School Plan

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
313 HWY 62E SUITE 4,SALEM, AR 72576

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2011-2012

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: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: All students will improve literacy skills.

Supporting Data:

1. 2011 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND CONTENT STRANDS OF READING ON THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE AND OPEN-RESPONSE ITEMS. THIS INCLUDES THE COMBINED POPULATION AND THE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. ALL SALEM TEACHERS,IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOMS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS, WILL BE LOOKING AT THOSE TYPES OF QUESTIONS DURING GRADE LEVEL MEETINGS TO SEE WHAT PART OF OUR CURRICULUM NEEDS TO BE ADJUSTED. 2011 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. In 2009, 82% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 78% of the economically disadvantaged students, 20% of the students with disabilities, and 82% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. 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 areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 17% of the students with disabilities, and 90% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. 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 areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2011, 90% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 89% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains.

2. In 2009, 80% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 67% of the economically disadvantaged students, 40% 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-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary 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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 40% of the students with disabilities, and 89% 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-Literary 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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 82% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 75% of the economically disadvantaged students, 14% 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-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. 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 were the multiple-choice items.
3. In 2009, 81% 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, 20% of the students with disabilities, and 84% 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-Practical 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-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2010, 92% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 94% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 94% 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-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2011, 95% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 95% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 96% 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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. 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.
4. In 2009, 88% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 87% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% of the students with disabilities, and 88% 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-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2010, 82% 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, 25% of the students with disabilities, and 84% 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-Literary 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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 87% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 80% of the economically disadvantaged students, 57% of the students with disabilities, and 88% 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-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

5. In 2009, 82% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 80% of the Caucasian population, 45% of the students with disabilities, and 78% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Ending Sounds Cluster, averaging 77%. In 2010, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2011, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%.
6. In 2009, 73% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 73% of the Caucasian students, 67% of the free/reduced students, and 25% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2010, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2011, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster.
7. In 2009, 58% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 59% of the Caucasian students, 52% of the free/reduced students, and 33% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2010, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2011, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster.
8. In 2009, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at the 57th percentile in Reading Comprehension. The students with IEP's scored at the 21st percentile. In 2010, 65% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 66% of the Caucasian students, 59% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2011, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at the 63rd percentile in Reading Comprehension. the Caucasian students scored at the 62nd percentile, the free/reduced students scored at the 57th percentile, and the students with IEP's scored at the 25th percentile.
9. In 2009, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 65th percentile in Reading Comprehension. The students with IEP's scored in the 28th percentile. In 2010, 79% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 83% of the Caucasian students, 70% of the free/reduced students, and 20% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2011, the combined population of 4th grade students scored at the 66th percentile in Reading Comprehension. the Caucasian students scored at the 65th percentile, the free/reduced students scored at the 53rd percentile, and the students with IEP's scored at the 26th percentile.
10. In 2009, the combined population of 5th grade students scored in the 64th percentile in Reading Comprehension, and the students with IEP's scored in the 26th percentile. In 2010, 76% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 78% of the Caucasian students, 63% of the free/reduced students, and 33% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2011, the combined population of 5th grade students scored at the 70th percentile in Reading Comprehension. the Caucasian students scored at the 71st percentile, the free/reduced students scored at the 60th percentile, and the students with IEP's scored at the 20th percentile.
11. In 2009, the combined population of 6th grade students scored in the 49th percentile in Reading

Comprehension, and the students with IEP's scored in the 11th percentile. In 2010, 50% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 49% of the Caucasian students, 46% of the free/reduced students, and 25% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2011, the combined population of 6th grade students scored at the 67th percentile in Reading Comprehension. the Caucasian students scored at the 66th percentile, the free/reduced students scored at the 53rd percentile, and the students with IEP's scored at the 21st percentile.

