 73rd percentile. In 2007, 77% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading. 80% of the Caucasian students, 69% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 39% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Identify and Analyze Words skill within the Word Analysis section. In 2008, 52% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 52% of the Caucasian students, 40% of the free/reduced students, and 43% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the 2nd grade students scored in the 74th percentile on the Total Language section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 72nd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 45th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 74th percentile. In 2007, 68% of the combined population of the 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Language. 71% of the Caucasian students, 59% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 23% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Usage and Expressions skill within the Language section.
8. In 2006, the combined population of the 3rd grade students scored in the 63rd percentile on the Total Reading section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 53rd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 24th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 64th percentile. In 2007, 82% of the combined population of the 3rd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading. 82% of the Caucasian students, 80% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 13% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Inference and Interpretation skill within the Reading Comprehension section. In 2008, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at the 57th percentile in Reading Comprehension. The students with IEP's scored at the 36th percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the 3rd grade students scored in the 69th percentile on the

- Total Language section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 57th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 30th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 71st percentile. In 2007, 75% of the combined population of the 3rd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Language. 75% of the Caucasian students, 69% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 13% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Apostrophe/Quotes skill within the Punctuation section. In 2008, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at the 48th percentile in Comprehensive Language. The students with IEP's scored at the 29th percentile.
9. In 2006, the combined population of the 4th grade students scored in the 81st percentile on the Total Reading section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 77th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 37th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 81st percentile. In 2007, 71% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading. 73% of the Caucasian population, 59% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 20% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Inference and Interpretation skill within the Reading Comprehension section. In 2008, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 65th percentile in Reading Comprehension. The students with IEP's scored in the 33rd percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the 4th grade students scored in the 77th percentile on the Total Language section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 72nd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 50th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 77th percentile. In 2007, 77% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Language. 78% of the Caucasian students, 72% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 40% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Apostrophe/Quotes skill within the Punctuation section. In 2008, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 39th percentile in Comprehensive Language, and the students with IEP's scored in the 14th percentile.
 10. In 2006, the combined population of the 5th grade students scored in the 77th percentile on the Total Reading section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 73rd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 36th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 77th percentile. In 2007, 85% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading. 85% of the Caucasian students, 81% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 0% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Analysis and Generalization skill within the Reading Comprehension section. In 2008, the combined population of 5th grade students scored in the 71st percentile in Reading Comprehension, and the students with IEP's scored in the 38th percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the 5th grade students scored in the 70th percentile on the Total Language section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 63rd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 43rd percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 70th percentile. In 2007, 85% of the combined population of the 5th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Language. 85% of the Caucasian students, 81% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 0% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Names, Titles, Dates, & Holidays skill within the Capitalization section. In 2008, the combined population of 5th grade students scored in the 49th percentile in Comprehensive Language, and the students with IEP's scored in the 42nd percentile.
 11. In 2006, the combined population of the 6th grade students scored in the 58th percentile on the Total Reading section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 53rd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 32nd percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 59th percentile. In 2007, 74% of the combined population of the 6th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading. 75% of the Caucasian students, 67% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 33% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was Vocabulary. In 2008, the combined population of 6th grade students scored in the 62nd percentile in Reading Comprehension, and the students with IEP's scored in the 27th percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the 6th grade students scored in the 45th percentile on the Total Language section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 40th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 19th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 46th percentile. In 2007, 69% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Language. 69% of the Caucasian students, 53% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 33% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Names, Title, Dates, & Holidays skill within the Capitalization section. In 2008, the combined population of 6th grade students scored in the 57th percentile in Comprehensive Language, and the students with IEP's scored in the 29th percentile.
 12. The 2006 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2006 School Improvement Report. The 2007 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2007 School Improvement Report. The 2008 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2008 School Improvement Report.

Goal All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.

Benchmark To meet the state AYP requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 2004-2007 Combined Population: 77.6 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 78.1 Econ. Dis.: 71.1 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2005-2008 Combined Population: 78.3 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 78.7 Econ. Dis.: 72.3 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: ALIGNMENT of the literacy curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks.				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs (2004). Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping, 1-181. Heidi Hayes Jacobs (1997). Mapping the Big Picture, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will be provided opportunities for staff development on the mapping and alignment process. Action Type: Professional Development	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each classroom teacher will identify the skills being taught in his/her literacy curriculum throughout the school year. Action Type: Alignment	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Special education teachers and regular classroom teachers will work together to align literacy curriculum for appropriate modifications in the special education classroom. Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Patty Neal and Judy Rose	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will have grade level meetings (horizontal meetings) to compare and contrast the mapping process, looking at the timeline of instruction and the methods being employed by each teacher to cover the skills. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The staff will participate in vertical meetings to discuss the mapping process across grade levels. Timeline of covering standards and methods being used will be the priorities of these meetings. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each year, the status of the alignment process will be evaluated by the administration to determine the next course of action for each building. The Benchmark scores and SAT 10 scores will also be processed each year to identify areas of weakness. Common planning periods make it possible for teachers to monitor and adjust on a daily basis. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Continued support and implementation of Effective Literacy.				
Scientific Based Research: Carol A. Lyons and Gay Su Pinnell (2001). System for Change in Literacy Education: A Guide to Professional Development, 11-21. Richard Allington (1996). Schools That Work, 148-172.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Appropriate grade level teachers will receive professional development in Effective Literacy to improve literacy skills. Teachers already trained will attend any recalibration trainings that are offered. Action Type: Professional Development	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	
Appropriate grade level teachers will implement Effective Literacy in the classroom in order to determine the literacy skills of the students and identify any one who might need remediation in literacy. Action Type: AIP/IRI	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will regularly evaluate the impact of the Effective Literacy program on the development of literacy skills. SAT 10 scores from the 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades will be looked at each year in addition to the percent of teachers currently using those strategies to determine the effectiveness of instruction at that level. This will be a baseline year for that data. Currently, 1 new staff member will begin training during the 2008-2009 school year. Classroom observations in coordination with the educational cooperative will be done to ensure the trainee is using the strategies of effective literacy. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Accelerated Reader Program.

Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning Inc. (2002, March). Summary of Research, 1-56.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS Teachers will use the Accelerated Reader Program, which uses computer-based testing of library books, to improve literacy skills. Approximately 1 computer, 1 printer, 9 projectors with mounting hardware, and 9 projector screens will be purchased and installed to support the program. Students take AR tests on the computers. The printers provide feedback for students, teachers, and parents. The projectors and screens will be used for demonstration of proper use in the computer lab and library, as well as other reading projects. Tech support for software related to the program will also be purchased each year - Athena and Star Reading. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • School Library • Teachers 	Title VI State - Purchased Services: \$3735.00 Title VI State - Materials & Supplies: \$16172.00 Title V - Materials & Supplies: \$837.00 Title I - Purchased Services: \$2500.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$1500.00 NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$682.75 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$25426.75
Teachers will give a pretest and a posttest using Star Reading to assess reading levels of all students. This data will also be shared with parents during Parent/Teacher Conferences to chart student growth. Pretests will be administered during September for grades 2-6. K-1 will administer the pretest in January. Posttests will be given during the month of April. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • School Library • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>All students will use the AR program and will take assessments on the books they read throughout the year. Reading logs or checklists will be kept by all students and teachers will check the status of the class on a daily basis. The levels of the students will be monitored and adjusted by the classroom teachers. Logs/checklists for special education students will be monitored by the resource teachers. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • School Library • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The AR program will be evaluated by the literacy committee for effectiveness each year to determine how to maximize its use in each grade level. Test score data will also be examined each year to look at growth of literacy skills. Student growth will be measured by comparing the pre- and post- STAR tests. In the 2004-2005 school year, our students gained an average of .9 in grade equivalency and an average of 8.7 percentile per class on the Star Reading tests. In the 2005-2006 school year, our students gained an average of 1.0 in grade equivalency and an average of 11 percentile per class on the Star Reading tests. During the 2006-2007 school year, our students gained an average of .99 in grade equivalency and an average of 14 percentile per class on the Star Reading tests. During the 2005-2006 school year, our students passed 36,683 quizzes out of 38,125. The average percent correct on a quiz was 88.1%, and our students earned 33,372.4 points. In 2006-2007, our students passed approximately 38,000 quizzes. During the 2007-2008 school year, our students passed 55,632 quizzes and averaged 86.8% on each quiz. Students gained an average of 1.0 in grade equivalency and 11 percentile points according to Star Reading results. 100% of our classroom teachers are using the program, including the two resource classrooms. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Parent volunteers will be encouraged to assist any students having difficulties in reading the AR books and assist them on the computer assessments. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>A list of AR books and levels of books will be provided to the local public library to support and encourage reading during the summer. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Vicki Ragan</p>	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Library • School Library 	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$25426.75</p>
<p>Intervention: Classroom Size Reduction.</p>				

Scientific Based Research: American Educational Research Association (Fall, 2003). Class Size: Counting Students Can Count, 1-4. Glen E. Robinson (1990, April). Synthesis of Research on the Effects of Class Size. Educational Leadership, 80-90.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The impact of CSR on literacy skills in the elementary school will be closely monitored by the teachers and administration. Test scores and retention rates will be two of the indicators that will be assessed each year. K MAT 8, 1-2 SAT 10, and 3-6 Benchmark scores will be the test data analyzed each year, depending upon the placement of the teachers. This will be a baseline year for the data. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
COORDINATION OF FUNDS Students will be placed in smaller classes in grades K-6 in order to improve instruction in literacy. 4 teachers' salaries (4 FTE's) will be paid in 2008-2009. Efforts will be made to make sure that classes are equitable when being divided into groups and that all students are treated equally and fairly at Salem Elementary School in order to prevent any kind of discrimination. Action Type: Equity	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	Title II-A - Employee \$46500.00 Salaries: Title II-A - Employee \$6607.00 Benefits: Title I - Employee \$135000.00 Salaries: Title I - Employee \$40498.88 Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$228605.88
The grade level placement of CSR teachers will be based upon enrollment at the end of the school year. Teacher input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. Action Type: Equity	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS All teachers on staff will be highly qualified and certified in the fields in which they are teaching. Newspapers and online postings will be used to fill any vacancies with highly qualified applicants. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Ken Rich	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/12/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$228605.88

Intervention: To implement open-response questions in literacy for all students in every grade level.

