

School Plan

SALEM HIGH SCHOOL
313 HWY 62E SUITE 2,SALEM, AR 72576

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2012-2013

Salem High School

Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan

It is the mission of the Salem High School to educate 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, in cooperation with the community, provide the experiences necessary for students to become responsible citizens

Grade Span: 7-12

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement: MS

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Priority 2: Math

Goal: To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.

Priority 3: Wellness

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

Priority 1: To improve the literacy skills of all Salem High students.

1. In 2012, the instructional literacy team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response content was the biggest area of concern in literacy.
2. In 2012, 71% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2012 91% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 86% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 40% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2012, 93% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 94% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 50% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for economically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2012, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the ITBS.

Supporting
Data:

3. In 2011, 63% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2011 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 65% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2011, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 90% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 67% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for economically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2011, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.
4. In 2010, 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2010 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 79% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2010, 84% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 80% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for economically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2010, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 62 percentile in Reading and 56 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 22 percentile in Reading and 8 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10. In 2010, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.
5. Students have scored an average of 19.7 on the ACT exam in English and a 20.7 in reading during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.
6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.
- 7.

Priority 2: To improve the math skills of all Salem High students.

1. In 2012, the instructional math team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response numbers and operations for the seventh and eighth grade benchmark and open response language of algebra for the Algebra EOC and open response language of geometry for the Geometry EOC were the biggest areas of concern in math.
2. In 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 69% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2012, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analysis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analysis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analysis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2012, 91% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 90% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2012, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2012, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 58 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 55 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. In 2011, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 64 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 59 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the ITBS.
3. In 2010, 89% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 84% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored

Supporting
Data:

- proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2010, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analysis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analysis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analysis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2010, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 34% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2010, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2010, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 70 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2010, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.
4. In 2009, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2009, 77% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam,

50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analysis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analysis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analysis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. In 2009, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 79% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 29% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. In 2009, 87% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 86% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 33% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. In 2008, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 67 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2009, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 20.4 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.
6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

Goal To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements annually.

| Intervention: Align math curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks and common core state standards. | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Dr. Heidi Hayes Jacobs: Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping. (2004) p. 1-181 | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Training in the curriculum mapping and alignment process. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| ALIGNMENT: Generate a common, grade-level specific curriculum. Action Type: Alignment | Ted Kerley, Math Teacher | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Special education teachers will meet with classroom teachers to align the math curriculum and ensure that proper modifications are being made in the regular class. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education | Johnny Smith, Special Education Teacher | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| ALIGNMENT: Teachers will meet in multi-level department meetings. Aligning the curriculum throughout grade levels will be the focus. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration | Ted Kerley, Math Teacher | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Outside Consultants Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| COLLABORATION: Teachers and administration will conduct a yearly review of alignment process to determine its effectiveness. Information from the state mandated criterion referenced exams will be used to check the effectiveness of the alignment. Students performed very well on the criterion referenced exams. 7th Grade math-77%, 8th grade math-81%, Algebra I-91%, Geometry-84%. On a recent survey, 100% of teachers said that the math curriculum is aligned to the state frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Additional calculators will be purchased to replace broken calculators. 30 TI-84 calculators will be purchased. Students may check out the calculators and bring them home to help complete homework. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion | Wayne Guiltner | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff | Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$3300.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$3300 |
| Common core state standard binders will continue to be used to assist teachers in implementing the common core state standards. Action Type: Alignment | Shaun Windsor, Technology Coordinator | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers Teaching Aids | NSLA (State-281) - \$0.00 Materials & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$0 |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$3300 |

Intervention: Reduce class size in mathematics.