12. The 2009 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2009 School Improvement Report. The 2010 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2010 School Improvement Report. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 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. 2006-2009 Combined Population: 80.9 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 81.6 Econ. Dis.: 76.4 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2007-2010 Combined Population: 84.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 85.7 Econ. Dis.: 81.2 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2008-2011 Combined Population: 87.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 88.8 Econ. Dis.: 84.1 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: ALIGNMENT of the literacy curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks and Common Core State Standards.				
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Each classroom teacher will identify the skills being taught in his/her literacy curriculum throughout the school year. The teacher will use a checklist to assist in this process. Action Type: Alignment	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 ITBS 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. 2011 results on the Federal Programs Inventory from the teachers indicate that 92% of the Salem Elementary teachers feel our literacy curriculum is properly aligned. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Common Core State Standards binders will be purchased for all teachers K-6 to assist the teachers in implementing the standards. Action Type: Alignment	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		Title VI State - Materials & Supplies: $1000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $1000
Total Budget:				$1000

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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Teachers will regularly evaluate the impact of the Effective Literacy program on the development of literacy skills. ITBS scores from the 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades will be looked at each year in addition to the percent of teachers currently using those stratagies 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 2011-2012 school year. Classroom observations in coordination with the edcuational cooperative will be done to ensure the trainee is using the strategies of effective literacy. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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. Magnolia Consulting. (2010). A final report for the evaluation of Renaissance Learning's Accelerated Reader program. Charlottesville, VA: Author.

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.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	Title I - Materials & Supplies: $53950.00

The AR program and other technology interventions will be purchased in the 2011-2012 school year. In grades K-6, iPads, cases, and charging stations will be purchased to support the Accelerated Reader Program. Seven wireless access points and supplies will be purchased to improve the wireless infrastucture. Also, eBooks and APPS will be purchased. Printers and printer supplies will be purchased to replace/repair old printers in classroom. Nine scanners will be purchased for 3 grade levels. Students take AR tests on the computers. Tech support for software related to the program will also be purchased each year - Destiny and Star Reading, Star Math and Accelerated Reader. Earbuds will be purchased for each student, K-6, to enhance the Accelerated Reader Program. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide			• School Library • Teachers	Title I - Capital Outlay: $13100.00 NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: $10315.00 ACTION BUDGET: $77365
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Computers • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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. Books will be purchased each year to update the fiction and nonfiction selections for students. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Computers • School Library • Teachers	Title I - Purchased Services: $4000.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: $8000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $12000
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. 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,	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

including the two resource classrooms. During the 2008-2009 school year, our students passed 67,881 quizzes and averaged 87.8% on each quiz. Students gained an average of 1.25 in grade equivalency and 13.55 percentile points according to Star Reading results. 100% of our classroom teachers are using the program, including the two resource classrooms. 2009 FPI teacher ratings rated the AR Program as a 4.5 out 5 in terms of effectiveness. During the 2009-2010 school year, our students passed 67,881 quizzes and averaged 87.8% on each quiz. Students gained an average of 1.18 in grade equivalency and 12.52 percentile points according to Star Reading results. 100% of our classroom teachers are using the program, including the two resource classrooms. 2010 FPI teacher ratings rated the AR Program as a 4.6 out 5 in terms of effectiveness. During the 2010-2011 school year, our students passed 66,276 quizzes and averaged 87.1% on each quiz. Students gained an average of 1.27 in grade equivalency and 12.88 percentile points according to Star Reading results. 100% of our classroom teachers are using the program, including the two resource classrooms. 2010 FPI teacher ratings rated the AR Program as a 4.6 out 5 in terms of effectiveness. Action Type: Program Evaluation				
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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	Vicki Ragan	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Public Library • School Library	ACTION BUDGET: $
As an incentive to students, a millionaires' word wall will be created. Students reaching certain grade level goals in terms of words read will be rewarded and recognized as members of the millionaire club. The students' pictures will be taken, printed off on a money template, and displayed on the millionaire's wall. In 2010-2011, students read 236,591,844 words. There were 116 millionaires, 3 students reached five million, and 1 student reached six million. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Vicki Ragan	Start: 08/15/2011 End: 05/24/2012	• Computers • School Library • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Technology infrustructure will be updated and improved to support all instructional programs. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers	Title I - Materials & Supplies: $7300.00 ACTION BUDGET: $7300