Scientific Based Research: Doug Reeves (2004). Accountability in Action, 185-208. Doug Reeves (1998). Making Standards Work, 33-40.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT Teachers will receive training in open-response question development and scoring. Specialists from the educational service center will provide training opportunities each year. Professional development related to six hours of technology, two hours of Arkansas History, and two hours of Physical Fitness will also be provided by the educational service center or by the school. The building principal will also receive the additional professional development for administrators as	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

mandated by the ADE. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
Parents will be informed about instruction and assessments related to open-response questions and the Benchmark exams during the Annual Public Meeting, parent/teacher conferences, Grandparent's Breakfast/Open House, and school newsletters. Action Type: Parental Engagement	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will collect and assess open-responses from students and adjust instruction as needed. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All classroom teachers and special education teachers will use open-response questions in literacy instruction, evaluate progress, and adjust instruction as needed. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
REMIEDIATION Regular classroom teachers will be responsible for remediating students who are not on grade level in reading and writing. Test scores and other criteria determined by the teacher will identify students to be remediated. Special Education teachers will also have input for students in their program. Remediation plans will be written annually by the classroom teachers and parents. These plans will be completed upon the arrival of the results of the Benchmarks. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
This entire plan to improve literacy skills will be reviewed and revised annually by the literacy committee. This evaluation will be used to determine the best use of the next school year's federal, state, and local funds in order to maximize increased student achievement and improvement of instruction. Benchmark and SAT 10 data will be analyzed to determine which grade levels need more practice on open-reponse items. In 2008, 3rd graders earned 53%, 4th graders earned 63%, 5th graders earned 54%, and 6th graders earned 75% of the possible points of the open-response items on the literacy portion of the Benchmark exam. These percentages will be compared to 2009 percentages. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT in the elementary school.

Scientific Based Research: Emma McDonald (2005). Developing Positive Parent Partnerships, 1-4. Diane Debrovner (August, 2004). Parents: Get Set for School, 144-152. Kathleen Cotton & Karen Reed Wikelund (1989). Parent Involvement in Education, 1-17.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The elementary school will have a family night to meet the parents and discuss reading programs and instruction. The technology coordinator will offer to parents training in school district software related to online grades, AR records, lunch balances,...	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 08/14/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
<p>Parent Involvement Meetings for providing information to parents will be held throughout the year by school personnel. Status of the school and student achievement are examples of topics of discussion at these meetings.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	David Turnbough	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>A newsletter (Little Hound Herald) will be sent home on a monthly basis to keep parents informed about student events, student performance, and other essential information parents will need to know throughout the year. Extra copies will be available at the Parent Center.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	David Turnbough	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>COLLABORATION Parents and community members will be encouraged to participate in school activities. Reading to students and participating in art/music activities are just a few examples of volunteer actions. Volunteer applications are available in the parent center. Members of the community will also be encouraged to participate in school activities. For example: inviting local policemen, military personnel, or businessmen in to do presentations for the students.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	David Turnbough	<p>Start: 08/15/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>A parent center will be set up the elementary office which shall provide informational packets, as well as numerous other materials to be available to parents and community members as required by Act 307 of 2007. The following are examples of some of the items: magazines and informative materials related to parenting skills; tips for parents concerning success for their children at school; volunteer applications; and copies of the latest newsletters. The Parent/Volunteer Resource Book and Log will also be located in the office. An area in the library has been provided for parent book selections. The parent center will be maintained by the facilitator, David Turnbough. The parent facilitator will assist and support the developemnt of any parent organization, such as PTA/PTO.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	David Turnbough	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The local newspaper and cable tv company will be used as information sources for the public concerning school events and achievements.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Ken Rich	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>A Grandparent's Breakfast will be held each year. Grandparents, parents, and other family members can eat for free. Afterward, they will have an opportunity to meet with the teachers and staff. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Vicky Rossitto</p>	<p>Start: 10/06/2008 End: 10/06/2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>There will be two parent/teacher conferences held each school year - one at the end of the 1st quarter and one at the end of the 3rd quarter. Parents that do not attend will be contacted by letter or phone. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Ken Rich</p>	<p>Start: 10/21/2008 End: 03/19/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>At the end of each quarter, a Renaissance Award Program will be held for parents and family members. It will be held during school hours so that all students will be able to participate. Students will be recognized for their academic achievements during the quarter. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>At the end of each school year, the kindergarten teachers and students will host a Parent Appreciation Breakfast. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Vicky Rossitto</p>	<p>Start: 05/07/2009 End: 05/12/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>NSLA (State-281) - \$400.00 Materials & Supplies:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$400</p>
<p>All parents who attend the parent/teacher conferences will be recognized in the local newspaper at the end of the school year for their contributions to their child's success in school. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Ken Rich</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 07/31/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT Each school year, the teachers and administration will assess the success of the parental involvement program and make any changes necessary to encourage future participation. Random parent surveys will be sent home each year to gather data from the parent perspective. Results will be tabulated and distributed to the staff members at the beginning of each school year. 2007-2008 survey results were shared with teachers during the summer inservice. Results were very positive. An area of concern was communication frequency, and our goal for 2008-2009 is to improve communication with parents. Parent/Teacher Conference attendance rates will also be monitored this year and future years. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