Scientific Based Research: Kiger, Derick M. Class Size Reduction: A Facilitator of Instructional Program Coherence, pg 1-43. Volume 7, Number 4 December, 2002.

| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
|--|------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| COLLABORATION: Salem teachers and administration will conduct a yearly review of the ACSIP plan to determine its effectiveness. Seventh and eighth | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| grade math benchmark results will be used to determine the effectiveness of class reduction. 77% of 7th grade students were proficient or advanced on the benchmark, 81% of 8th grade students were proficient or advanced on the benchmark. Federal, state, and local funds will be used to coordinate and integrate services to improve instruction and increase student achievement. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | | | | |
| COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Title I and Class size reduction will be used to reduce the size of Math classes. Class size in 8th Math will be reduced from 26 to 13 students per class. We have added two additional sections in the 8th grade. We will pay 0.2857 FTE with this money. Action Type: Collaboration | Wayne Guiltner | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Title Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| RECRUITING AND MAINTAINING OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: All teachers are highly qualified. Newspapers, on-line postings and various media will be used to attract highly qualified teachers. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Ken Rich | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| 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. In the seventh grade, the CSR improved from 27 students per teacher to 14 students per teacher. In the eighth grade, the CSR improved from 26 to 13 students per teacher. Action Type: Equity | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff | NSLA (State-281) \$1671.00 - Employee Benefits: NSLA (State-281) \$6681.00 - Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$8352 |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$8352 |

Intervention: To incorporate open response questions in the curriculum.

Scientific Based Research: Reeves, Doug. 2004. Accountability in Action, pg 185-208.

| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Teachers will use open response questions in all classes. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: Parents will be informed about instruction methods and testing procedures during the annual public meeting, parent conferences, and newsletters. Action Type: Parental Engagement | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| COLLABORATION: Teachers will review students' writing to evaluate the effectiveness of incorporating open response questions into each class. Teachers and administrators will examine ACTAAP results to evaluate the efforts made to improve performance on open response times on the ACTAAP exams. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 3.53. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: An academic improvement plan will be written for students that do not score proficient for above on the ACTAAP exams. The focus of the plan will be to improve student performance on open response questions. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Assessments Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

| Intervention: To improve mathematics curriculum by continuing to teach the Transition to College Mathematics course, College Algebra, and College Trigonometry; | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Scientific Based Research: High School Curriculum Vol.1, No. 1, August-September 2001. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| ALIGNMENT: Continue to offer Transition to College Math as a fourth year math course at Salem High. | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside Consultants Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Provide staff development necessary for teacher to teach Transition to College Mathematics course. Action Type: Professional Development | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside Consultants Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| ALIGNMENT: Through a cooperative agreement with Ozarka College -- Continue to offer College Algebra as a fourth year course on the Salem campus. Action Type: Collaboration | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside Consultants Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| COLLABORATION: The administration and math staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the Transition to College Math course at the conclusion of the school year. Evaluation will be made using ACT results, student grades, and teacher observation. The average math ACT score for the 2011-2012 school year was above the state average at 19.9. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Performance Assessments Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Salem schools will purchase one ACT exam through the VUAA for each junior. Students will take the exam in April. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers | NSLA (State-281) - \$3000.00 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$3000 |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$3000 |

| Intervention: Provide study skills classes for students in the 7th grade. | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Contributions of Study Skills to Academic Competence. Gettinger, Maribeth, Seibert. School Psychology Review, 02796015, 2002, Vol. 31, Issue 3. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Study skills classes will be used in the 7th grade to provide additional practice in English and Math. 54 students will be involved in study skills classes which are not required. Students will receive supplemental instruction in Math and English. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Performance Assessments Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| this intervention 3.5. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Technology Inclusion | | | | |
| COLLABORATION: Teacher and Administrators will evaluate the productivity of study skills classes by reviewing student progress. Teachers and Administrators will evaluate the seventh grade state criterion referenced test. Seventh grade students were 77% proficient or advanced on the math portion of the benchmark. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

| Intervention: Step Up to Writing | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Vaughn, Gersten, and Chard (2000). How Step Up to Writing Supports the Underlying Message in LD Intervention Research: Findings from Research Synthesis. The Council for Exceptional Children, 99-114. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| ALIGNMENT: The Step Up to Writing Program will continue to be used in grades 7-12 to provide a consistent guide for writing instruction. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| ALIGNMENT: Purchase materials and supplies necessary to continue use of the Step Up to Writing Program. | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Aids | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| COLLABORATION: Teachers and Administrators will closely monitor the effectiveness of the Step Up to Writing program. ACTAAP results will be used to measure effectiveness. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 4. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