The librarian will open the library in the summer to promote students to continue to read throughout the summer. The librarian will be paid $30 per hour. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Vicki Ragan	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 08/15/2012	• Administrative Staff • School Library • Teachers	Title I - Employee Benefits: $110.00 Title I - Employee Salaries: $400.00 ACTION BUDGET: $510
Total Budget:				$97175

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 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. As of 2009, Title I funds will no longer be used for classroom reduction. However, on the 2010 FPI (Federal Programs Inventory), Salem teachers rated classroom reduction as a 4.6 out of 5 in terms of importance for our educational program and success. 2-A funds will still be used as long as permissible. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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. 1 teacher's salary (1 FTE) Cathy Manes will be paid with Title II-A and 2 teacher's salaries, Lynn Maguffee and Lindsey Wiseman, at 1 FTE each will be paid with NSLA funds in 2011-2012. 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. The student to teacher ratio in the grade levels using classroom reduction will be 18.3 to 1. If the funds were not used, the ratio would have been 21.3 to 1. Action Type: Equity	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	Title II-A - Employee Salaries: $40038.00 Title II-A - Employee Benefits: $4670.00 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: $20272.89 NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: $84000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $148980.89
The grade level placement of CSR teachers will be based upon enrollment at the beginning 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$148980.89

Intervention: To improve instruction in literacy with an emphasis on 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 opportunites 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 mandated by the ADE. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Teachers will collect and assess open-responses from students and adjust instruction as needed. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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. Materials and supplies will be purchased to supplement the literacy curriculum throughout the school year. Technology will be purchased to aid in literacy instruction. Teachers will also have the option of virtual field trips to improve student vocabulary and prior knowledge. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
REMEDIATION 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: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 ITBS data will be	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

analyzed to determine which grade levels need more practice on open-reponse items. On the 2010 FPI teacher ratings, Salem Elementary teachers rated literacy open-response instruction as a 4.6 out of 5, with 93% of the staff using open-response items in their instruction at least on a daily/weekly basis. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
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 or open house to meet the parents and to discuss reading programs and instruction, as well as developmentally appropriate activities that parents can do in the home to help their child be successful. The technology coordinator will offer other opportunities to parents to attend trainings on school district software related to online grades, AR records, lunch balances,... Kindergarten will also host a Parent/Literacy Night. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff	ACTION BUDGET: $
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. Salem Elementary will implement effective parental involvement which would include the following: (1) joint collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, teachers, etc.; (2) support for schools to develop policies/programs to improve	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

student achievement; (3) parental involvement strategies for public/private preschool programs; (4) annual assessments of the effectiveness of Parental Involvemnt Programs; (5) the six components to build parental capacity --- (A) Provide assistance to parents in understanding content how to monitor a child's progress; (B) Provide materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve academic achievement; (C) Educate teachers, principals, and other staff in the importance of effective communication and the value of the contributions of parents; (D) Coordinate and integrate parent involvement programs and activities; (E) Ensure that information related to school and parent programs is sent to parents in language that parents can understand; (F) Provide other reasonable support that parents may request. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
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 and Act 397 of 2009. 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. Training opportunities will be provided to volunteers as needed, depending on the voluneer's location and responsibilities. An area in the library has been provided for parent book selections. The parent center will be maintained by the facilitator, Corey Johnson. The parent facilitator will assist and support the developemnt of any parent organization, such as PTA/PTO. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff	ACTION BUDGET: $
The local newspaper and cable tv company will be used as information sources for the public concerning school events and achievements. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	ACTION BUDGET: $
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	Vicky Rossitto	Start: 09/30/2011 End: 09/30/2011	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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 or email.	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	Title I - Materials & Supplies: $5000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $5000
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	Vicky Rossitto	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 07/31/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	ACTION BUDGET: $
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. 2010-2011 survey results were shared with teachers during the summer inservice. Results were very positive. Parent/Teahcer Conference attendance rates will also be monitored this year and future years. On the 2010 (FPI) Federal Programs Inventory, teachers rated the following parental involvement activities using a 1-5 scale as follows: Open House---4.7; Grandparent's Breakfast---4.6; PT Conferences---4.6; Renaissance Programs---4.4; and parent volunteers---3.1. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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. The compact shall include the following: Salem Elementary will implement effective parental involvement which would include the six components to build parental capacity --- (A) Provide assistance to parents in understanding content how to monitor a child's progress; (B) Provide materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve academic achievement; (C) Educate teachers,	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