A Parent/Student/Teacher/Principal Compact will be distributed in the student handbooks each year. A list of recommendations are provided for each involved party to ensure a successful educational experience. The compact is signed by all of the involved parties and filed in the principal's office each year. Parent grievance procedures are also provided in the hand book. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school purchased GradeQuick for all teachers to keep electronic grades. Grades will be sent to EDline, so parents will be able to check on their child's progress at any time on-line. A computer is available for parent use in the parent center for parents who do not have a computer at home. Yearly tech support fees will paid for the program. Also, homework folders were purchased for each grade level. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ken Rich	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$3750.00 NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$600.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$4350
TRANSITION Each year, Salem Elementary will conduct a kindergarten registration and screening. The following agencies will be included in the transition process in addition to school personnel: NAESC, Salem Wee Care, Early Horizons, and Salem Head Start. Parents will be encouraged to attend the meetings and will be given kits by the kindergarten teachers to help the children and parents prepare for starting kindergarten. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 03/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009		ACTION BUDGET: \$
The school will provide at least two hours of PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT each year related to parental involvement by providing meaningful training to encourage and develop relationships with parents. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 09/19/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$4750
Intervention: REMEDIATION Afterschool Tutoring Program.				
Scientific Based Research: Gil G. Norm (2004). Afterschool Education: A New Ally for Education Reform, 1-3.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
An afterschool tutoring program will be offered to eligible students on Tuesday of each week. Students will receive small group instruction in various areas of literacy based upon teacher recommendation and/or remediation plan.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The instruction provided to the student will include interactions with the teacher and with computer software. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>At the end of each school year, the tutoring program will be evaluated by the staff to determine strengths and weaknesses, and to recommend any changes. Remediation rates, as well as, students repeating remediation will be looked at each year. Benchmark scores will be used to see if any growth occurred for those participating in the tutoring program. In 2005-2006, students participating in the tutoring program increased their raw scores by an average of 14.5 points in literacy. In 2006-2007, students participating in the afterschool tutoring program increased their raw scores by an average of 133.36 points in literacy and 34%(11) of those students scored proficient/advanced. In 2007-2008, students tutoring students on average increased their scale scores by 37 points. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Public Library 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Afterschool tutoring will be offered to all students at the beginning of school year, especially targeting new students who may be behind or struggling with the new curriculum. Participating teachers will be paid \$30 per hour.</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/20/2008 End: 05/23/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3792.88 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$14500.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$18292.88</p>
<p>REMEDIATION sessions will be conducted each week among all students in all grade levels. At a minimum of one session a week, students will be receiving instruction based upon previous test data and AIP's. Action Type: AIP/IRI</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/20/2008 End: 05/23/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$18292.88</p>

Intervention: The Orchard software will be used in grades K-6.

Scientific Based Research: Effect of Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) on Reading Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. Soe, K., Koki, S., and Chang, J.M. June, 2000.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Orchard software will be used to facilitate literacy instruction in grades K-6. Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Classroom teachers will be able to generate individual literacy assignments for students on the computers. The program will be installed on every computer for all students to have access. Touchscreens were added in the special education classrooms to enable any student with physical problems to use the program. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>David Turnbough</p>	<p>Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

The software will also be used to tutor students requiring remediation in literacy skills. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each year, the program will be evaluated to determine any necessary changes to be made. Consideration of additional learning trees will also be made at that time. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each year, the program will be evaluated to determine any necessary changes to be made. Consideration of additional learning trees will also be made at that time. Pre and posttest data will be used to determine student growth. Pre and post data from the Orchard program indicates a average growth of 5% in language arts in 04-05. In 2005-2006, the average increase between pre and post tests was 14.5% in language arts. The posttest data for 2006-2008 was lost due to a error during an upload of new Orchard trees. Pretest and posttest data will again be used in the 2008-2009 school year. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/07/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Study Island will be purchased and used in grades K-6.

Scientific Based Research: Magnolia Consulting, July 15, 2008. Study Island Scientific Research Base, pp. 1-17. Educational Leadership, Vol. 63, Num. 3, pp. 19-24, November, 2005. Classroom Assessment: Minute by Minute, Day by Day.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Study Island will be purchased for grades 3-6 to provide supplemental instruction in literacy during classroom instruction and after school tutoring. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/18/2008 End: 01/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers 	Title VI State - Materials & Supplies: \$3806.67 ACTION BUDGET: \$3806.67
A version of Study Island for grades k-2 will be purchased during the fall semester (1,658.70). It will also be used for remediation and tutoring. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 01/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of the Study Island software will be based upon the amount of growth students experience using pre and posttests provided by the program itself. The program will also be measured by the amount of growth experienced by students in after school tutoring who are using Study Island. This growth will be based upon Benchmark and SAT 10 scale scores. This is the first year of use for Study Island, so this will be a baseline year for data. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 05/19/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$3806.67

Priority 2: All students will improve math skills.

Supporting Data:

- In 2006, 80% of the 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark exams. 75% of the low socioeconomic students, 40% of the students with disabilities, and 72% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There are no measurable subgroups for any other ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined

- population were the open-response and multiple-choice questions of the Data Analysis and Probability strand. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the open-response questions of the DAP strand and the multiple-choice questions of the Geometry strand. In 2007, 87% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient/advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 87% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 87% of the Caucasian students scored proficient/advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the multiple-choice items from the Measurement strand and the open-response items from the DAP strand. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items from the Measurement strand, and the open-response items from the DAP & Algebra strands. In 2008, 90% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 87% of the low socioeconomic students, 91% of the Caucasian students, and 66% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Measurement multiple-choice and the Measurement open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Measurement multiple-choice and the Measurement open-response.
2. In 2006, 87% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 81% of the low socioeconomic students, 33% of the students with disabilities, and 87% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no measurable subgroups for any other ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Geometry open-response questions and the NPO multiple-choice questions. The lowest identified areas for the IEP students were the Algebra open-reponse and multiple-choice questions. In 2007, 77% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient/advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 69% of the economically disadvantaged students, 40% of the students with disabilities, and 78% of the Caucasian students scored proficient/advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the multiple-choice items of the Geometry strand and the open-response items of the Measurement strand. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice and open-response items in the Measurement strand. In 2008, 80% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 79% of the low socioeconomic students, 79% of the Caucasian students, and 13% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Geometry multiple-choice and the Data Analysis and Probability open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Geometry multiple-choice and the Geometry open-response.
 3. In 2006, 86% of the 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the Benchmark exams. 84% of the low socioeconomic students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 86% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There are no measurable subgroups for any other ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the open-response and the multiple-choice questions of the Data Analysis and Probability strand. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the open-response and the multiple-choice questions of the Algebra strand. In 2007, 89% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient/advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 84% of the economically disadvantaged students, 33% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient/advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were in the multiple-choice items in the Measurement strand and the open-response items in the Geometry strand. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice and open-response items of the NPO strand. In 2008, 88% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 78% of the low socioeconomic students, 90% of the Caucasian students, and 50% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Measurement multiple-choice and the Algebra open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Numbers and Operations multiple-choice and the Algebra open-response.
 4. In 2006, 75% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 76% of the low socioeconomic students, 20% of the students with disabilities, and 75% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no measurable subgroups for any other ethnic group or for any LEP students. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the NPO open-response questions and the Algebra multiple-choice questions. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the NPO & Algebra open-response questions and the Algebra multiple-choice questions. In 2007, 88% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient/advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 81% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 88% of the Caucasian students scored proficient/advanced. The lowest identified areas for the combined

population were the multiple-choice and open-response items of the Geometry strand. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice and open-response items of the DAP strand. In 2008, 94% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 91% of the low socioeconomic students, 94% of the Caucasian students, and 50% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were the Numbers and Operations multiple-choice and the Geometry open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Measurement multiple-choice and the Algebra and Geometry open-response.

5. In 2005, the combined population of kindergarten students scored in the 67th percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 57th percentile, and the students with disabilities scored in the 46th percentile. In 2006, the combined population of the kindergarten students scored in the 73rd percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 68th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 33rd percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 73rd percentile. In 2007, 76% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 77% of the Caucasian students, 60% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 29% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Number Properties and Operations skill. There is no data for kindergarten for the Spring of 2008.
6. In 2006, the combined population of the 1st grade students scored in the 84th percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 81st percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 69th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 84th percentile. In 2007, 79% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 79% of the Caucasian students, 77% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 67% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Read Amounts skill within the Math Problems section. In 2008, 80% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 81% of the Caucasian students, 62% of the students with IEP's, and 75% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile.
7. In 2006, the combined population of 2nd grade students scored in the 69th percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 69th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 37th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 69th percentile. In 2007, 81% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 82% of the Caucasian students, 77% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 62% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Multiple-Step Problem Solving skill within the Math Problems section. In 2008, 77% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 78% of the Caucasian students, 57% of the students with IEP's, and 70% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile.
8. In 2006, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 68th percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 61st percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 27th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 70th percentile. In 2007, 77% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 77% of the Caucasian students, 72% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 13% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Probability and Statistics skill within the Concepts and Estimation section. In 2008, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 68th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 52nd percentile.
9. In 2006, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 92nd percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 90th percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 66th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 92nd percentile. In 2007, 89% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 90% of the Caucasian students, 90% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 40% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Problem Solving skill within the Problem Solving and Data Interpretation section. In 2008, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 68th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 22nd percentile.
10. In 2006, the combined population of the 5th grade students scored in the 85th percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 82nd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 66th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 85th percentile. In 2007, 89% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 89% of the Caucasian students, 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 17% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Measurement skill within the Concepts and Estimation section. In 2008, the combined population of 5th grade students scored in the 79th

percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 72nd percentile.

11. In 2006, the combined population of the 6th grade students scored in the 69th percentile on the Total Mathematics section of the ITBS. The low socioeconomic students scored in the 63rd percentile, the students with disabilities scored in the 44th percentile, and the Caucasian students scored in the 70th percentile. In 2007, 84% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Total Math. 83% of the Caucasian students, 73% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 33% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Divide with Whole Numbers skill within the Math Computations section. In 2008, the combined population of 6th grade students scored in the 82nd percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 33rd percentile.

Goal

All students will improve mathematic skills in the area of Measurement, on both multiple-choice and open-response items; all students will improve skills in problem solving in all areas of mathematics.