| Intervention: After School Tutoring Program. | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Gil G. Norm (2004). After School Education: A New Ally for Education Reform, 1-3. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| COORDINATION OF FUNDS: An after school tutoring program will be offered to eligible students on Monday through Thursday of each week. Students will receive small group instruction in various areas of literacy based upon teacher recommendation, parent-student concern, and/or remediation plan. Teachers will be paid \$30.00 per hour. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 3.7. | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: The instruction provided to the student will include interactions with the teacher and with computer software. Action Type: Technology Inclusion | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| COLLABORATION: 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. Teachers and Administrators will evaluate students who have been in after school tutoring by comparing their ACTAAP results from one year to the next. Students in remediation/tutoring improved their average | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----|
| math benchmark score 94.23 points and nine students moved from basic to proficient. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | | | | |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

| Intervention: Professional Development | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Lindstrom, P.H. and Speck, M. (2004). The Principal as Professional Development Leader. Corwin Press. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: The teachers and principal will obtain 60 hours of professional development. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: The teachers and principal will obtain 6 hours of technology professional development. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: The teachers and principal will obtain 1 hour of Nutrition and Fitness professional development. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teachers will obtain 2 hours of Parental Involvement professional development. The principal will obtain 3 hours of Parental Involvement professional development. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teachers who teach Arkansas History will obtain 2 hours of professional development in Arkansas History. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| COLLABORATION: Administrator will monitor teachers' professional development hours. Administrators and teachers will evaluate the plan each year based on state standards. All teachers have completed the state requirements for the 2012-2013 school year. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

| Intervention: The high school will continue to use Study Island software in the high school. | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Study Island Scientific Research Base. 2008. Jennifer Watts. Magnolia Consulting, LLC. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| Students will continue to use study island in 7th and 8th grade, algebra, geometry, biology, AP Biology, AP U.S. History, AP Literature, AP Calculus AB, and ACT. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Students will be able to access study island from their home computer internet access. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Collaboration: Teachers and administrators will review criterion reference tests to evaluate the effectiveness of study island as a benchmark review. On a scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 3.6. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

Priority 3: To improve the health and wellness of all Salem High Students.

- 2012-2013 School Health Index: High School: Module 1 - 92% Module 2 - 96% Module 3 - 89% Module 4 - 88% Module 8 - 56% Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 12-13: High School -42% paid, 13% reduced, 45% free. Migrant 11-12: 0 Homeless 11-12: 3 2012-2013 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: The average percentages of alcohol, cigarette, and chewing tobacco usage among Salem 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students meets or exceeds the state averages. In 2012-2013, 92 8th and 10th grade students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: High School: Males-45.1% Females-41.5%;
- 2011-2012 School Health Index: High School: Module 1 - 92% Module 2 - 95% Module 3 - 88% Module 4 - 87% Module 8 - 65% Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 10-11: High School -37% paid, 9% reduced, 54% free. Migrant 11-12: 0 Homeless 11-12: 2 2010-2011 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: The average percentages of alcohol, cigarette, and chewing tobacco usage among Salem 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students meets or exceeds the state averages. In 2010-2011, 86% 8th and 10th grade students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: High School: Males-52.1% Females-42.6%;
- 2010-2011 School Health Index: High School: Module 1 - 94% Module 2 - 96% Module 3 - 89% Module 4 - 86% Module 8 - 56% Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 09-10: High School -40% paid, 10% reduced, 50% free. Migrant 10-11: 0 Homeless 10-11: 1 2009-2010 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: The average percentages of alcohol, cigarette, and chewing tobacco usage among Salem 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students meets or exceeds the state averages. In 2009-2010, 92 8th and 10th grade students had their BMI's assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: High School: Males-55.2% Females-30.8%;

Supporting Data:

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

Benchmark By the 2011-2012 school year, there will be a decrease of the average BMI for students in the Salem School District as evaluated by the 2010-2011 results of the annual BMI screening.