principals, and other staff in the importance of effective communication and the value of the contributions of parents; (D) Coordinate and integrate parent involvement programs and activities; (E) Ensure that information related to school and parent programs is sent to parents in language that parents can understand; (F) Provide other reasonable support that parents may request. Parent grievance procedures are also provided in the hand book. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
The school purchased Pinnacle for all teachers to keep electronic grades. Grades will be automatically updated, so parents will be able to check on their child's progress at any time on-line. A computer is available for parents' use in the parent center for parents who do not have a computer at home. Yearly tech support fees will be paided for the program. Fees for AlertNow will also be paid. AlertNow is a phone system that allows the district to communicate with parents using a mass call. Teachers will continue to use email to communicate with parents. The district will purchase items necessary to maintain the integrity of the email system. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • District Staff • Teachers	Title I - Purchased Services: $5500.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: $1500.00 ACTION BUDGET: $7000
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		ACTION BUDGET: $
The school will provide at least two hours of PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT each year related to parental involvement to teachers by providing meaningful training to encourage and develop relationships with parents. Adminstrators will receive at least three hours of professional development in parental involvement at the local educational cooperative. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Homework/Communication folders will be purchased each year for students so parents will be able to locate homework and graded assignments easily each night. Each grade level will have a different color folder. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$12000

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
The instruction provided to the student will include interactions with the teacher and with computer software. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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 occured 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, tutoring students on average increased their scale scores by 37 points. In 2008-2009, students in the tutoring program increased their scale scores by an average of 83 points. In 2009-2010, students in the tutoring program increased their scale scores by an average of 98 points. In 2010-2011, students in the tutoring program increased their scale scores by an average of 122 points. On the 2010 FPI teacher rating scale, Salem Elementary teachers rated after school tutoring as a 4.6 out of 5 in terms of effetiveness. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Public Library	ACTION BUDGET: $
Remediation/tutoring will be offered to all students. The school will target new students who may be behind or struggling with the new curriculum. Remediation/tutoring may occur after school or during summer months. Participating teachers will be paid $30 per hour.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • School Library • Teachers	Title I - Employee Salaries: $19000.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: $3960.11 ACTION BUDGET: $22960.11
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 intruction based upon previos test data and AIP's.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Student critical thinking wheels will be purchased in grades 2-6 to develop and improve questioning and thinking skills. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Performance Assessments • Teaching Aids	Title VI State - Materials & Supplies: $1147.01 ACTION BUDGET: $1147.01
Total Budget:				$24107.12

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
Orchard software will be used to facilitate literacy instruction in grades K-6. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The software will also be used to tutor students requiring remediation in literacy skills. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Each year, the program will be evaluated to determine any necessary changes to be made. Condsideration 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. In 2010, teachers rated Orchard Literacy as a 2.5 out 5 in terms of effectiveness on the 2010 FPI rating survey. 41% of the teachers never used the program at all. At this time, no further investment is planned in Orchard software. Teacher concerns were the difficulty of use with the allotted lab time. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 has been purchased for grades K-6 to provide supplemental instruction in literacy during classroom instruction and after school tutoring. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers	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 ITBS scale scores. 2010 teacher rating for the program wasa 4.6 out of 5, with 75% of teachers using the program on a daily/weekly basis. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

Classroom Response system has been purchased to enhance the effectiveness of the Study Island program. The response system will provide classroom teachers with instant assessment on Student Learner Expectations (Arkansas Frameworks). Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Performance Assessments • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Interactive Whiteboards will be purchased and used in all grades.