To meet the state AYP requirement annually as required by the state with a goal to increase the total number of students scoring proficient/advanced by 1/2%. 2004-2007 Combined Population: 86.8

Benchmark

African American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 87 Econ. Dis.: 83 LEP: NA Stud. Dis.: NA 2005-2008 Combined Population: 86.7 African American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 87.2 Econ. Dis.: 83.5 LEP: NA Stud. Dis.: NA

Intervention: ALIGNMENT Align math curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks.				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs (2004). Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping, 1-181. Heidi Hayes Jacobs (1997). Mapping the Big Picture, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will be provided opportunities to receive staff development in the mapping and alignment process. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each teacher will develop a curriculum map for mathematics. Skills being taught throughout the school year will be identified and recorded on the disc provided. Teachers will work together during grade level meetings (horizontal meetings) to compare methods and the timeline. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Special Education teachers and regular classroom teachers will work together to align math curriculum for appropriate modifications in the special education classroom. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Patty Neal and Judy Rose	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Vertical meetings will be held that include all teachers to discuss the mapping process, methods and materials being used to teach skills, and the timeline the skills are being taught. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each year, the progress of the alignment process will be assessed by the administration. Future actions will be based upon that assessment. Test score data from the Benchmarks and the SAT 10 tests will also be examined each year to identify weaknesses in the curriculum. Common planning periods will also allow grade levels to monitor and adjust curriculum on a daily basis. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Star Math.				
Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning, Inc. (2002). Differentiating Math Instruction, 1-29.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Tests will be administered during the school year to identify student growth in mathematics using the Star Math program. A pretest will be given during the first quarter. A posttest will be given in April. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will evaluate the usefulness and effectiveness of frequent Star Math assessments in determining student growth in mathematics. Pre and posttests will be given each year. Math data from the Benchmarks and the SAT 10 tests will also be used to compare results. Tech support will be purchased each year for Star Math. According to Star Math data for the 2004-2005 school year, students gained 13 percentile points and 1.63 in grade equivalency during the school year. In 2005-2006, our students gained an average of 16.3 percentile points and 2.5 in grade equivalency. In 2006-2007, our students gained an average of 9.3 percentile points and 1.4 in grade equivalency. In 2007-2008, our students gained an average of 22 percentile points and 2.4 in grade equivalency. 93% of the staff reported data by using Star Math. 100% of the classroom teachers in grades 3-6 use the Star Math for an assessment instrument, including the two resource classrooms. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
During parent/teacher conferences, the test data will be shared with parents to chart student growth in mathematics. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0
Intervention: Classroom Size Reduction.				
Scientific Based Research: American Educational Research Association (Fall, 2003). Class Size: Counting Students Can Count, 1-4. Glen E. Robinson (1990, April). Synthesis of Research on Effects of Class Size. Educational Leadership, 80-90.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The impact of CSR on mathematics skills in the elementary school will be closely monitored by the teachers and administration. Test scores and retention rates will be two of the indicators that will be assessed each year. K MAT 8, 1-2 SAT 10, and 3-6 Benchmark scores will be the test data analyzed each year, depending upon the placement of the teachers. This will be a baseline year for the data. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Students will be placed in smaller class sizes in grades K-6 in order to improve instruction in mathematics.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The grade level placement of the CSR teacher/teachers will depend upon the enrollment at the end of the school year. Every effort will be made to use data from various sources to divide classrooms fairly. Action Type: Equity	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