| Intervention: Salem Schools 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. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 4.3. | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Scientific Based Research: Moag-Stahlberg, Alicia. The Learning Connection: Better Health, Better Performance. Our Children, The National PTA's Magazine, pg. 1-3. (10/1/2006). Pediatrics, Vol. 105 No. 5, pp. 1156-1157. 2000. Physical Fitness and Activity in Schools. American Academy of Pediatrics. | | | | |
| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
| WELLNESS: Salem Schools will support staff members in making physical activity and healthy foods widely available in all areas of the school campus and encourage students to make healthy behavior choices outside of school. Action Type: Wellness | Ken Rich | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: The Salem School District will promote and support a curriculum emphasizing healthy living and physical activity. The | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| curriculum will be aligned with the Arkansas Health Frameworks. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness | | 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: The Salem School District will involve parents in physical activity and nutrition education through homework activities, school menus, and parent meetings. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness | Wayne Guiltner, Principal | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: The Salem School District will support the computer-based system for student meal accounts. Every effort will be made to inform parents of the free and reduced lunch application process and the private lunch account process to ensure student privacy. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness | Martha Wood | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: Salem Schools will support the cafeterias in order to offer students healthy food choices each day. Students will also be offered a variety of low fat and skim milk with each meal. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness | Martha Wood | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: Salem Schools will assist the Wellness Committee as the committee evaluates the effectiveness of the Wellness Plan each school year. Changes in the plan will be made accordingly. Action Type: Wellness | Ken Rich | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

Intervention: Administrative Support for Wellness. ON a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 4.3.

Scientific Based Research: Pediatrics, Vol. 117 No. 5: pp. 1834-1842. 2006. Active Healthy Living: Prevention of Childhood Obesity Through Increased Physical Activity. Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 103(7): 887-93. 2003. Position of the American Dietetic Association: Child and Adolescent Food and Nutrition Program. J. Stand, C.T. Bayerl.

| Actions | Person Responsible | Timeline | Resources | Source of Funds |
|--|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| WELLNESS: The Salem School District has developed district wellness policies in collaboration with the district Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee. Policies have been approved by the district school board. Policies include the five federal requirements: Goals for nutrition education, physical activity and other school-based activities, nutrition guidelines, guidelines for reimbursable school meals, a plan for measuring implementation of the local wellness policy, and community involvement. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness | Ken Rich | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: Salem Schools 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: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness | Ken Rich | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|
| WELLNESS: Staff development regarding physical fitness and nutrition will be held for all district teachers. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness | Melinda Coffman | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| WELLNESS: The Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee will regularly monitor the goals of the wellness plan and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions in place by reviewing data results from the School Health Index, the BMI, and the Youth Risk Survey. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness | Ken Rich | Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Community Leaders • Teachers | ACTION BUDGET: \$ |
| Total Budget: | | | | \$0 |

• Planning Team

| Classification | Name | Position | Committee |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| | Cory Arnold | Student | Student |
| | Johnny Smith | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Alanna Russell | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Alanna Russell | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Amanda Himschoot | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | April Tyree | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Cody Curtis | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Crystal Newberry | | Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Don Carithers | | Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Eileen McCord | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Johnny Smith | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Josh Watson | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Josh Watson | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Juan Ramirez | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Kim Smith-Harber | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Mike Cole | | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Patricia Dailey | | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Rachel Faulkner | Teacher | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Rachel Foster | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Rhonda Huddleston | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Rhonda Huddleston | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Rob Long | | High School Literacy |
| Classroom Teacher | Rona Moore | | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Scott Faulkner | | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Seth Brazeal | | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Ted Kerley | | High School Math |
| Classroom Teacher | Tesa Nelson | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Tesa Nelson | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Classroom Teacher | Tim Eckman | | High School Math |
| Non-Classroom Professional Staff | Amanda Kennedy | | High School Literacy |
| Non-Classroom Professional Staff | Brandi Sanderson | School Nurse | Title I |
| Non-Classroom Professional Staff | Susanne Jones | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Non-Classroom Professional Staff | Susanne Jones | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Parent | Angela Bassham | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Parent | Angela Bassham | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Parent | Dana Johns | | High School Math |
| Parent | Larry Brown | | High School Literacy |
| Parent | Luke Barker | | High School Math |

| | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--------|----------------------------|
| Parent | Melanie Stone | Parent | ACSIP |
| Parent | Wendall Smith | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Parent | Wendall Smith | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Principal | Corey Johnson | | Title V Advisory Committee |
| Principal | Corey Johnson | | Title I Advisory Committee |
| Principal | Wayne Guiltner | | ACSIP |