Scientific Based Research: Graetz, K. (2006). The psychology of learning environments. In Diane G. Oblinger, Ed., Learning Spaces. Boulder, CO: 2006. 6.1–6.14. Milne, A. J. (2007). Entering the Interaction Age: Implementing a future vision for campus learning spaces... today. Educause Review, January/February 2007, page 22.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The district will use Interactive Whiteboards in all grades (classrooms) to increase student engagemnent, motivation, and enhance student understanding. The use of Interactive Whiteboards will allow teachers to accommodate a variety of learning styles. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
The district will purchase replacement bulbs for projectors. Projectors are used with the Interactive Whiteboards to make use of the supplemental technology programs used by the district.	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: $3000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $3000
Total Budget:				$3000

Intervention: Education City will be purchased and used in grades K-6.

Scientific Based Research: Case Study Research Summary of EducationCity.com in California Magnolia Consulting, LLC November 17, 2009

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Education City will be purchased for grades K-6 to provide supplemental instruction in literacy during classroom instruction and after school tutoring. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	Title I - Purchased Services: $2900.00 ACTION BUDGET: $2900
The effectiveness of the Education City 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 Education City. This growth will be based upon Benchmark and ITBS scale scores. Education City works with the Study Island software, so teachers will evaluate using assessment from Study Island. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $

Classroom Response system will be purchased to enhance the effectiveness of the Education City program. The response system will provide classroom teachers with instant assessment on Student Learner Expectations (Arkansas Frameworks). Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$2900

Intervention: Literacy DVD's will be purchased and used in all classrooms.

Scientific Based Research: •Marzano, R. J. (with Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J.). (2003) Classroom Management that Works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. •Hall, T., Strangman, N., & Meyer, A. (2003). Differentiated Instruction and Implications for UDL Implementation, Retrieved 10/13/05 from http://www.k8accesscenter.org/training_resources/udl/diffinstruction.asp

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Literacy DVD's will be purchased and used in all classrooms to help differentiate the instruction. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Vicki Ragan	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• School Library	Title I - Materials & Supplies: $2000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $2000
Total Budget:				$2000

Priority 2: All students will improve math skills.

Supporting Data:

1. 2011 MATHEMATICS DATA FOR SALEM ELEMENTARY INDICATES THAT THE MEASUREMENT & DATA ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY STRANDS WERE THE WEAKEST AREAS ON THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE ITEMS AND OPEN-RESONSE ITEMS FOR BOTH THE COMBINED POPULATION AND STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. TEACHERS WILL BE DISCUSSING CURRICULUM ADJUSTMENTS AND ANY POSSIBLE SUPPLIMENTAL MATERIALS THAT MAY BE NEEDED TO ADDRESS THESE WEAKNESSES DURING GRADE LEVEL MEETINGS THROUGHOUT THE SCHOOL YEAR. In 2009, 96% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 95% of the low socioeconomic students, 97% of the Caucasian students, and 100% 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 Algebra multiple-choice and the Geometry open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Data Analysis & Probability multiple-choice and the Number and Operations open-response. In 2010, 92% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 88% of the low socioeconomic students, 91% 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 Geometry multiple-choice and the Geometry open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Data Analysis & Probability multiple-choice and the Number and Operations open-response. In 2011, 92% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 86% 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 Numbers & Operations multiple-choice and the Geometry open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Data Analysis & Probability multiple-choice and the Number and Operations open-response.
2. In 2009, 90% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 82% of the low socioeconomic students, 89% of the Caucasian students, and 80% 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 Data Analysis and Probability 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. In 2010 , 93% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 90% of the low socioeconomic students, 98% of the Caucasian students, and 40% 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 Number & Operations open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Measurement multiple-choice and the Measurement open-response. In 2011, 89% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 83% of the low socioeconomic

students, 88% of the Caucasian students, and 43% 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 Number & Operations open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Measurement multiple-choice and the Measurement open-response.