HIGHLY QUALIFIED All teachers hired and on staff will be highly qualified and certified in the fields in which they are teaching. Newspapers and online postings will be used to fill vacancies with highly qualified applicants. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Ken Rich	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: To implement open-response questions in math for all students.
 Scientific Based Research: Doug Reeves (2004). Accountability in Action, 185-208. Doug Reeves (1998). Making Standards Work, 33-40.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Teachers will receive training at the educational service center regarding Benchmark scoring, rubric development and development of math questions. The six hours of professional development in technology will also be provided by the educational service center. Action Type: Professional Development	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Outside Consultants Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The entire plan to improve mathematics skills will be reviewed and revised on an annual basis, based on the data from all of the student population. This evaluation will be used to determine the best use of the next school year's federal, state, and local funds in order to maximize increased student achievement and improvement of instruction. The effectiveness of open-response instruction will also be evaluated each year based upon student achievement on open-response items on the Benchmark exams. In 2008, 3rd grade students earned 45% of the possible points, 4th grade earned 56%, 5th grade earned 68%, and 6th grade earned 60% on the open-response questions of the Benchmark exam. These percentages will be compared to the 2009 results to measure the growth of the grade levels. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Parents will be informed about instruction methods and testing procedures during the annual public meeting, parent/teacher conferences, Grandparent's Breakfast/Open House, and newsletters Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
REMIEDIATION Students identified to be below grade level in mathematics will receive remediation by the regular classroom teachers at appropriate times. Special Education teachers will provide input for their students who need remediation. Remediation plans will be written annually by the classroom teachers, and they will be based upon the most current data available. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	David Turnbough	Start: 08/15/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Teachers will regularly collect and assess student work, evaluate progress, and adjust instruction as needed. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 08/15/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All classroom teachers and special education teachers will use open ended questions in math instruction and assessments, evaluate progress, and adjust instruction throughout the school year. Calculators will be purchased to ensure that all classrooms will have complete sets in preparation for the Benchmark exams.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
7 sets of calculators will be purchased to prepare students for the calculator portion of the Benchmark exam. (450) Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 05/19/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: REMEDIATION Afterschool Tutoring Program.				
Scientific Based Research: Gil G. Norm (2004). Afterschool Educator: A New Ally for Education Reform, 1-3.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
An afterschool tutoring program will be offered to eligible students on Tuesday of each week. Students will receive small group instruction in various areas of mathematics based upon teacher recommendations and/or remediation plans.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The instruction provided to the student will include interactions with the teacher, as well as with computer software (Orchard or Study Island). Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
At the end of each school year, the tutoring program will be evaluated by the staff to determine strengths and weaknesses. Recommendations for changes will be made at that time. Data from Benchmark results will be analyzed each year to determine growth of students involved in the program. In 2005-2006, students who participated in the after-school tutoring program increased their raw scores by an average of 10.3 on the Benchmark exam. In 2006-2007, students who participated in the after-school tutoring program increased their raw scores by an average of 75.67 on the Benchmark exam and 60%(15) scored proficient/advanced. In 2007-2008, students participating in the after school program increased the average math scale score by 40 points. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Tutoring will be offered to all students each week, especially targeting new students struggling with the curriculum.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/20/2008 End: 05/23/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
REMEDATION Remediation sessions will occur every week in all grade levels. Grade level teachers will work together and use test score data and AIP's to direct instruction. Action Type: AIP/IRI	David Turnbough	Start: 08/20/2008 End: 05/23/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Orchard software will be used K-6 to facilitate math instruction.				
Scientific Based Research: Improving Mastery of Basic Mathematics Facts in Elementary School Through Various Learning Techniques. Haught, L., Kunce, C., Pratt, P., Werneske, R., and Zemel, S. 2002.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Orchard software will be implementd K-6 in the elementary school.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Classroom teachers will be able to generate individual math assignments for students on the computers. The program will be installed on every computer for all students to have access. Touchscreens were added to the special education classrooms to enable students with physical problems to use the program. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The software will also be used to tutor students requiring remediation in mathematics. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Each year, the program will be evaluated to determine any necessary changes to be made. Consideration of additional learning trees will also be made. Pre and posttest data will be used to determine student growth. These results will also be compared to Benchmark and Iowa results. The pre and post data indicated a growth of 8% in mathematics for the 2004-2005 school year. In 2005-2006, the pre and post data indicated a growth of 18.75% increase in mathematics. The posttest data for 2006-2008 was lost during an upload of new trees. Pre and posttest data will again be used during the 2008-2009 school year. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Science trees will be added to support and supplement math instruction. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Study Island will be purchased and used in grades K-6.				
Scientific Based Research: Magnolia Consulting, July 15, 2008. Study Island Scientific Research Base, pp. 1-17. Educational Leadership, Vol. 63, Num. 3, pp. 19-24, November, 2005. Classroom Assessment: Minute by Minute, Day by Day.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Study Island will be purchased to provide supplemental instruction in mathematics during classroom instruction and after school tutoring.	David Turnbough	Start: 08/18/2008 End: 01/01/2011		ACTION BUDGET: \$
A version of Study Island for grades k-2 will be purchased during the fall semester. It will also be used for remediation and tutoring. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 01/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The effectiveness of the Study Island software will be based upon the amount of growth students experience using pre and posttests provided by the program itself. The program will also be measured by the amount of growth experienced by students in after school tutoring who are using Study Island. This growth will be based upon Benchmark and SAT 10 scale scores. This is the first year of use for Study Island, so this will be a baseline year for data. Action Type: Program Evaluation	David Turnbough	Start: 08/14/2008 End: 05/19/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 3: It is a priority of the Salem Elementary School to provide an education to all students concerning healthy lifestyle choices.

1. In 2003-2004,640 students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or overweight: District: Males-45.25% Females-42.1%; Elementary: Males-40.5% Females-41.4%; High School: Males-50% Females-42.8%; In 2004-2005, 676 students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or overweight: District: Males-47.5% Females-41.65% Elementary: Males-46% Females-35.5% High School: Males-49% Females-47.8% In 2005-2006, 621 students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or overweight: District: Males-49.2% Females-40.95% Elementary: Males-45.1% Females-34.2% High School: Males-53.3% Females-47.7% In 2006-2007, 632 students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or overweight: District: Males-42.6% Females-36.5% Elementary: Males-37.5% Females-28.9% High School: Males-50% Females-48.3% In 2007-2008, students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or overweight. District: Males-43% Females-40% Elementary: Males-33% Females-31% High School: Males-53% Females-48%
2. 2005-2006 School Health Index Elementary: High School: Module 1- 93% Module 1-93% Module 2- 86% Module 2-97% Module 3- 97% Module 3-87% Module 4- 98% Module 4-92% Module 8- 72% Module 8-55% 2006-2007 School Health Index Elementary: Module 1-97% Module 2-88% Module 3-100% Module 4-95% Module 8-67% 2008 School Health Index Elementary: Module 1-96% Module 2-97% Module 3-92% Module 4-95% Module 8-72%
3. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 08-09 District- 40% paid, 10% reduced, 51% free; Elementary- 37% paid, 10% reduced, 53% free; High School- 42% paid, 10% reduced, 48% free. Migrant-2 Homeless-0 Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 07-08 District- 44% paid, 9% reduced, 47% free; Elementary- 37% paid, 9% reduced, 54% free; High School- 51% paid, 9% reduced, 40% free. Migrant-11 Homeless-3 Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 06-07: District- 43% paid, 11.5% reduced, 45.5% free; Elementary- 37% paid, 11% reduced, 52% free; High School- 49% paid, 12% reduced, 39% free. Migrant 06-07: 2 Homeless 06-07: 1 Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 05-06: District- 45.5% paid, 7% reduced, 47.5% free; Elementary- 54% paid, 8% reduced, 38% free; High- 53% paid, 6% reduced, 41% free. Migrant 05-06: 8 Homeless 05-06: 7 Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 04-05: District- 45% paid, 11.5% reduced, 43.5% free; Elementary- 39% paid, 10% reduced, 51% free; High- 51% paid, 13% reduced, 36% free. Migrant 04-05: 0 Homeless 04-05: 0
4. 2005-2006 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: According to the 2005 Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment Student Survey, Salem 6th grade students exceed the state average in exposure to alcohol, cigarettes, and chewing tobacco. 2006-2007 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: According to the 2006 data, Salem 6th grade students exceed the state averages in alcohol, cigarettes, and chewing tobacco. 2007-2008 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: Data for the 2007 school year indicates 20% of Salem 6th grade students used Alcohol, which is a decrease from 23.7% for the 2006 school year. 12.2% used cigarettes, which is a decrease from 15.8% for the 2006 school year. 10% used chewing tobacco, which is a decrease from 28.9% for the 2006 school year.

Supporting Data:

Goal

The district will provide educational opportunities for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing activities to aid in decreasing the average BMI on the annual student screening.

Benchmark

By the 2009-2010 school year, there will be a decrease of the average BMI for students in the Salem School District by 1/4% as evaluated by the 2008-2009 results of the annual BMI screening.

Intervention: Salem Elementary School will provide opportunities for students to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food choices and educate them concerning life-long physical activities which will result in higher academic achievement and a healthier life.

Scientific Based Research: Pediatrics, Vol. 117 No. 5, pp. 1834-1842. 2006. Active Healthy Living: Prevention of Childhood Obesity Through Increased Physical Activity. Council on Sports Medicine and Fitness & Council on School Health.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Salem Elementary School will facilitate the alignment and implementation of the Arkansas Nutrition and Physical Education and Physical Activity Standards and Arkansas Curriculum Frameworks. Opportunities for grade level meetings and curriculum meetings will be given to review framework changes and any changes in the health curriculum. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	David Turnbough	Start: 08/16/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

Staff development regarding physical fitness and nutrition will be held for all elementary teachers. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Melinda Coffman	Start: 08/16/2008 End: 08/16/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee will regularly monitor the goals of the wellness plan and evaluate the effectiveness of the elementary activities in place by reviewing data results from the School Health Index, the BMI, and the Youth Risk Survey. For 2008, results of the School Health Index were relatively the same as previous years. BMI percentages were down for boys by 4% and up 2% for the girls. Youth Risk Survey results were down in all three categories. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Ken Rich	Start: 05/01/2009 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Community Leaders Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The elementary school will participate in the Body Walk on a two-year cycle. 2009-2010 will be the next school year. Students will walk through a tent structure that resembles the organ systems of the human body. Community members provide brief talks at each body organ station. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Melinda Coffman	Start: 04/23/2009 End: 04/24/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Leaders 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
All grade levels in the elementary school will have the opportunity to implement the Take 10 health curriculum. Teachers and students will dedicate 10 minutes a day to physical activity and health activities. A survey will be sent home at the end of the semester to parents to assess the program's effectiveness. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Melinda Coffman	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Salem Elementary School will exceed the PE and physical activity requirements by providing recess, PE classes, and numerous activities to all students throughout the school day. Action Type: Wellness	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Salem Elementary will support physical fitness activities outside of the school day by providing parents with information and by providing host sites for activities to occur. These activities include: intramural and pee wee basketball, mighty-mite football, summer baseball, cheerleading, 4-H, and scouting activities. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	David Turnbough	Start: 08/21/2008 End: 05/21/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Community Leaders 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Elementary students, K-6, will be participating in PE activities related to the Presidential Fitness standards. Action Type: Wellness	Lisa Hurtt	Start: 08/20/2008 End: 05/23/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
	Gaye Passmore	Teachers Aide	Literacy
	Miranda Hurtt	1st Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Business Representative	Mike Falco	Parent	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Amy Sanders	5th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Andrea Walling	1st Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Annette Henley	Mathematics Chairperson	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Becky Turnbough	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy

Classroom Teacher	Cathy Manes	Literacy Chairperson	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Cindy McCullough	2nd Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Cory Johnson	5th Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	David Cone	6th Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Denise Fowler	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Devon Edwards	3rd Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Jacqui Walker	Music Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Jon Neal	PE Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Judy Rose	Special Ed. Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Julie Marsh	Kindergarten Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Kara Boyd	4th Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Linda DuBois	2nd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Linda May	3rd Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Lindsey Washam	6th Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Lisa Hurtt	Art Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lynn Maguffee	5th Grade Teacher	Title I
Classroom Teacher	Melodye Aldridge	1st Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Mylet Trotter	6th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Patty Neal	Special Ed. Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Rae Lynn Simers	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Tiffany Fish	2nd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Treva Cotter	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Community Representative	Dena Barnett	Parent	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Juanita Newman	Paraprofessional	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Mary Smith	Paraprofessional	Title I
District-Level Professional	Melanie Stone	School Nurse	Title I
District-Level Professional	Sandy Massey	Elementary Chair	ACSIP
District-Level Professional	Vicky Rossitto	Counselor	Title I
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Vicki Ragan	Librarian	Title I
Parent	Wanda Koelling	Parent	Title I
Principal	David Turnbough	Elementary Principal	Title I
Principal	Wayne Guiltner	High School Principal	Title I