3. In 2009, 96% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 95% of the low socioeconomic students, 96% of the Caucasian students, and 80% 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 Data Analysis and Probability open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Meaurement multiple-choice and the Data Analysis and Probability open-response. In 2010, 96% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 96% of the low socioeconomic students, 96% of the Caucasian students, and 100% 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 Geometry open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Meaurement multiple-choice and the Data Analysis and Probability open-response. In 2011, 100% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 100% of the low socioeconomic students, 100% of the Caucasian students, and 100% 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 Algebra multiple-choice and the Numbers & Operations open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Meaurement multiple-choice and the Data Analysis and Probability open-response.
4. In 2009, 98% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 97% of the low socioeconomic students, 98% of the Caucasian students, and 100% 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 Algebra open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Data Analysis and Probability multiple-choice and the Algebra and Geometry open-response. In 2010, 80% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 74% of the low socioeconomic students, 80% of the Caucasian students, and 25% 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 Measurement open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Data Analysis and Probability multiple-choice and the Algebra and Geometry open-response. In 2011, 96% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the Benchmark exams. 94% of the low socioeconomic students, 96% of the Caucasian students, and 86% 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 Numbers & Operations open-response. The lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Data Analysis and Probability multiple-choice and the Algebra and Geometry open-response.
5. In 2009, 73% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile on the MAT 8 Math. 72% of the Caucasian students, 63% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 55% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Data and Probability cluster. In 2010, 80% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile on the MAT 8 Math. 79% of the Caucasian students, 74% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 67% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Data and Probability cluster. In 2011, 80% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile on the MAT 8 Math. 79% of the Caucasian students, 74% of the economically disadvantaged students, and 67% of the students with disabilities scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Data and Probability cluster.
6. In 2009, 78% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 78% of the Caucasian students, 50% of the students with IEP's, and 71% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Estimation cluster. In 2010, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 65% of the Caucasian students, 47% of the students with IEP's, and 58% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Estimation cluster. In 2011, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 65% of the Caucasian students, 47% of the students with IEP's, and 58% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Estimation cluster.
7. In 2009, 66% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 67% of the Caucasian students, 33% of the

students with IEP's, and 61% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Measurement cluster. In 2010, 84% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 84% of the Caucasian students, 40% of the students with IEP's, and 78% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Measurement cluster. In 2011, 84% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 84% of the Caucasian students, 40% of the students with IEP's, and 78% of the Free/Reduced students scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area was the Measurement cluster.

8. In 2009, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 77th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 62nd percentile. In 2010, 75 % of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored at or above 50 percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 33% of the students with IEP's. In 2011, the combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 79th percentile in mathematics. The caucasian students scored in the 79th percentile. The students with an IEP scored in the 38th percentile. The free/reduced students scored in the 68th percentile.
9. In 2009, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 77th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 70th percentile. In 2010, 85% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored at or above 50 percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 20% of the students with IEP's. In 2011, the combined population of 4th grade students scored in the 70th percentile in mathematics. The caucasian students scored in the 69th percentile. The students with an IEP scored in the 30th percentile. The free/reduced students scored in the 60th percentile.
10. In 2009, the combined population of 5th grade students scored in the 73rd percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 58th percentile. In 2010, 83% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored at or above 50 percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 50% of the students with IEP's. In 2011, the combined population of 5th grade students scored in the 79th percentile in mathematics. The caucasian students scored in the 80th percentile. The students with an IEP scored in the 49th percentile. The free/reduced students scored in the 71st percentile.
11. In 2009, the combined population of 6th grade students scored in the 80th percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. The students with IEP's scored in the 42nd percentile. In 2010, 79% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored at or above 50 percentile in Math Problem Solving on the SAT 10. 50% of the students with IEP's. In 2011, the combined population of 6th grade students scored in the 73rd percentile in mathematics. The caucasian students scored in the 73rd percentile. The students with an IEP scored in the 52nd percentile. The free/reduced students scored in the 65th 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.

Benchmark: 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%. 2006-2009 Combined Population: 91 African American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 91.2 Econ. Dis.: 88.6 LEP: NA Stud. Dis.: NA 2007-2010 Combined Population: 92.4 African American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 92.8 Econ. Dis.: 89.8 LEP: NA Stud. Dis.: NA 2008-2011 Combined Population: 94.2 African American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 94.4 Econ. Dis.: 91.3 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 a skills checklist. 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 ITBS tests will also be examined each year to identify weaknesses in the curricululm. Common planning periods will also allow grade levels to monitor and adjust curriculum on a daily basis. 2010 results from the Teacher Surveys on the Federal Programs Inventory (FPI)indicate that 100% of the staff surveyed felt our math curriculum was properly aligned. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 ITBS 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 2006-2007, our students gained an average of 16.3 percentile points and 2.5 in grade equivalency. In 2007-2008, our students gained an average of 9.3 percentile points and 1.4 in grade equivalency. In 2008-2009, our students gained an average of 22 percentile points and 2.4 in grade equivalency. In 2009-2010, our students gained an average of 25 percentile points and 2.06 in grade equivalency. In 2010-2011, our students gained an average of 24 percentile points and 2.04 in grade equivalency. 100% of the classroom teachers in grades 3-6 use the Star Math for an assessment instrument, including the two resource classrooms. FPI results from the teachers rate the STAR MATH program a 4.1 out 5, with 67% of the teachers using the program at least on a quarterly basis. Concerns were related to technology access. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 ITBS, and 3-6 Benchmark scores will be the test data analyzed each year, depending upon the placement of the teachers. As of 2009, Title I funds will no longer be used for classroom reduction. However, on the 2009 FPI (Federal Programs Inventory), Salem teachers rated classroom reduction as a 4.6 out of 5 in terms of importance for our educational program and success. 2-A funds will still be used as long as permissible. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff	ACTION BUDGET: $
The grade level placement of the CSR teacher/teachers will depend upon the enrollment at the beginning of the school year. Every effort will be made to use data from various sources to divide classrooms fairly. Action Type: Equity	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: To improve instruction in mathematics with emphasis on 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

and improvement of instruction. The effectiveness of open-response instruction will also be evalutated 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. In 2009, 3rd grade students earned 68% of the possilbe open-response points, 4th grade earned 65%, 5th grae earned 58%, and 6th grade earned 75%. In 2010, 3rd grade students scored above the state average on open response questions, 4th grade students scored above the state average on 4 of 5 categories, 5th grade students scored above the state average on all categories, and 6th grade students scored above the state average on 3 of 5 categories. 2011 FPI results from the teachers rate the importance of open-response as a 4.7 out of 5, with 90% of the staff implementing open-response items on a daily/weekly basis. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
REMEDIATION 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: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Teachers will regularly collect and assess student work, evaluate progress, and adjust instruction as needed. Teachers will also have the option to have virtual field trips to strengthen math concepts and allow studentst to see the value of math in the real world. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: REMEDIATION Afterschool Tutoring Program.				
Scientific Based Research: Gil G. Norm (2004). Afterschool Educaton: A New Ally for Education Reform, 1-3.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
An afterschool remediation/tutoring program will be offered to eligible students. Remediation/Tutoring will be offered throughout the school year and during summer months. Students will receive small group instruction in various areas of mathematics based upon teacher recommendations and/or remediation plans.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 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. In 2008-2009, students participating in the tutoring program increased their scale scores by an average of 90 points. In 2009-2010, students participating in the tutoring program increased their scale scores by an average of 97 points. In 2010-2011, students participating in the tutoring program increased their scale scores by an average of 124 points. 2011 FPI results from the teachers rate after school tutoring as a 4.4 out of 5 in terms of importance to our educational program. Concerns include not enough time per student and the number of students participating. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Remediation will be offered to all students each week, especially targeting new students struggling with the curriculum.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
REMEDIATION 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.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The Buckle Down benchmark review program will used to supplement instruction and be used as a remediation tool for math. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Performance Assessments • Teaching Aids	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.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 pysical problems to use the program. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The software will also be used to tutor students requiring remediation in mathematics. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $

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 as new programs become available to provide supplemental insturction in mathematics during classroom instruction and after school tutoring.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		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 ITBS scale scores. Pre and post test data indicated an average growth of 21% in math and 14% in reading. In 2011, teachers rated Study Island Math as a 4.4 out 5. 68% of the staff used the program on a daily/weekly basis. 2009 was the first year of implementation. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
Classroom Response system will be purchased to enhance the effectiveness of the Study Island program. The response system will provide classroom teachers with instant assessment on Student Learner Expectations (Arkansas Frameworks). Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Total Budget:				$0

Intervention: Education City will be purchased and used in grades K-6.				
Scientific Based Research: Case Study Research Summary of EducationCity.com in California Magnolia Consulting, LLC November 17, 2009				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The effectiveness of the Education City 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 Education City. This growth will be based upon Benchmark and ITBS scale scores. Education City works with the Study Island software, so teachers will evaluate using assessment from Study Island. In 2011, teachers rated Education City Math as a 4.4 out 5. 70% of the staff used the program on a daily/weekly basis. 2010 was the first year of implementation. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Classroom Response system will be purchased to enhance the effectiveness of the Education City program. The response system will provide classroom teachers with instant assessment on Student Learner Expectations (Arkansas Frameworks). Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	• Computers • Teaching Aids	ACTION BUDGET: $
Education City will be purchased for grades K-6 to provide supplemental instruction in literacy during classroom instruction and after school tutoring. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Computers • Teaching Aids	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.

Supporting Data:

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 precent 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% In 2008-2009, students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percent of students overweight or obese. District: Males-45% Females-39.5% Elementary: Males-44.9% Females-37.5% High School: Males-45.1% Females-41.5% In 2010-2011, students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percent of students overweight or obese. Elementary: Males-40.3% Females-23.0%
2. 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% 2009 School Health Index Elementary: Module 1-89% Module 2-95% Module 3-92% Module 4-76% Module 8-90% 2011 School Health Index Elementary: Module 1-90% Module 2-96% Module 3-93% Module 4-78% Module 8-92%
3. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 10-11 District- 39% paid, 10% reduced, 55% free; Migrant-4 Homeless-3 Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 09-10 District- 39% paid, 10% reduced, 51% free; Elementary- 35% paid, 8% reduced, 57% free; High School- 42% paid, 13% reduced, 45% free. Migrant-4 Homeless-0 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. 2008-2009 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: The surveys were given in the sixth grade, but less than the required number of students participated to get individual school results. 2009-2010 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: According to the 2009 data, Salem 6th grade students exceed the state averages in alcohol, cigarettes, and chewing tobacco. 2010-2011 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: According to the 2010 data, Salem 6th grade students exceed the state averages in alcohol, cigarettes, and chewing tobacco.

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 2011-2012 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 2010-2011 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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 Gray	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee will regulary 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 2011, results of the School Health Index were relatively the same as previous years. BMI percentages were down for boys by 14.9% and down 7.8% for the girls. Youth Risk Survey results were not received due to limited number of participants. 2010 Teacher Surveys (FPI) rated the physical activity/wellness activities as follows using a 1-5 scale: PE---4.7; Recess(Physical Activity Period)---4.5; Body Walk---4.4; Health Curriculum---4.1; and Activities with Malinda Gray---4.3. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: $
The elementary school will participate in the Body Walk on a two-year cycle. 2012-2013 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 Gray	Start: 05/24/2012 End: 05/24/2012	• 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 Gray	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Bob Maguffee	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• 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	Bob Maguffee	PE Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Cassie Knight	5th Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Cathy Manes	Literacy Chairperson	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Cindy McCullough	2nd 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	Judy Rose	Special Ed. Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Julie Marsh	Kindergarten Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Kara Boyd	4th Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Kristen Hyslip	2nd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Linda DuBois	2nd Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Linda May	3rd Grade Teacher	Mathematics
Classroom Teacher	Lindsey Wiseman	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	Patty Neal	Special Ed. Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Rae Lynn Simers	Kindergarten Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Tiffany Pierce	6th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Treva Cotter	4th Grade Teacher	Literacy
Community Representative	Dena Barnett	Parent	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Anna Sutherland	Paraprofessional	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Brandi Sanderson	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	Melanie Stone	Parent	Title I
Principal	Corey Johnson	Elementary Principal	Title I
Principal	Wayne Guiltner	High School Principal	Title I